

3.96 HOUSING OMISSION SITE PROPOSALS

3.96.1 BENTLEY

The Objections

Western Outskirts

509 Mr G R Goodwin/Planbuild Services

Site is being proposed within policy HS09 as an appropriate site for residential development. The site is located on western outskirts of Bentley where no residential development has occurred for a period of time. A mixed residential development is proposed that would satisfy the needs of the people in the area. The allocation of additional housing will generally help promote the well being of facilities within Bentley such as a primary school. Development on the site will not affect the character of the village. The landscaping of the site to current standards would not create a situation where the setting of the village would be impaired. The site is well related to the principal traffic network of the District while access would be provided to the Village Street where the junction could be improved.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.1.1 From my visit I consider Bentley to be a small commuter village with few facilities. It is suitable only for minor infilling within the Built Up Area Boundary. Development on a larger scale and on a site which could accommodate up to 50 dwellings would not be sustainable.
- 3.96.1.2 The site reads as part of the open countryside and its development would involve a large unacceptable incursion into the rural setting of the village.
- 3.96.1.3 I have no evidence before me of any particular local needs which would justify additional housing in the village.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.2 BILDESTON

The Objections

East of Rotherham Road

2673 Mr J Ryder-Smith/Brown & Co

It is considered that the existing employment, shopping and recreational facilities provided within the village of Bildeston and the surrounding areas are sufficient to cater for additional housing and it is proposed that a site lying to the east of the Village Site (Rotheram Road, Bildeston) presents an opportunity to provide housing for the village and as such it should be allocated for housing in the plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.2.1 It is accepted by the Council that Bildeston is a sustainable village with a wide range of facilities and services. This has resulted in a housing allocation for the village (HS09L) now in process of development.
- 3.96.2.2 OM220 is an elevated site prominent in the countryside which reads as an integral part of the rural setting of the village. Any development here including any new access would be obtrusive and unrelated to the form of the settlement. Considerable works would be required to provide appropriate vehicular access into the site and to secure pedestrian links to village facilities. These would have an adverse impact on the rural setting of the village.
- 3.96.2.3 With the Council's allocations and my recommendations I consider that there will be adequate land available for development during the Plan period to meet both local and district wide housing needs.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.3 BOXFORD

The Objections

Between Stone Street & River Box

61 Mr T E J Jones

The remainder of the land allocated for a community car park should be included for residential development (it had originally

been zoned for low cost housing although this did not proceed). This could perhaps be linked to an amenity area being provided along the flood plain of the river Box.

Little Orchard off Ash Street

92 Mr J H Taylor/Summers Wykes-Sneyd

Suggest the field on the north side of the village known as Little Orchard which lies between the recreation area and the Homefield development and the centre of the village, to be developed for housing. The site has good access from main roads & bus route. It is better located in relation to the recreation ground & community centre and would allow for pedestrian and cycle access, between the centre of the village and the Homefield development. The site would also allow for vehicular access to be made from the centre of the village to serve the recreation ground and community centre and allow for landscaping and low-cost housing as part of scheme. It is not located in the flood plain and does not overlook other areas of the village.

Land at Sand Hill

940 R C Partridge & Co Ltd/Tim Harbord Associates

The land is located on the eastern edge of the village and abuts the built-up boundary. Further development at Boxford would be in accord with the strategic principles and policies for the location of new housing sites in the Suffolk County Structure Plan (2001) and the Draft Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.3.1 Boxford has a range of facilities and is shown as a semi sustainable village under Policy HS03. It is suitable for some additional development if required. See my report on the categorisation of villages at HS02 above.
- 3.96.3.2 This site at Stone Street consists of Grade 3a agricultural land on the edge of the village within an area liable to flooding, as it is within the flood plain of the River Box. It is also a site within the Conservation Area and the Box Valley Special Landscape Area and is an integral part of the setting of the village. Development here would involve an unacceptable visual intrusion into this rural setting. In my view this is not a site which has potential for housing. Its development would be in direct conflict with a number of Structure Plan and Local Plan policies. There are other far better located sites for development if required.

- 3.96.3.3 I accept from my visit that the site at Ash Street is well located having regard to the facilities within the village. However, it is an elevated site and housing here would be very prominent in the countryside. Ash Street would need considerable improvement to serve the number of dwellings which could be accommodated on the site and this would involve an unfortunate urbanisation of this rural part of the village.
- 3.96.3.4 I do not consider this Grade 3a/b agricultural land to be better than the proposed allocation site and it is far larger than is needed to provide the scale of housing required in the village over the plan period to meet Structure Plan requirements.
- 3.96.3.5 This land at Sand Hill which abuts the Built Up Area Boundary is elevated and reads as an integral part of the countryside. I do not consider it to be well related to the village and its development would be an unacceptable intrusion into the setting of the village and have an adverse impact in the countryside from the A1071. Because of the difference in levels the provision of vehicular access would involve extensive earthworks adding to the urbanisation of Sand Hill. Development of this scale would cause harm to the Box Valley Special Landscape Area and the wider landscape. The Objector has compared the site with those allocated in this and other villages. I have considered allocated sites and omission sites elsewhere in my report and have recommended the deletion of some allocated sites.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.4 BRANTHAM

The Objections

Land to south of Brooklands Road

452 Mr M N Southgate/Fenn Wright

Council should note the merits and suitability of the land at Brantham (Brooklands Road) for residential development.

ICI Imagedata (Mixed Use)

2124 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

It is considered that this location presents a sustainable location for new development comprising:

200-250 mixed tenure dwellings; a neighbourhood centre; a transportation strategy; sports facilities; new open space and ecological habitat management. The site is well related to the existing village. Although the site is not of any inherent importance for wildlife or conservation the existing hedgerows and trees can be retained and strengthened. The site can be suitably serviced and drained and offers significant advantages in terms of its sustainability.

ICI Imagedata (Housing)

2125 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

It is considered that this location presents a sustainable location for new development comprising:

200-250 mixed tenure dwellings; a neighbourhood centre; a transportation strategy; sports facilities; new open space and ecological habitat management. The site is well related to the existing village. Although the site is not of any inherent importance for wildlife or conservation the existing hedgerows and trees can be retained and strengthened. The site can be suitably serviced and drained and offers significant advantages in terms of its sustainability.

ICI Imagedata (Mixed Use)

2126 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning

Brantham is one of the larger villages with a range of local services, facilities and public transport connections. The proposed site would not only provide a sustainable location for housing but could deliver benefits such as new employment, improved access to the industrial site, enhance public transport, environmental improvement, sport and social facilities etc.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.4.1 OM227 reads as part of the open countryside and OM226 with its ponds even more so. OM60 has less impact on the wider countryside but would be difficult to access because of levels. The three omission sites form a large area of land at present separating two areas of development and providing a rural setting. The southern most extremity of OM228 is a promontory which reads as part of the open marshes and would not be suitable for development. In my view more than

adequate provision has been made for housing and mixed-use development in Brantham during the Plan period and there is no need to release any additional areas of greenfield land in the village.

3.96.4.2 Revised Inset Map 13 (Appendix 1) has been agreed with the objectors and this includes omission site EM14 which I consider to be a logical addition to allocation EM02e.

3.96.4.3 The Objections in respect of the ICI site have been conditionally withdrawn following agreement between the parties on a mixed-use scheme for the whole site. I have concluded that the changes are acceptable and that the EM02e allocation and Inset Map 13 should be amended in accordance with details agreed. See also the Employment Chapter of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify EM02e and Inset Map 13 in accordance with agreement between the parties of January 2005.

3.96.5 BURSTALL

The Objections

Adj Burstall House

1741 Mrs G J Varmer/Stuart P Reid Planning

In respect of the land concerned it is submitted that it relates well to the built-up confines of the village settlement form; it is available during the plan period for small scale growth in scale and character with the village and its immediate surroundings; the resultant impact on the prevailing environment would be complementary to existing residential development in the locality; it has no current commercial value for agriculture or other countryside use, and not least of all it would provide the village with some additional housing opportunity in order to sustain the community at a time when the rural villages are fast being depleted of available development land and in turn losing local services.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.5.1 Burstall is a small village with few facilities. OM181 is an attractive open area providing a setting for Burstall House. Its

openness has been recognised by its inclusion as an Area of Visual Amenity. There is sporadic development only on the west side of Burstall Hall Lane. Although the Council has calculated that the site of 1.25 hectares could accommodate over 37 dwellings, from my visit and having regard to the character of Burstall House and its setting I consider that such a density would be out of keeping with the area. In any event it would not be appropriate to allocate general needs housing in such a small settlement. Having regard to the character of the village the site is too small to be a Local Plan allocation and any proposals to develop would need to be dealt with as a windfall. Development of this small site is not likely to have a significant impact in the improvement of the viability and vitality of the village or its services. I do not believe housing on the site would be sustainable. See also paragraph 3.42.6.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.6 CAPEL ST MARY

The Objections

Nurseries etc between London Road/A12

489 he Bypass Nurseries/The Johnson Dennehy Planning Partnership

The land is owned by Bypass Nurseries. This site at London Road, Capel St. Mary is strategically well located as a brownfield site to accommodate residential development within the boundary of the built-up area.

Land at Ashcroft, London Road

1187 Mr B W Southgate/Edward Gittins And Associates

The site frontage lies within the 'Boundary of the built-up area' while there is established development along London Road which has recently been consolidated with the construction of new housing on part of the old coal yard site. The main body of the Objection Site lies to the rear of the frontage development and the total site area extends to 0.7ha. The site is further located within a well-developed village with community facilities and services, and within a Transport Corridor. It is accessible to public transport and will benefit from improvements along the A12. The site can deliver a mixed development but with particular emphasis on first time buyer homes at a density consistent with PPG3. The site is also adjacent

to the built up area of the village but would not involve harmful visual encroachment into the countryside.

Haulage Yard

1979 Mr M D Gilson

In 1999, the site was put forward for a social housing development of 30+ houses, and was turned down on the grounds of other development. The owner has since purchased a property next to the former one but a further planning application has not yet been submitted. This plot is currently being used for a lorry park and storage facility which is out of character with village life not to mention the environmental effect on the local community (example air pollution). The traffic from this yard has increased to an unacceptable level and has had a very big impact on the residents' quality of life. The A12 trunk road was built to take the traffic away from this village as it was felt that the local roads were not built to handle this type of heavy lorries.

2613 Mr B Elmore

This site, the lorry park, London Rd, Capel St Mary would be better suited to infill housing, which is much needed within the village.

Land adj Capelgrove Off A12

95 Mr R R Pearce

Capel St Mary should receive an appropriate number of housing allocation. The site proposed is 19.1 acres and is bounded on the North by the present development, on the East by housing and the village playing field, on West by houses and farm buildings and on the South by a hard boundary from open country provided by a farm road. Access to the A12 is direct and by the Capel Underpass. The site is located close to community services and facilities and shops.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.6.1 While generally supporting the Council's balance between urban and rural housing provision the objector has questioned the thinking behind the choice of certain villages for development.
- 3.96.6.2 This does require clarification and in my introduction to the housing chapter and when considering Policies HS02 and HS03 I have commented and made recommendations on the urban and rural balance of housing provision and the star system of categorising villages. I have also questioned the choice of some rural settlements for growth and the exclusion of others, on

grounds of sustainability. This has resulted in recommendations that certain allocations be deleted and that sites in other villages be included. I do not repeat the details here.

- 3.96.6.3 I have also concluded that with the recommendations I have made there would no need to provide more housing in villages to meet Structure Plan requirements. However, this does not preclude me from considering revisions to built up area boundaries on their own merits.
- 3.96.6.4 Capel St Mary is denoted at present in Policy HS03 as a "two asterisk" village, being a village which the Council has defined as falling short of one or more facilities found within "sustainable" villages. The Council considers that the deficiency in Capel St Mary is that it does not "have a variety of employment opportunities which have potential for further development."
- 3.96.6.5 Although this may have been a reasonable assessment of Capel St Mary in the past, it seems to me that with the designation of the large site at London Road for employment use that this would add considerably to the "variety of employment opportunities which have potential for further development" during the Plan period. I believe that this combined with other commercial uses within the village, and the compliance with other listed criteria in the bullet points of the policy is sufficient to identify Capel St Mary as a sustainable village once employment development is carried out.
- 3.96.6.6 Capel St Mary is also included in the category of "larger village" with a range of facilities under Policy HS02 (being a village with an asterisk in Policy HS03). This local plan policy accepts that the village is of a size able to accommodate "small groups of up to five dwellings" of appropriate development. I agree with the Council that with the range of facilities within the village and because of its overall size development in the village would be acceptable in principle subject to compliance with criteria in Policy HS02 which I consider below.
- 3.96.6.7 The objection site has a frontage to a cul de sac known as London Road and includes land to the rear of Ashcroft and Pine Dell. The frontage to London Road,

occupied by dwellings viz; eastern part of the site is within the proposed BUAB but the major part of the site lies outside it. Most of this area is in use as a paddock. (apparently formerly used as commercial kennels). There is a medium density estate to the west, with low-density development to the south and the gardens of frontage development to London Road to the north.

- 3.96.6.8 As this is a larger village I am satisfied that the development of a site of this size would be in scale with the village and the proposal would, in density terms, be in accordance with Policy HS02, as currently worded. I have, however, recommended changes to that policy to delete the 5 dwelling restriction in larger sustainable villages. In my view this site also has to be assessed against government advice to make best use of land by increasing densities. The Council assessed that 40 dwellings could be accommodated on the site but I do not consider this would be acceptable, having regard to its setting, and the character of adjoining development. However, I do agree with the Council that the site, if developed, should be at a higher density than 5 dwellings. Although it would be possible to provide a 6.6m driveway, by demolishing substantial outbuildings, garage, stable, workshop and shed, the access would be totally unsuitable for development at a higher density.
- 3.96.6.9 From my visit I do not consider there are any landscape characteristics which would, of themselves, preclude development, or that the visual impact on the countryside from development would be unacceptable. The site is not an important open space for the village. Trees subject to tree preservation orders could be protected from development. Services and facilities are readily available.
- 3.96.6.10 Because of its location I consider the site to be well related to the village but in my view if development does occur in the future it should be at a higher density and make a more positive contribution to the village. At present there is no satisfactory means of access to the site to serve a scheme of higher density and I cannot envisage how the objection site could be developed in isolation during the plan period.

* * *

- 3.96.6.11 I consider that regardless of the increase in intensity of use of the lorry park site, it and adjoining land and premises should remain in employment use. In my view the village at present needs employment more than it needs additional housing. This is a very suitable site for employment purposes being close to the A12. The allocation is for employment in the future and once lost to housing the site would never be regained. The proposal to use the site for housing would be contrary to Policy EM15. I have also dealt with objections to these sites in the Employment Chapter of the Plan.
- 3.96.6.12 OM22 – Land North of Capelgrove – This site of about 7.7 hectares is to the south of existing housing, to the west of the village playing field and to the west by sporadic housing and farm buildings. I consider it to be well related to existing facilities within the village.
- 3.96.6.13 I have commented above that I believe that with its allocation for employment the village will have a reasonable degree of sustainability. I, therefore, agree in principle with the Objector that the village has potential for further development. However, although I take issue with the Council about the village only accommodating small scale in-filling, I do not believe that the form and character of the village and its existing facilities could accommodate an addition of the scale proposed, whether it occurs on the existing playing field site or the omission site.
- 3.96.6.14 If best use were made of the land in accordance with government guidance on densities, this site could take between 230 to 385 houses, a scale of development which in my view would rely heavily on car use and put considerable pressure on facilities within the village. Even if this density were reduced, to make best use of land such development would be way out of scale with the employment allocation within the village. This would encourage more commuting to Ipswich or further.
- 3.96.6.15 The extension of the playing field or its relocation would not require an allocation as appropriate open uses are acceptable in the countryside

- 3.96.6.16 Taking the site as a whole it is close to the A12 and noisy. It would have difficulties of vehicular access and the road network would be unsuitable for the scale of traffic growth envisaged from the development. Anglian Water has objected to the proposal on grounds of Sewerage Treatment Works Capacity. Development of this scale is not required either to meet Structure Plan or local needs during the Plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan by stating in a revised Policy HS03 that Capel St Mary will be included as a sustainable village once the site allocated for employment has been substantially developed, but do not modify the plan to include the objection sites as allocations or include them within the BUAB of the village.

3.96.7 CHELMONDISTON

The Objections

Land off Richardsons Lane

**112 Mr D F Martin;123 Mr J M Aitken;234 Mr A G Barker
264 Mr J M B Edgell;268 Mr G V Jackaman**

The last significant village development was about 30 years ago. The land (proposed site) is not good quality farmland and is not of outstanding natural beauty/commonly hidden from view. The land is proportionate, being about 1/7th of the village size. The village infrastructure is stagnating in terms of affordable housing, business, schools, banking, post office, health service and job creation, the same with services such as gas, telephone and other inward investment. This opportunity to increase the development boundary may not occur again due to several landowners agreement now which may not last until the next Local Plan review after this one. This site is the ideal focal point for any extra housing on the Shotley peninsular giving sustainability to the other untouched villages.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.7.1 In the introduction to the housing Chapter of the plan I have concluded that if my recommendations are accepted Structure Plan housing needs will be met during the Plan period. There is, therefore, no need for

Chelmondiston to significantly expand to meet housing requirements for the district as a whole.

- 3.96.7.2 Chelmondiston is a fairly large settlement with some facilities, but it is not categorised as a sustainable village in the Plan at Policy HS03.
- 3.96.7.3 The sites lies immediately to the west of the BUAB for the village. It is also within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site has frontage to the B1456 and Richardson Lane and is about 6.5ha in extent.
- 3.96.7.4 The development of this land would involve an addition out of proportion with the existing village. If the site were used for residential development as suggested by one objector, the site could accommodate over 200 houses on the basis of national guidance in Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 3. The Highway Authority consider that if developed at around 225 dwellings 1500 to 1800 trips per day would be generated. Anglian Water advises that there is insufficient capacity at the local treatment works.
- 3.96.7.5 What is being suggested by another objector is, in effect, an urban extension, a neighbourhood which would accommodate small workshops, a village hall and affordable and speculative housing. To my mind, in principle, this is a more logical approach because it would incorporate local employment opportunities. This would also be likely to involve the erection of about 100 units on the basis of national guidance.
- 3.96.7.6 However, I do not consider that Chelmondiston can be looked at in isolation from the rest of the Shotley Peninsular. Although, in principle, I accept it is a better location for some local housing than other parts of the peninsular, as the HMS Ganges site is brownfield it is likely that sooner or later a significant amount of mixed-use development will be built there. The scheme not only envisages a mix of house types with affordable housing on site, the developer has agreed to the contribution by commuted sum for the provision of affordable housing elsewhere on the peninsular. Also proposed are local retail and employment uses. Although this development is not before me in any

detail, and it seems a final decision on the site will not be taken for some time, the mixed-use development proposed would provide a similar form of neighbourhood to that being suggested by some objectors at Chelmondiston.

- 3.96.7.7 I accept that Chelmondiston, because of its location closer to Ipswich is a more sustainable location for some development than Shotley. However, I cannot ignore the likelihood that the needs of the peninsular would be substantially met at Brantham to the west, which I consider to be a better location for development and redevelopment than Chelmondiston, and Shotley to the east, during the Plan period.
- 3.96.7.8 If the objection site were to be developed for housing on the scale envisaged in national guidance to make best use of land, I consider major improvements would be required to the B1456. If half of the site were to be used for housing and the remainder for industrial or community purposes, in my view similar improvements would be necessary. From my visit I do not consider it would be possible to provide adequate sight splays or an acceptable new junction within the confines of the site and the public highway.
- 3.96.7.9 All objectors have said that the development of the objection site at Chelmondiston would enable affordable housing to be provided. I accept that it would but this form of housing could be provided as an exception to the plan to meet local needs. Under Policy HS06 "affordable housing" in scale and character with the village is accepted, beyond the village boundary if necessary, and both the policy and the supporting text at paragraph 6.39 recognise Chelmondiston as a location for affordable housing.
- 3.96.7.10 Turning to the objection site itself, I agree that the present boundary of the village does present a somewhat hard edge to the village from the west. However, the objection site is not only an integral part of the open countryside, linking with fields to the north and south, it is also in the AONB, an area which is given the highest status of protection in formulating planning policies.

3.96.7.11 I have concluded above that there would be no justification for large-scale expansion of the village. I do take the view that AONB boundaries should be revisited from time to time, as in my experience elsewhere I have found the boundaries have failed to recognise changes in the character of an area. I do not, however, believe there are exceptional reasons why the AONB status of this open agricultural land which is a part of the rural setting of the village should not at present be given the greatest weight in defining the BUAB. This reflects Policy CRO2 of the emerging Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.8 COCKFIELD

The Objections

Abbey Lane

530 Mr L A Cornell

In future the Council might consider infill between Shannon House and Janva-lan in Abbey Lane.

Windsor Green

531 Mr L A Cornell

In future the Council might consider infill with a single plot on land which is surplus garden adjoining 4 Hedgerow cottage Windsor Green, as in planning policy guidance note 7.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.8.1 From my visits I saw that Cockfield is a large Parish with a number of well spread hamlets, including Great Green, Cross Green and Crowbrook/McKenzie Place which have defined Built Up Area Boundaries. Other settlements retain their countryside status, such as Chapel Road and Parsonage Green.

3.96.8.2 To some degree the objection of the Parish Council has been met in that a BUAB has been reinstated for Windsor Green. However, this reinstatement of the boundary has not resulted in the inclusion of open land

and other premises which would allow for modest growth, and this is the concern of the objector. In this respect I accept from my visit that there is little opportunity for infilling within the defined BUAB and I have some doubt as to whether a BUAB is justified. The infilling policy does, however, relate to a wide range of listed villages with BUAB's some of which have considerable opportunities for infilling, whereas others do not.

- 3.96.8.3 It seems to me that the Parish Local Needs Housing Survey Report shows there is a demand for houses in the parish, it also shows from the table on the range of incomes that housing needs would not be met by merely building more small houses for sale in the villages and hamlets. The summary of the above report recognises that the need is for "affordable housing". Affordable Housing does not have to be allocated or included within a BUAB, as the Council is able to deal with this specific area of need as an exception to the Plan under Policy HS06.
- 3.96.8.4 In determining which villages should accommodate affordable housing, the District Council would take into account the sustainability of the settlement, viz: the nearness to a range of facilities, including public transport facilities, to avoid dependence on the car.
- 3.96.8.5 From my visit I do not consider that Windsor Green, of itself, has any priority for new development, it is a hamlet with few facilities. If the District Council is satisfied that there is a local need, in my view there would be an opportunity for some infilling adjacent to Roundwood Kennels. Although the site is fairly open, it is an integral part of the village and is not an important visual open space. However, whether such windfall development takes place would be a matter to be assessed on the merits of local need and not because of a change to the BUAB boundary in the Local Plan
- 3.96.8.6 OM73 = As the garden adjacent to 4 Hedgerow Cottages has now been included within the Built Up Area Boundary there is no dispute on principle between the parties. However as this is a single plot it is not suitable for an allocation and any proposal here would be dealt with as a windfall site within the BUAB.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.9 COPDOCK & WASHBROOK

The Objections

Between old A12 & A14 interchange Copdock

899 Mrs A H Doel; 1938 Mr R P Doel

An area put forward for housing development located between the old A12/London Road between Boss Hoggs Transport Café and the A14 underpass.

Land off Oakfield Road adj A12 Copdock

900 Mrs A H Doel; 1939 Mr R P Doel

A site put forward for housing development at Oakfield is also suitable for a corridor development. The field which runs alongside the A12 bypass Colchester to Ipswich side.

Westhill Farm Wenham Road Copdock

901 Mrs A H Doel; 1940 Mr R P Doel

Westhill farm in Wenham Road should be considered as a prime site for selective development. The Copdock/ Washbrook landscape has already been spoilt by previous road and commercial development.

Hillbrook The Street Copdock

1745 Mr A E Moffatt/Stuart P Reid Planning

In respect of the land concerned it is submitted that it relates well to the built-up confines of the village settlement form; it is available during the plan period for small scale growth in scale and character with the village and its immediate surroundings; the resultant impact on the prevailing environment would be complementary to existing residential development in the locality; it has no current commercial value for agriculture or other countryside use, and not least of all it would provide the village with some additional housing opportunity in order to sustain the community at a time when the rural villages are fast being depleted of available development land and in turn losing local services.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.9.1 OM111 - A small area of land mainly in agricultural use adjoining West Hill Farm which from my site visit would not be suitable for an allocation. An allocated site should be able to accommodate a minimum of 10 dwellings which this site shown on a revised plan accompanying a letter dated 14 April 2005 could not. The site is in the midst of sporadic development well outside of any built up area boundary and remote from the range of facilities required to support housing. Any proposal for the development of this site would need to be dealt with on its own merits on the basis of local need under countryside policies in the Plan. Development in the countryside is not readily agreed without special reason. This is reflected in a previous refusal of planning permission and the dismissal of a subsequent appeal in respect of this site.
- 3.96.9.2 OM110 - This omission site is remote from any settlement. It is immediately adjacent to the A12 but with no access to it. The site is located in the countryside isolated from Copdock and Washbrook and from any support facilities, services or employment opportunities. The villages are considered non sustainable under Policy HS03 and the proposed development would also be unsustainable in itself. Development here would also be an obvious isolated visual intrusion in this rural area and have an adverse impact on the open countryside.
- 3.96.9.3 OM182 - Copdock is a small village with few facilities some of which are already under pressure. Hillbrook is an elevated site which provides an attractive setting to the village. Housing here would dominate the surrounding area. The site is open countryside and is within the designated Gipping Valley Special Landscape Area.
- 3.96.9.4 Adequate provision has been made either by the Council or by me in my recommendations to meet housing requirements during the Plan period. Apart from local needs affordable housing which can be dealt with as an exception, in accordance with government guidelines housing is generally directed towards towns and larger sustainable villages where the vitality and viability of existing services can be maintained and enhanced.

- 3.96.9.5 OM109 This site is a vast wedge of land between the A12(T) road and the old London Road containing limited sporadic development. The size of the site has been reduced on the plan attached to the letter dated 14 April 2005 to a site similar to OM110 above. The site has a poor relationship with the form of Washbrook, a small village to the west and with existing development to the north, from which it is severed by the A14.. Development here would be remote from any designated built up area and unrelated to a settlement with any facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.10 EAST BERGHOLT

The Objections

Land SE of South White Horse Road

1478 Mr A Gordon/Fenn Wright

It is considered that East Bergholt is a sustainable village with services and facilities that can support the development on the proposed site.

Quintons Corner

1589 Mr R Geary/Tim Harbord Associates

East Bergholt has the basic facilities to facilitate additional development. Quintons Corner is a sustainable location providing an opportunity to develop currently under-used land within the all important perimeter landscaping. Development would consist of a smaller number of dwellings within the site, shielded by the mature hedgerows and existing planting. Quintons Corner lies within the existing planting, it is supported by the adopted County Structure Plan, will contribute to maintain the vitality and viability of existing facilities, has good access to public transport corridors and is a sustainable location for development within the existing village settlement. This site provides the perfect opportunity for sensitively developing under-used land.

Adj Claverly East End

2189 Mrs J Beall

The site is flanked by properties from 3 sides. We wish to include the field within the building area. There are more than one access to the property (two), with a possible third access.

South of White Horse Road

2060-2063 Mr I Miller

Propose to the Council to consider putting the Local Charity in East Bergholt in a position whereby it could sell some land for building 5 expensive houses and then could use the proceeds to build affordable housing for rent to local young couples on its remaining land. Alternatively, the same situation can be achieved by allowing the objector to build 10 houses on his own land.

South of White Horse Road

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.10.1 From my visit I consider that East Bergholt to be very well served with a range of facilities. It is defined by the Council as a sustainable settlement under Policy HS03 of the Local Plan 2nd Deposit Draft and its range of facilities, services and employment ensure its compliance with Policy CS3 (e) of the Structure Plan.
- 3.96.10.2 East Bergholt is the second largest village in the district and consists of two parts. The main part to the north, which is linked by sporadic development to the south east. That part of the village to the south and south east is within the Dedham Vale and Stour Valley Area of Natural Beauty. (AONB). East End I have dealt with separately in my report.
- 3.96.10.3 I consider East Bergholt to be in an important strategic location. It is situated to the east of the district within easy access to Ipswich and Colchester and just over 3 miles from the London/Liverpool Street station at Manningtree, a regular stop on the main London line. The only other sustainable village in the eastern part of the district is Brantham. The remainder of the sustainable villages are located in the western part of the district with a result that housing allocations are heavily weighted towards the west.
- 3.96.10.4 The Urban Capacity Study (CD41) which at stage 1 identified capacity sources included East Bergholt as one of six villages for assessment. An objection site at

Quintons Corner was identified as having a capacity of 6/8 dwellings with retained open space. I have dealt with this in detail below.

- 3.96.10.5 Although defined as a sustainable village East Bergholt has no housing allocations primarily because of its location within an AONB. I consider that regardless of this designation there are opportunities for some additional development.

OM165 Land rear of properties in White Horse Road

- 3.96.10.6 This omission site has a poor relationship with the form of the settlement and reads as an integral part of the rural setting of the village. It is also remote from the larger part of the village which contains most of the facilities. It has a poor vehicular access and is also situated on the outside of a bend with sub standard visibility. Its visual importance has been recognised by its inclusion in the Dedham Vale AONB. The site scores very badly against the Council's Sustainability Assessment and conflicts with a range of Structure Plan and Local Plan policies. I consider the site to be unsuitable for allocation.

- 3.96.10.7 I conclude that if my recommendations are accepted there will be a more than adequate allocation of land to meet Structure Plan housing requirements. I accept from this and other sessions of the Inquiry there is a *demand* for general housing in East Bergholt but the only need that has been identified which has to be met locally is for affordable housing.

Quintons Corner

- 3.96.10.8 The Objection site is located within the village, towards its northern edge but within a kilometre of the shops and primary school, and 400m of the secondary school, which includes an adult centre and youth club, the new medical centre, three public houses and a garage. It is some 1.25ha of land incorporating a number of mature trees and a pond in the north western corner. The site is a triangular area of unused land, surrounded on all sides by roads, Quintons Road, Woodgates Road and Heath Road. The regular bus service to Colchester and Ipswich runs along Heath Road.

- 3.96.10.9 The Urban Capacity Study identified East Bergholt, including the Objection site as a housing capacity source. It is estimated that the objection site has a capacity of 6/8 dwellings with retained open space, pond and trees because of their amenity value.
- 3.96.10.10 The site is not within the AONB, Conservation Area or and AVRA, although it is proposed for inclusion in the latter.
- 3.96.10.11 In my view the site is an integral part of the village and as far as location and sustainability are concerned is an appropriate site for limited housing development.
- 3.96.10.12 However, the Council proposes that this site should be designated as an Area of Visual and/or Recreational Amenity (AVRA). AVRAs complement and strengthen policies that protect open spaces and the setting of buildings from development. From the list of criteria, in my view, the following apply:

The protection and/or retention of:

- a) Trees, woodlands and other natural features
 - b) Important visual gaps in the street scene
 - c) Historic form of the settlement
 - d) The setting of listed buildings
 - e) Visual quality of the settlement
 - f) Visually important approach to the village from the A12.
- 3.96.10.13 The illustrative layout of 5 dwellings retaining the pond and important trees would in my view strike a balance between the need for some development in this sustainable village and the retention of the most important features of the site. The site is not strictly an important visual *gap* in the street scene, but the site does provide a visual amenity to those houses surrounding it. However, with a low density of houses, modest in scale, retaining the important features, I believe that visual amenity could be substantially retained. The existing houses along Woodgates Road are screened by the dense hedgerow which should be retained. Better views could also be incorporated into the site because it is, at present a private open space

that can be looked at but not into. Again with modest dwellings set among the trees I do not consider the setting of the listed buildings, The Linnets and Smithy, Quintons House and Quintons Cottage would be affected. With careful layout and screening the impact would not be significant. Again with a sensitive layout I believe that the important wooded areas of the site and the wildlife corridors around the edge could be retained.

- 3.96.10.14 I accept the view of the Council that densities should be increased to make best use of land in accordance with national guidance. However, the character of the site and adjacent houses, including listed buildings, would preclude such higher density housing here, and I doubt from the illustrative layout produced, that as many as 8 dwellings could be satisfactorily be located on the site. I share the view of the Council about the impact of large houses, and consider it important that the dwellings are of a modest scale and do not dominate views into the site. Also with a small number of dwellings the access could be limited to a private drive to avoid loss of trees and hedgerows to secure visibility splays. The precise number of houses will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage.
- 3.96.10.15 Although reference has been made to the recommendation of the previous Local Plan Inspector at Alteration No 1 stage, I do not consider what is now being proposed is similar to that previously rejected. That proposal was for frontage development, which I agree would have an unacceptable impact on the biodiversity of the objection site and the visual amenities of adjacent dwellings. The present proposal would allow some development but at the same time retain and enhance important features on the site.
- 3.96.10.16 From the survey I requested at Inquiry and which was forwarded to me no evidence has been found that bat roosts occur within any mature trees on the site, and no reptile species or great crested newts were found. I do not consider that biodiversity considerations would preclude development of the site.
- 3.96.10.17 The Objector has suggested that Policy HS09 be amended to include the land as an allocation and has provided a form of wording. I believe the criteria listed

would be those necessary to control development but as the site is not suitable for 10 dwellings or more I do not consider it would be appropriate to make a specific allocation in the Local Plan.. The site is an integral part of the village within the Built Up Area Boundary but too small for an allocation.

East End, East Bergholt

- 3.96.10.18 This site of some 0.80 ha is just outside the Built Up Area Boundary for East End. It is enclosed by housing on three sides. The fourth side abuts agricultural land from which it is well screened and through which vehicular access is proposed. East End is a fairly large village but with few facilities. It is not sustainable in itself, although the London main line station is not far away and there are facilities in Brantham and East Bergholt.
- 3.96.10.19 The policy of the Council, in accordance with government guidance, is to generally direct new housing development towards towns or larger sustainable villages with a full range of facilities to avoid unnecessary travel. If there is an identifiable local need for affordable housing in less sustainable settlements, such as East End, this would normally be as a result of agreement between the parish and the district. I have no evidence before me that this is the case. The District Council is then able to provide for affordable housing as an exception to the Plan, without changing Built Up Area Boundaries.
- 3.96.10.20 If this site were to developed for housing of any kind, again, in accordance with government advice it would need to be at a reasonably high density to make best use of limited land resources and prevent further incursion into the countryside. To use the site for only a few dwellings would not equate with the need to provide smaller more affordable homes at higher densities.
- 3.96.10.21 The objector in his evidence pointed out the close relation of East End to Brantham, rather than East Bergholt and from my visit I agree that some residents of East End may well look towards Brantham for some needs. However, in my view if there were a further housing need , sites both for general needs and

affordable housing could be provided, some on brownfield land in Brantham itself, which is a far larger and more sustainable settlement with a wider range of facilities, and is closer to Manningtree and the London line station.

3.96.10.22 The Council considers that it has already identified sufficient land within the Plan period for general needs housing, and although I have recommended certain changes, I consider that overall the Structure Plan requirements for housing during the Plan period have been met. There is, therefore, no need to allocate or identify further land to meet general housing needs.

3.96.10.23 As to the merits of the site I agree that of itself it is well related to the village, and does not read as an integral part of the countryside. However, I consider that a long access through the open field on to Park Road and breaking through the enclosed hedgerow would involve an unacceptable urban intrusion into open countryside detrimental to the rural character of the area and to visual amenity

3.96.10.24 In conclusion, for the reasons stated above I find no justification to include the objection site within the Built Up Area Boundary.

White Horse Road, OM210, 212

3.96.10.25 I have concluded elsewhere that taking the district as a whole, if the Council accepts my recommendations, there will be more than sufficient land allocated to meet Structure Plan requirements during the Plan period.

3.96.10.26 There have been a number of objections on the grounds of local need in certain villages and I have dealt with those objections on their own merits. This has resulted in my recommending that some allocated sites are deleted from the Plan and other sites added, either by allocation in the case of larger sites or by a change in the BUAB to accommodate smaller sites.

3.96.10.27 I have no doubt from the evidence that in an attractive village like East Bergholt where development has been restricted over the years affordable housing is badly needed. The Council accepts this and on the basis of

national guidance formulated a rural exception Policy HS06, and has also identified East Bergholt in paragraph 3.39 of the supporting text as a receptor for affordable housing, not only to serve the village itself, but also the adjacent smaller local parishes. This approach is in accordance with Annex B: Rural exception sites of PPG3 (as revised)

- 3.96.10.28 It seems to me that with this policy the Council is able to ensure that sustainable affordable housing can be provided in the village as an exception to the Plan. This avoids the need to allocate a larger site for general needs housing on which only a percentage of houses would be in the "affordable" category. As far as I can see this would be the only way in which young local people, key workers and "impoverished middle class pensioners" identified by the Objectors, would be able to "afford" property in the village. Accommodation for older or more frail members of society is also encouraged by Policy HS23 of the emerging Plan.
- 3.96.10.29 I heard from other sessions of the Inquiry that the Council through its planning and housing powers is actively attempting to provide affordable housing where it is needed. From the evidence there would appear to be an effective system in force within the Council whereby the Housing Officer identifies local housing need. The Council, in conjunction with the Parish Council, will no doubt determine the number of affordable dwellings required and how these can best be provided within the village as a whole. The Objector has referred to the government's First Time Buyers Initiative in Sustainable Communities: Homes For All. I am sure the Council would welcome this initiative but initially making public sector land available is part of the strategy and I am not aware of any surplus public land within the village.
- 3.96.10.30 Turning to the Objection sites, from my visits to the area I am inclined to agree with the Objectors that although within an AONB the fields A, B, C and D on Mr Miller's plan have little scenic quality and the developed area to the north has none. This was the view of one previous Inspector, which I agree with. However, the AONB is a national designation and cannot be altered in a Local Plan. I can only recommend that the boundary

of the AONB be revisited to determine an appropriate boundary, which recognises the status of East Bergholt as a sustainable village suitable for some additional development.

- 3.96.10.31 Having regard to the townscape I accept from my visit that there are no approaches from the south and the attractive area of Flatford from which the Omission sites would be seen. There are existing dense belts of trees screening existing development from the south. However, development here would be an intrusion into the countryside as seen from within the village, and would also impact on its present rural setting.
- 3.96.10.32 As to the question of access, in my view the impact of the development on the existing roads and the standards required for the access would depend on the form and density of the housing. However, anything over a few houses, which could be served by a private drive, would need to be served by an access of adequate width with reasonable visibility in either direction. I saw from my visits that there already sub standard accesses in the village but I do not consider that on highway safety grounds new housing development should similarly be served by a sub standard means of access.
- 3.96.10.33 From the 2 sketch plans produced by the Objector, 20 dwellings are indicated, (10 open market and 10 local needs). On one scheme this would involve the replacement of the existing playing field on Field A, with a playing field and new pavilion on Field D with access from Flatford Road. On the other the existing playing field remains where it is and a new hall is proposed on Field D with access from White Horse Road. A high voltage power line crosses Field D.
- 3.96.10.34 The Council considers that on the basis of national guidance a minimum of 72 dwellings could be erected on the site to make best use of land. This would be a substantial increase in housing in the village and involve a significant increase in traffic. With even 20 dwellings I believe that access to recommended highway standards would be required. This would not be possible within the confines of the land providing access into the playing field from Flatford Road.

3.96.10.35 I do not consider that the alternative access through the Social Club site off White Horse Road would be a practical or economic way of developing the site. The vehicular access from White Horse Road would be through a long narrow plot, taking away potential for redevelopment of that plot. This long length of road would then turn into a cul-de-sac extending to the western end of the site, an uneconomic form of development.

3.96.10.36 I accept from this and other sessions of the Inquiry there is a *demand* for general housing in East Bergholt. I also agree that there is potential for more housing in the village. However, the only need that has been identified which has to be met locally is for affordable housing.

3.96.10.37 I consider there is insufficient reason put forward to justify development in this AONB or to override Policies HS04 and CR02 of the Local Plan. For these reasons and others identified above I do not consider the site should be allocated for housing.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections .

3.96.11 GLEMSFORD

The Objections

Kings Field Park Lane

262 Messrs PJ&NJ Ford/Fenn Wright

The site is within the south east of Glemsford. The northern boundary adjoins Kings Road estate, which has been built during the last 30 years. The eastern boundary adjoins Park Lane. The site is currently used for arable farming. A mixed use residential development is proposed for this site. 40% of the area put forward could be available for trees, parkland, open space etc. The proposal provide flexibility and could include low density housing on part, detached or semi-detached dwellings, social housing, public open space, sport facilities and a shelter belt of trees and shrubs. There

is no existing public open space of this nature and this is an opportunity to create such space for parkland. The most natural movement to work from Glemsford is to the South and this site will meet that requirement and may obviate additional traffic movements. This site will have easy access to the A1092 to Sudbury in one direction and Haverhill & Cambridge in the westerly direction.

Cavendish Lane

290-291 Mr C Huggins

Include the land adjacent to the village envelope, Glemsford into the Local Plan or if more appropriate, considered for inclusion in the village envelope.

Former railway station site Lower Road

845 Albion Business Service/Whymark & Moulton

The site represents a brownfield site. The existing warehouse on site in the process of being converted to 6 flats and planning permission exists for construction of a large building intended to form a leisure complex, part of an earlier consent to use the existing building as holiday units. The site has mature landscaping to the road frontage and within the site and is therefore well screened from the highway and the countryside. There is a good vehicular access to the main highway, capable of accommodating further residential development on site. It would be intended to retain a large area of land between the existing driveway and frontage boundary as open amenity space. Currently, the site is under-used and has in the past been subject to requests from the District Council to tidy up the area. Development will provide housing close to the major employment site of Avent, which is approximately 250m to the east. This is a major employment site for Glemsford and the local area.

Northern Site

1226 Mrs B Jacobs/Neil Ward Associates

Policy HS09 proposes a number of new housing allocations but excludes any provision for additional housing in Glemsford. A site of approximately 1.8 ha, owned by Mrs B Jacobs, at the northern end of the village(Glemsford), is considered suitable to cater for part of the identified housing needs of the District over the plan period. The site is vacant and undeveloped rectangular area of land abutting the village development boundary of Glemsford on its north-western edge. It lies outside any area designated as being of

particular landscape interest and is enclosed on its eastern and southern side by Spring Meadow and Crownfield Road residential estates and on most of the northern and western boundaries by well established hedgerows. The site previously enjoyed the benefit of planning permission in conjunction with the adjoining Crownfield Road development and in that development provision was made for vehicular access and services to be provided. Housing development on the site will not intrude into the surrounding countryside. Approx 40 dwellings can be accommodated if combined with provision for public open space of about 0.5ha.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.11.1 Glemsford is a large sustainable village as defined in Policy HS03. It has a diverse range of facilities and in my view is a village where additional development could take place, if there is an identified need for it.
- 3.96.11.2 It can be seen from my introduction to the Housing Chapter that I have considered the categorisation of villages and recommended change. I have also later in my report looked at housing in villages, including those which have not been defined as sustainable or nearly sustainable. This has led to my recommendation that certain sites be deleted from the Plan and others included.
- 3.96.11.3 However, I have also concluded early in the Housing Chapter that if my recommendations are followed, there will be sufficient land to meet the total shown in Table 2 of the Housing Topic Paper (CD/91). There is, therefore, no need to allocate more housing land to meet district wide housing requirements during the Plan period.
- 3.96.11.4 OM85 This is the site of the former railway station. Although there is a warehouse building on the site being converted to 6 flats the site is remote from village facilities and housing here would result in an unacceptable addition to sporadic development along the A1092. The site is close to one source of employment but other facilities are in the village proper. There are no sewers near the site and it is partially within the flood plain. I consider that if housing development is required sites with a better relationship

with the form of the existing village can be found with a safer pedestrian and cycling link to the centre. I do not consider it would be appropriate to include this site and adjoining sporadic development within a Built Up Area Boundary.

- 3.96.11.5 OM42 Although the whole of the site is not intended to be covered with buildings development of this site would result in a massive expansion to the village. This prominent site used for arable farming reads as an integral part of the countryside forming a rural setting to the village. At 11.5 hectares the scale of development is strategic rather than local and I do not consider the village to be suitable for such large expansion. Development here would have an adverse impact in the countryside on the form and character of the village and on traffic conditions on rural roads. It would infringe a number of Structure Plan and Local Plan policies.
- 3.96.11.6 If my recommendations are accepted there will be adequate provision for housing both in the district and in the village during the plan period and no large-scale allocations are required.
- 3.96.11.7 OM153 - Cavendish Lane. This overgrown site is situated between the built up area boundary and former farm units, which appear to be used for employment purposes. From my visit I found the site reasonably well located to the form of the village but access is poor and its overgrown nature has become an important natural feature. I do not consider there is need for an additional allocation.
- 3.96.11.8 OM152 - The site is about 1.8 ha and on the basis of national guidance could accommodate between 54 and 90 dwellings but with the exclusion of perimeter landscaping belts as suggested by the Objector between 45 and 60 dwellings is a more realistic figure. This would be a substantial expansion of the village but not disproportionately large compared to the overall size of the settlement, which has a dwelling stock of around 1400.
- 3.96.11.9 The site had the benefit of a planning permission for housing in 1971 with a covenant that access would be

provided through the Crownfields estate. Since then the site has become overgrown unused agricultural land. Although the site has reverted to grassland and shrub I do not consider this should preclude it from development.

- 3.96.11.10 I consider the site to be well related to existing pattern of development, and access could be gained through the adjacent partially completed housing site, although as yet there is no adopted road up to the site boundary and the road is in very poor condition. This adjoining site has been developed piece meal over many years and shows no sign of being satisfactorily completed. If Crownfield Road were to be used to serve the objection site there would need to be some traffic management measures taken to ensure reasonable visibility for vehicles entering on to Brook Street.
- 3.96.11.11 Outstanding permissions in the village are mainly for single dwellings although 6 flats have been completed and there is permission for another 6 dwellings. At the time of my inspection construction had not commenced. The building of another group of 11 dwellings had commenced. There is at present a slow supply of dwellings coming forward.
- 3.96.11.12 Glemsford is the second largest village in the district and in the sequential approach meets the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance No. 3, and PPS7, and this is reflected in its designation as a sustainable settlement under Policy HS03. Although I have mentioned above that Structure Plan housing requirements can be met, this would mainly be by urban allocations as required by the sequential test. There is, however, also a requirement to provide sufficient housing in villages to meet local needs. This the Council has attempted to do through its allocations. In my view the Crownfield Estate would be expected to meet part of this local need, but progress has been so slow and piece meal that I doubt that it would contribute in an effective way to local supply. Because of their size the sites with outstanding planning permissions are unlikely to provide much in the way of affordable housing.
- 3.96.11.13 There has been a generally slow rate of growth, which might, but not necessarily, reflect a weak private

demand. Although the objection site might not make a significant contribution to Structure Plan targets over the plan period, its inclusion within the BUAB as an allocation would enable provision to be made for affordable and market needs housing to serve the local area. On balance, as there are no other allocated sites in this large sustainable village, and the site is large enough to incorporate a range of house types and affordable housing, and would help to support local facilities, I consider the site should be included in the Plan.

3.96.11.14 The objectors have not suggested any criteria which should be attached to an allocation and I would leave these details to be provided by the Council if my recommendation is accepted. From the evidence at Inquiry they would cover such matters as satisfactory access, open space provision and structural landscaping. Affordable Housing is covered elsewhere in the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Plan be modified to allocate objection site OM152 for housing.

3.96.12 GREAT CORNARD

The Objections

Off Shawlands Avenue

844 Mr B Drury/Whymark & Moulton

Object to the Policy HS09 as there is no allocation for small-scale housing on land owned by Mr. Drury. Consider allocation of part of the southern end of this land for housing purposes. A new access exists from Shawlands Avenue and access may also be possible from the Potkilns. This land is also well protected and screened because of topography, presence of landscaped area and proposed community woodland. The land could be suitable for small-scale housing incorporating either low-cost or dedicated disabled sheltered units. The land is close to amenities and Shawlands Avenue is a main road and bus route.

Land at Cornard Mills

1448 Ralston Purina Northern Europe/RPS Consultants

Over the last 3 years Consultants (RPS) have been working with Officers regarding the future of the Cornard Mills site on behalf of the owners, Ralston Purina Northern Europe - RPNE. Various documents and information have been submitted to the District Council and the Council also holds copies of all the various correspondence. Having carried out all this work and having been informed in both October 2000 and January this year (2001) that the Local plan Working Group had accepted the principle of allocating the site for mixed-use redevelopment (primarily residential with a small element of B1 employment use), RPS were surprised that the site had not been included for redevelopment in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan.

Land east of Carsons Drive

1522 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Land south of Cornard Tye Road, Great Cornard should be allocated for housing purposes with provision made for public open space. Housing development would comprise an area of about 13 acres with an additional 9 acres provided for public open space and structure planting. The existing built-up area abutting the site has no clearly defined edge and visually intrudes onto the site. The site is also partly enclosed by the existing housing development at Sheephead Hill which lies to the north. The site is well related to existing facilities including schools and bus routes. Carsons Drive runs parallel with the site is an existing bus route and there is an direct pedestrian link between the site and Carsons Drive.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.12.1 OM84 is an elevated site which is an integral part of the countryside. Its biodiversity is important and it is being considered as a County Wildlife Site. Development here would be a prominent and unacceptable intrusion into the setting of the village. From my visit I do not consider a satisfactory access could be obtained from Pot Kilns and no access is shown direct to Shawlands Avenue. Access might be possible through the allocated site HS09J but as I am of the view that it is not suitable for allocation either I have recommended that it should be deleted from the Plan and Carsons Lane substituted.
- 3.96.12.2 Land at Cornard Mills has the benefit of planning permission. No further action is required.

CARSONS DRIVE

- 3.96.12.3 The site area is about 16 ha with 4.4 ha of the site is proposed for housing. The site is intended to accommodate between 154 and 176 dwellings and in my view the upper end of these figures is a reasonable assessment. The balance of the site is to provide public open space and woodland planting.
- 3.96.12.4 The C732 is narrow and twisting but its width increases when it approaches the A134. The main access point would be taken from the C732 close to the centre of the site where from my visits I consider there is reasonable visibility in both directions. The C732 would need some widening and a new footway provided from the site to the C732/Shawlands junction. The objectors propose that the 30 mph limit be extended to the edge of the built up area. A footway and cycle link would be provided at the northwest corner of the site on to the C732. From my visit I consider the site is well located to nearby schools and other village services, including a local sports centre.
- 3.96.12.5 A review based on the TRICS database indicates that the development would generate an additional 152 movements in the AM peak on the road network. There is a bus stop in Shawlands Avenue and services S5,S7 and 753 stop there with S5 and S7 continuing along Carson Drive. The services link with Bury St Edmunds, Colchester and Sudbury. Although some road improvements will be necessary these details would need to be determined at the planning application stage. I am, however, satisfied that with say about 160 dwellings on site that the increase in traffic movements will be relatively small and that there is no inherent highway objection to the principle of residential development on site.
- 3.96.12.6 Although there was originally an objection from Anglian Water this was based on an assessment of development on the whole site of 16 ha and a total of about 520 dwellings. Anglian Water has indicated that there are problems with the capacity of the Sewage Treatment System which serves this area. This would presumably also have applied to the Shawlands Avenue allocation which I have recommended for deletion. I

accept that extensive drainage works may be necessary and some upgrading of the pumping station may be required. This may affect the timing of some of the development.

- 3.96.12.7 I consider that a thorough landscape assessment of the area has been carried out on behalf of Persimmon Homes. The Council had carried out a Landscape Character Assessment in proposing an extension of the Stour Valley SLA in the 1st and 2nd Deposit Draft Local Plan but this was not based on the more detailed analysis available to the Objectors. From my visits to the area I believe that the area to the west of the proposed planted ridgeline on Drawing 6 – Development Proposals – prepared by The Landscape Partnership - reads more with the built up area of the village than the countryside. I do not, therefore, consider it would be appropriate to include it within SLA designation. Also because of its topography and location it would be a logical extension to the village. The view from the lake to the east would be marginally affected by the development in the southern triangle on Drawing 6 but on balance I consider that with effective ridgeline planting the view from and the setting of Abbas Hall and the village would be enhanced. I do not believe the historic setting of Abbas Hall would be affected by deleting the SLA designation from land to the west of the ridgeline.
- 3.96.12.8 The Objectors have argued that the Omission site is preferable to the Shawlands Avenue allocation (HS09J), which is of some 9.66ha, with 2.7ha for housing. I agree and have recommended elsewhere in my report the deletion of the Shawlands Avenue allocation from the Plan. This omission site would be a substitute for that allocation but would provide for about double the number of units. This will provide greater flexibility in housing provision and as I have said in my introduction to the housing chapter additional housing is required.
- 3.96.12.9 Concern was expressed by Objectors about archaeological remains but from the letter dated 5 November 2004 from Suffolk County Council it is evident that the known COG 011 site would be outside the area to be developed. The Archaeological Officer

would be content with evaluation taking place prior development but post determination.

- 3.96.12.10 Consultants for the Objectors have suggested a form of wording if the site is allocated. I have revised it slightly and have not specifically mentioned affordable housing as this is a requirement covered by specific policies in the Plan. I have also kept the requirements in general terms which the Council may wish to enlarge upon prior to adoption of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan as follows:

Approximately 4.4 ha of land off Carson Drive, Great Cornard to be allocated for about 170 dwellings. Proposals for the development will be required to provide for:

- **Woodland planting along the ridgeline and general ecological enhancement together with its future management**
- **Public open space and its future management**
- **Deletion of the proposed expansion of the Special Landscape Area designation for the housing site.**
- **Archaeological investigation**
- **Highway improvements including provision of a footpath.**
- **Adequate and appropriate sewage treatment**

Make no other modifications to the Plan in response to the above objections.

3.96.13 GREAT WENHAM

The Objections

Council Depot

3 Mr R A Smith

There are no proposals for more intensive use of council housing land where redevelopment could achieve higher but acceptable brownfield densities. There are no proposals for using council owned land such as Great Wenham (a former depot).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.13.1 Great Wenham is a small village with few services and has no BUAB. Although the site is brownfield and from my visit I consider it to be an integral part of the built up area of the village, the site is too small for an allocation. Any housing here would be in a non sustainable location as there are few local facilities. As the site is brownfield and owned by the District Council, if it became surplus to requirements any proposal would be dealt with on a windfall basis.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.14 HADLEIGH

The Objections

Council Depot Calais Street

4 Mr R A Smith

There are no proposals for more intensive use of council housing land where redevelopment could achieve higher but acceptable brownfield densities. There are no proposals for using other council owned land such as Calais Street (former depot)

The Green

428 Mr T D Gray

This site is suitable to be allocated as an edge-of-town site for housing. Part of the site, the existing bungalow and front and immediate rear garden area, is already within the built up area of Hadleigh. The land at the rear is in the same ownership and has existing residential development adjacent to the north western and north eastern and western boundaries. Also adjacent to the southern boundaries is Partridges Coach Depot. This area is scheduled for housing development in Policy HS09. When developed, the housing on Partridges Coach Depot will further enclose the land to the rear of Home Farm Bungalow, a logical extension to the development boundary. Land to the rear of Home Farm Bungalow is not used for agriculture. Access would be from the Green, convenient for Town Centre, close to bus stop, local shops and convenient for main industrial estate at Lady Lane. Existing hedges could be retained although the land at the rear of the bungalow is not easily visible.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.14.1 OM54 This omission site is located between the depot site which is an allocated site with works taking place on site and existing housing. It has a satisfactory relationship with existing housing. The bungalow on the frontage is already within the built up area. Subject to satisfactory access it seems to me to be a reasonable site for development. It is a sustainable site not far from the town centre, shops and employment and just off a main road and close to bus routes into town. Until details of the access are determined it is difficult to assess the capacity of the site or how it could be satisfactorily developed. I do not, therefore, consider it would be appropriate as an allocation but it would be reasonable to include the site within the BUAB and deal with it on its own merits as a windfall.
- 3.96.14.2 OM2 This Council depot is in the midst of a residential area and would in principle be suitable for housing if the its use as a depot were no longer required. However, the site is already within the built up area of the town and appears to be too small for an allocation. If it became surplus to requirements it could be dealt with as a windfall site against various housing and other policies of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by including OM54 within the Built Up Area Boundary

3.96.15 HINTLESHAM

The Objections

Rear of Hintlesham & Chattisham CEVCP School

2675 Mr R Pearson/Wincer Kievenaar Partnership

Objection with regard to inclusion of land to rear of Hintlesham and Chattisham CEVCP School for:

-Limited enabling residential development

- New access road from the A1071 and provision of drop off and car parking facilities for the primary school;
- Provision of a new, larger landscaped playing field and play ground for the primary school.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.15.1 Hintlesham is a linear village with a few facilities but this is not a sustainable, nor near sustainable village under policy HS03. There is little employment, the nearest locations being Ipswich and Hadleigh. As such it is not regarded as an appropriate location for new housing, other than limited infilling. Development in depth would be out of character with the form of the village and housing at any scale in depth, if permitted at all, would need to be justified as an appropriate planning gain.
- 3.96.15.2 I saw from my visits that the school is poorly served by parking or dropping off facilities and vehicles parked on the main road interrupt flows of traffic. It would obviously be desirable to improve the school facilities. However, provision well within the site of a dropping off and parking area may or may not improve the present congested situation. I suspect that few would drive into the site to merely drop off children but would still use the main road, as those entering the site have to access on to the main road to join the traffic stream. The scheme would help with deliveries from commercial vehicles and help when children are collected from school. It appears that satisfactory vehicular access can be obtained through the western part of the site, but not from the eastern wing where any new access road would be on the outside of a bend with sub standard visibility.
- 3.96.15.3 I have no detailed evidence from the Education Authority about the future needs of the school as it wishes to remain impartial. The Parish Council advise that the proposal would limit any expansion of the school but if this were the case I would expect the Education Authority to have drawn attention to it as they are not obstructive to the proposal.
- 3.96.15.4 On the basis of housing need to meet Structure Plan requirements there is no justification for an allocation

of even a small site in this village. If there are modest local needs, including affordable housing, which have to be met locally, and I have no evidence from the District Council or the Parish Council that there are, these would be dealt with as an exception, or as a windfall proposal where other benefits could be negotiated.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.16 HOLBROOK

The Objections

Ipswich Road

510 Thorcross Builders Ltd/Planbuild Services

The company, Thorcross Builders have an interest in the land at Ipswich Road, Holbrook. The land at one time supported a residential development which has been demolished. Since that time it has lain derelict without any lawful use. It is incapable of sustaining an agricultural use and ought to be regarded as a brownfield site. It should be included in policy HS09 as a site worthy of development with the construction of a small group of dwellings. The construction of a small group of dwellings would reflect the scale and character of the village. The character of the landscape on the edge of the village would not be affected particularly as the trees and hedgerows at the rear of the site are developing. Other dwellings have recently been built in this vicinity without detracting from the character of the village. The site is derelict and does not function as an important open space within the village scene. A sensitively designed development would round off the form of the village without creating adverse precedents for further growth.

Adj Vine Cottage

836 Mr E J Wood/Strutt & Parker

This site, adjacent Vine Cottage in Holbrook, better meets the criteria suggested by the Council than many of the other sites suggested as future housing allocations and therefore we object to policy HS09. The site fronts the street which gives access to the main residential areas of Holbrook. Many of the essential services and community facilities in Holbrook are situated on this street. The site is bounded on the south by the playing field of Holbrook

primary school and on the east and north by the grounds and playing fields of Holbrook high school. As the site is visually enclosed by the playing fields and the grounds of the schools, it is considered that this provides a suitable defensible boundary for a residential scheme. The site does not make any visual contribution to the appearance of the countryside and is ideal for the erection of dwellings of a similar scale and character to those recently erected on the opposite side of this road. Such dwellings would not impact on the appearance of the countryside.

Land at Hyams Lane

837 Greenwich Hospital/Strutt & Parker

Object to Policy HS09 which has currently excluded the land at Hyams Lane, Holbrook which amounts to a more sustainable and realistic location for a residential housing allocation. The site is bound on the east, north, and west by existing residential development. The southern boundary of the site is made up by an unmade road forming a natural boundary. The site is poor agricultural land and has not produced a commercial crop for 5 years. It also suffers the disadvantages of an urban fringe site. Residential development on the site would allow the road on the western boundary to be made up. Hyams Lane could be improved and a visually effective southern boundary to the development of Holbrook created. Holbrook is also close to and even accessible to the Brantham industrial area and Manningtree station.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.16.1 I have concluded earlier on in the Housing Chapter that if my recommendations are accepted there will be an adequate supply of housing land to meet Structure Plan needs during the Plan period and that no further allocations will be necessary. The Council is providing a mix of sites in both urban and rural areas, the latter in particular to meet identified local needs

3.96.16.2 Holbrook is a fairly large settlement for the district, but it is not recognised as a sustainable settlement under Policy HS03 because of a shortage of employment opportunities within the village. However, The Royal Hospital School provides additional local employment, and because of this the village is more self-contained for employment purposes than many other villages. Also the presence of the High School as well as a Primary School is an additional important sustainable factor.

BUAP31/OM66 Ipswich Road, Holbrook

- 3.96.16.3 This site of approx. 3.5 ha could accommodate between 105 and 175 dwellings on the basis of national guidance although having regard to the illustrative scheme produced by the objector this would be reduced to 70 units because of open space provision
- 3.96.16.4 I accept that Holbrook because of its size, location, facilities and transport links to Ipswich, is an appropriate receptor for some limited housing to meet local needs. However, development of the scale proposed would be disproportionate to meet those needs. Also Holbrook cannot be looked at separately from the development on the Shotley peninsular as a whole, where there are outstanding permissions on brownfield sites. Although not as conveniently located as Holbrook or Chelmondiston these sites, because of their previous history and uses are likely to provide significant housing development and some employment uses during the Plan period, which do not need to be duplicated elsewhere.
- 3.96.16.5 I consider the present BUAB to the village to be sustainable. It retains the basic form of the settlement and protects the adjoining countryside. I do not share the view of the Objector that the objection site would be well contained within the current form of the settlement. Most of the existing development of Holbrook is on the west side of the Ipswich Road, B1080, and particularly at the northern end of the village there is only sporadic development to the east of the road. Also the existing housing at the northern end of the village is a promontory of development and substantially surrounded by open space. I consider the development of the objection site would have a considerable impact on the countryside setting of the village and be an adverse intrusion in the landscape. From my visits I found that apart from its convenient location in relation to the High School, the objection site is not well related to the main part of village.
- 3.96.16.6 OM 80 - Vine Cottage. From my site visit I consider this site to be outside the village and it does not read as an integral part of the built up area, as it is separated from

the village proper by open use. Development here would be an intrusion into the countryside and have an adverse visual impact on the Dodnash Special Landscape Area. The site cannot be adequately serviced. Its development would be contrary to a range of Structure Plan and Local Plan policies.

- 3.96.16.7 OM81-Greenwich Hospital - This is a prominent sloping site used for agriculture and an integral part of the open countryside. It is, however, well related to existing development. About a third of the site would be unsuitable for development because of a "cordon sanitaire" around the sewage treatment works. This would reduce the impact of the development in the countryside. The highway authority would accept access through the adjoining housing estate but not from Hyams Lane.
- 3.96.16.8 The Council has accepted that Holbrook would be an appropriate location to meet local housing need. The village is specifically mentioned in paragraph 3.39 of the supporting text to Policy HS06 as a receptor for affordable housing and housing to meet the needs of specific groups, not just in the village but also for the benefit of adjoining more rural parishes.
- 3.96.16.9 Although I agree with the objectors that for the reasons I have stated above there is no inherent reason why development should not occur in the village, neither the Parish Council nor the District Council have identified local requirements which need to be met in the village during the Plan period, and there are adequate allocations elsewhere to meet Structure Plan requirements.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.17 LONG MELFORD

The Objections

Land at Bull Lane

2625 The Melford Hall Estate/Bidwells

Land at Bull Lane, Long Melford should be allocated for housing development and if necessary in substitution for the proposed site in Station Road.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.17.1 This is a prominent open field in agricultural use. It is grade 2/3 quality land. It reads as part of the countryside linking open land to the north of Bull Lane site and open land to the south beyond the route of the line of the Melford Walk. Development here would erode the gap between the village and sporadic development to the east. The site is not well related to facilities within the village which are in excess of 1km away.
- 3.96.17.2 With the allocations proposed by the Council and with my recommendations in this report there is no need to allocate further land in the district for housing during the Plan period.
- 3.96.17.3 Although this site was proposed as an alternative to the Station Road site the latter allocation has now been deleted from the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.18 NAYLAND

The Objections

Adj The Bungalow off Harper's Hill

1738 Mr J Oakes/Stuart P Reid Planning

It is submitted that his client's land relates well to the built-up confines of the village settlement form. It is available for growth in scale and character with the village and its immediate surroundings. The resultant impact on the prevailing environment would be complementary to existing residential development in the locality. It has no current commercial value for agriculture or other countryside use and it would provide the village with some additional housing in order to sustain the community.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.18.1 OM179 - Nayland is a reasonably sustainable village and there is no inherent objection to additional housing. The site, which is the corner of an open field, although fairly prominent has a reasonable relationship with the village. I have, however, determined elsewhere that no further allocations are required during the Plan period to meet Structure Plan requirements. On the basis of government advice on densities this site could accommodate more than 10 dwellings and it would be appropriate to consider the impact of its development on the village on the basis of allocation criteria and not as a change to the BUAB. In my view the only reason to change the present defensible boundary of the village would be to accept the need for an allocation.

3.96.18.2 Any proposal to use this site for local affordable housing needs could be dealt with as an exception to countryside policies of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.19 NEDGING

The Objections

Ipswich Road/Crowcroft Road Nedging Tye

132 Mr B Smith/Wincer Kievenaar Partnership

Object to policy HS09 as it fails to include a village Brownfield site in Nedging. The site is derelict land having formerly been used for Nissan Buildings during World War II. The land is unusable for any form of cultivation since the drainage, slabs and foundations to these buildings still exist. This land as part of a larger parcel of 8 acres should be included. Site should be use for residential purposes for approx. 12 dwellings of which 25% would be affordable housing. The expanding military base at Wattisham is adjacent to Nedging Tye and the availability of a number of limited houses close to the base would give an opportunity for the service families to integrate into a village community. Adjacent to the site is additional land in ownership of Mr B Smith which could be used as open space.

Crowcroft Road Nedging Tye

239 Mr D Emmett/Wincer Kievenaar

The site is located on the left of Crowcroft Rd, Nedging. Land is all brownfield site and could never be use for agricultural purposes as there is to many remnants of buildings. . No affordable housing for young locals has been constructed in the last 20 years. Plans have been submitted for low to medium cost housing with a maximum number of 45 over an approx. area of 8 acres. This will allow the village to survive with younger people and not just pensioners. Facilities such as shops, schools etc, exist in Hadleigh and Bildeston and until people can be drawn back in the village no facilities will ever be viable. The site is semi derelict and situated in the middle of the village.

Crowcroft Road Nedging Tye

2632 Mr D Emmett/Wincer Kievenaar Partnership

The site at Crowcroft Road to the rear of Sunnybank, will be acceptable for new housing. The site is well related to the existing village and is a natural extension to the existing village envelope. The village has good employment opportunities with a small industrial estate within it and the adjacent military base. The village has a petrol station, post office, village hall and playing field and is only 2 miles from the minor centre village of Bildeston which has a Primary School and Health centre.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.19.1 OM39,218,29 To develop these three derelict and overgrown sites which are apparently brownfield sites but not noticeably so on the ground, would double the size of the village. Such development would be completely out of scale with the form and character of this small settlement. It is not considered that even with the number of dwellings that could be provided on all of the omission sites that the village would be other than unsustainable. There are also highway and Anglian Water objections to the scale of development.
- 3.96.19.2 Housing development of any scale will be directed in accordance with government policy to larger and more sustainable villages where the additional development with help maintain the vitality and viability of existing village facilities and services.

- 3.96.19.3 Objectors have mentioned that Nedging is only 2 miles from Bildeston, a minor centre with facilities. The Council accepts that Bildeston is a sustainable settlement and for this reason it has a housing allocation (HS09L) to serve the needs of the area. It is better located for both general needs housing and affordable housing.
- 3.96.19.4 If the Council determines in conjunction with the Parish Council that there is a particular affordable housing need which has to be met in this small village this can be dealt with as an exception to the restrictive countryside policy under HS06 of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.20 NEWTON

The Objections

Opposite Saracen's Head Sudbury Road

2210 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

The land identified has a total area of 0.32 ha and belongs to Pubmaster and is owned in connection with the operation of the Saracen's Head Public House opposite. The land has no relationship with the trade of the public house. It has been void and essentially redundant for several years. It comprises an open frontage of approx 100m between two separated parts of Newton Green. It does not perform any essential open space or landscape function nor to the separation of the two parts of the settlement which otherwise may properly be considered as one. The land could provide for a small number of affordable housing to meet local needs in a central location. Alternatively the site would be suitable for the construction of an energy dwelling in accordance with Policy HS25. Such a dwelling would be well related to the built-up part of the village.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.20.1 Newton is a small linear village with few facilities.

3.96.20.2 The site opposite the public house forms a gap between two ribbons of development on the north side of Sudbury Road. It is the only significant physical and visual break in an otherwise built up frontage. On the basis of government advice on densities the site could accommodate between 10 and 12 dwellings, development out of scale with the infilling which would normally be permitted in a non sustainable village under Policy HS02. If there is a proven need for affordable housing provision in the village it can be dealt with as an exception

3.96.20.3 The site is currently not of any recreational amenity value but it is a break of some visual importance which should be protected from the impact of development.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.21 RAYDON

The Objections

Woodlands Road

2142 Mr J Peacock/Fenn Wright

Mr Peacock wishes to draw the attention to the merits and sustainability of land at Woodlands Road Raydon area "A" for residential development

Woodlands Road

2143 Mr J Peacock/Fenn Wright

Mr Peacock wishes to draw attention to the site in Woodlands Road, Raydon area "B" for residential development

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.21.1 Raydon is a village which is not considered sustainable under Policy HS03 in that it lacks facilities to make it so.

3.96.21.2 Both sites, one contained within the other, would involve significant incursion into open countryside, the larger site by development in depth, the smaller by an extension of ribbon development along the frontage.

Neither site would involve infilling as envisaged by Policy HS02. If land is required to meet local affordable housing needs any such proposal could be dealt with as an exception to the Plan, although such development would normally be directed towards sustainable settlements with a wide range of facilities.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.22 SHIMPLING

The Objections

Shimpling Street

838 David Alston (Suffolk) Ltd/Strutt & Parker

Objection relates to policy HS09. The omission site is situated on the outskirts of Shimpling Street, Shimpling and is situated within the special landscape area abutting Shimpling Street. The site is currently made up of a number of redundant agricultural buildings which abut the boundary of the built-up area. The site is bound by the existing road network, serving residential properties and an adjoining farm. Site is suitable for the erection of dwellings similar in scale and character to adjoining residential properties. The site is too small to be of any value for agricultural purposes and is for practical purposes unused except for casual grazing. The site has adequate frontage to the adjoining public highway to allow the formation of a vehicular access.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.22.1 This is a small village with few facilities and as such is a settlement where only infilling would generally be permitted under Policies HS02 and HS03. The site which has a reasonable relationship to the form of the village appears to be used for grazing. It is located within the Chad Brook Special Landscape Area. Under government guidance on densities the site could accommodate between 7 and 12 dwellings. This would be in excess of what would be acceptable in a non sustainable village with few facilities. I have no evidence from the Parish Council or the District Council that there are particular affordable housing needs which should be met in the village. However, even if there were such needs they could be dealt with as an exception under Policy HS06 of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.23 SHOTLEY

The Objections

Land to the south of The Rose PH The Street

2214 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

Object to the non allocation of approximately 1.6ha gross to the rear of The Rose P.H, Shotley Street. The land is presently used by Shotley Rose Bowls Club, with the remainder laid out as a football pitch and used by local clubs during the season. There is also a small area of allotments in the south western part of the area. Planning consent had been granted for a new football pitch and replacement bowls green on land immediately abutting the present open space. Shotley street has a good basic level of local services and facilities and public transport to Ipswich. The site should be specifically identified as suitable for residential development comprising a mixture of private houses for open market sale and affordable housing for low cost sale or rent. Redevelopment of the bowling green would be funded by a development of the site which would include relocation of the remaining allotments, reorganisation of the public house forecourt, car parking and trade garden area. The allocation would not be intrusive in the landscape. Taken into account the provision of open space required and the opportunity to rationalise and extend the pub carpark, the net developable area would be about 1.2ha with a capacity of approx. 35 dwellings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.23.1 Although greenfield this site is well located in relation to existing development adjacent to the village hall and between it and the village. This 1.6 ha site is at present used for bowls and football. It has a capacity to accommodate about 35 dwellings. Vehicular access to the site adjacent to the public house is restricted and may not be suitable to serve the development.
- 3.96.23.2 This is a large site for development and Shotley is a small remote village where facilities are limited and additional housing on any scale would not be

sustainable. If there are local affordable housing needs which have to be met in the village these could be dealt with as an exception to the plan. Shotley is not shown to be a sustainable village in Policy HS03 and its development cannot be looked at in isolation from the remainder of the Shotley peninsular, and in particular Shotley Gate.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.24 SPROUGHTON

The Objections

Rear of The Croft London Road

2103 Mr I A Van Der Ende

The property is owned by Mr A Van der Ende. The site lies on the Ipswich fringe along the A1214 and overlooks Chantry Vale. At present the paddock at the bottom of the garden is zoned as agricultural use only while the garden is not. Request that consideration be given to moving the existing line to the natural hedge line on the northern edge of the paddock. This area does not form part of the Chantry Vale and is only accessible via the frontage. Propose that site be use for housing development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.24.1 The ribbon of housing with long gardens is an isolated group on the north side of the road, separated from other housing by Chantry Park. Because of the long gardens the paddock is remote from the houses on the frontage and acts as a transition between the gardens and the countryside beyond. Including the land within the BUAB would encourage the development of part of the rear garden areas, the paddock and adjoining land, served by a new access road off the A1214. The area would be transformed from frontage dwellings in a rural setting to an urban enclave.
- 3.96.24.2 I have concluded earlier in this chapter that there is no need to release further land over that allocated, in the Plan, other than that recommended by me, to meet the

housing figures in the Structure Plan during the Plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.25 STRATFORD ST MARY

The Objections

South of Swan Meadow Off Lower Street

2211 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

Land has been identified that is redundant and under-utilised an area of 0.23ha lying to the rear of The Swan Public House and adjoining properties known as Meadow Cottages on the southern-eastern flank of Stratford St Mary. The northern boundary of the site is formed by the access to Meadow Cottages, which is owned by Pubmaster Ltd, whilst other boundaries are clearly defined to existing curtilages and are largely defined by belts of trees. The site is well contained by existing landscaping. The provision of appropriate vehicular access to enable development can be achieved adjacent to The Swan and the site offers an opportunity for the development of mixture of houses for open market sale and to meet local housing needs. The site can be developed with approx 7 dwellings.

North East of the Anchor Upper Street

2212 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

We object to the non allocation of land at The Anchor, Stratford St. Mary for residential development. The land comprises approx. 0.3ha and is suitable for the development of about 12 dwellings. The site lies within the built up area of Stratford St Mary and is fully surrounded on all sides by the existing built up area. The land does not offer public access. The land has formerly been part of the area available for use in connection with the public house and therefore falls to be considered as previously developed land. It is now surplus to requirements for future successful operation of the public house and is not required for the purpose of trade or children's garden, car parking etc. Having regard to this, this site should be allocated for residential development in order to relieve the pressure arising elsewhere on the development of previously undeveloped greenfield sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

The Swan

- 3.96.25.1 Stratford is a village with a wide range of facilities. As it is reasonably sustainable it is a village suitable for some additional development in accordance with Policies HS02 and HS03. I have, however, recommended these policies for revision giving my reasons in the Introduction to the Settlement Policy and Housing Chapter of the Plan.
- 3.96.25.2 I accept that the site is underused and bears little relationship with the countryside. It is well contained within existing landscaping. However, the amendment sought is for an allocation of 7 dwellings on a site outside the defined BUAB. It would not be appropriate to allocate a site of this number, as ten is the minimum for allocation in the plan. A proposal for seven dwellings outside the BUAB would have to be dealt with as a windfall under other policies of the Plan, including Policy HS06, which specifically deals with local need. Any scheme would be assessed on its own merits having regard to the location of the site within an AONB and Conservation Area.
- 3.96.25.3 From my visit I am of the view that the vehicular access off Lower Street would be unsuitable for the number of dwellings, existing and proposed, to be served by it, and it would not be appropriate to include the site within the BUAB.

The Anchor

- 3.96.25.4 This 0.3 hectare site is within the Built Up Area Boundary of the village and enclosed by existing development. It is open land in a Conservation Area but not of public interest or with any form of public access. It has been recognised by the Council as an integral part of the village in defining the BUAB, but because it has importance as an open area of land that it should not be developed. I consider this openness to be of limited importance as a feature of the village or Conservation Area and not sufficient to resist development.

3.96.25.5 I am however concerned that the access would be inadequate to serve the number of dwellings proposed and it would be inappropriate to allocate a site which could not practically be developed for the purpose. In any event the number of dwellings which could be accommodated would appear to be less than 10 and it would be inappropriate to allocate the site for housing. If additional land becomes available the site could be developed as a windfall during the Plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.26 SUDBURY

The Objections

Bartholomew's Farm adj St Bartholomews Priory

1570 Mr & Mrs F May/Fenn Wright

Mr & Mrs May are owners of Bartholomew's Farm. This land comprises the original farmhouses, St Bartholomew's Chapel and Listed Barn together with other modern farm buildings. The site is no longer required by the farm as the surrounding farmland to the west (south eastern bypass) is zoned for housing development and subject of a current planning application. This site is therefore redundant. The large area of land to the south and east of Bartholomew's Farm is vacant land extending to approx. 0.9ha. There is established planting to the north-eastern boundary towards the bypass and the Tesco's store beyond. There is substantial residential development to the east, south and proposed to the west. As part of the proposed development, Clermont Avenue is to be extended south of Bartholomew's farm to serve the new development to the west. Site be allocated for housing and it is surrounded by residential development.

Pinecroft Rise

2004 Valid Aspect Limited/Birketts

The policy provides a paucity of residential development on 'previously developed land'. It also fails to provide a choice of sites which are both suitable and available for housing building and is therefore contrary to par 3 of PPG3. Particularly when from a total of 1 185 dwellings 700 of these are proposed in one location

(Chilton). The land at Pinecroft Rise comprises approx. 1ha. The site was previously used as a chalk pit and should be developed as a priority and certainly before any green field sites. The site relates well to the existing residential development and to the existing recreation area/ playground. The steep and very high sides of the previous chalk works form a strong defensible boundary and therefore the sites development would be visually contained from the wider landscape. The site is located close to services, facilities and employment opportunities. The site has benefited from planning permission for residential development which authorised 25 warden service units with access along the edge of the Council's play area. The site could be developed for a minimum of 30 dwellings.

Stephen Walters site, Cornard Road

5832 Stephen Walters & Sons Ltd

Do not object to proposed development at Williams Armes but wish to apply to include the Stephen Walters site within the proposed area designated because:

- under the new proposal the Cornard Road site will be surrounded by residential accommodation with potential conflict with noise etc.
- the existing site is steeply sloped creating production problems for articulated transport
- the existing factory is on three levels creating problems for modern industrial use.
- the Walters group currently has three sites at Sudbury, Bull Lane and Glemsford and would like to consider consolidating to a single site on an industrial estate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.26.1 I am satisfied that if my recommendations are accepted there will be a sufficient allocation of land during the plan period to meet Structure Plan requirements.

3.96.26.2 The St Bartholomews Priory site is prominent in the countryside from the A134 and the Omission Site is an integral and important part of the setting of high quality listed buildings. I consider that any development which detracts from this openness should be resisted.

3.96.26.3 I understand there may be opportunity for some development within the confines of the farm. However, development of the scale proposed on the Omission Site

would be an unacceptable urban intrusion into both the rural setting of the town and the landscape character of the Priory site.

- 3.96.26.4 OM202 - Pinecroft Rise – Although this site was apparently a former landfill site from my visit I consider it to be excluded from the previously developed land definition under Appendix C of Planning Policy Guidance No. 3, as it now forms part of the natural landscape. It is in a semi natural overgrown state with considerable biodiversity value and reads as an integral part of the countryside, more particularly so because it is separated from Pinecroft Rise by the recreation ground. It is within the Stour Valley Special Landscape Area. Access would presumably be required through the playground as there is no direct link shown between the omission site and the road. As a previous landfill site there would be a number of restrictions to its development. Although these might be overcome at a cost I do not consider the site to be well related to village facilities apart from the local industrial site. Other facilities identified, including the school, which is about 1.25 kilometres away are in excess of the recommended 400m walking distances in Planning Policy Guidance No. 13.
- 3.96.26.5 It is accepted that Sudbury is a sustainable location for development but it already has a sufficient allocation of housing land to meet Structure Plan requirements during the plan period.
- 3.96.26.6 The two employment studies (CD42 and CD42A) clearly indicated that employment land is in short supply. Because of this under Policy EM15 of the Plan a loss to other uses would only be considered if it is determined to the satisfaction of the Council that the retention of an employment use on the site has been fully explored, as in the case of William Armes. As no such assessment or marketing exercise has been carried out in respect of the Stephen Waters site any proposal for rationalisation of the company and the use of its sites in the future would be a matter for negotiation with the local planning authority as a prerequisite to the submission of a planning application. As I have said above there is no need for additional housing allocations during the Plan period.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

3.96.27 TATTINGSTONE

The Objections

The Wheatsheaf PH Church Road

2213 Punch Taverns/D L & P Consultants Limited

The Wheatsheaf occupies land at the junction of Church Street and the A137. The land owned by Pubmaster is identified on the attached Plan and comprises the public house, car park and trade garden and a surplus area of redundant and unused land adjacent to the junction and abutting the that part of the village which lies astride the main road. The surplus land is considers suitable for further modest residential development comprising a mixture of principally detached private houses facing Church Street with the remainder, abutting the built up part of Tattingstone Heath, given over to affordable housing to meet local community needs. The density of development will overall comprise of 30 dwellings per ha with a total yield of 5 houses for open market sale and up to10 houses for rental (0.308ha) managed and operated by a registered social landlord. A commensurate provision of open space, including the potential for an equipped children's play area would be included within the scheme.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.27.1 Although there is a straggle of development near these cross roads the area of Tattingstone Heath is remote from most facilities and services. Development here would not be sustainable. Also part of the omission site has been identified as an important visual open space separating two ribbons of development and housing would be an unacceptable intrusion into the openness of the Dodnash Special Landscape Area. The total number of dwellings proposed would be out of scale with this small hamlet where only limited infilling would be acceptable within the BUAB.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.28 WHATFIELD

The Objections

Off Wheatfields

2130 Mr and Mrs A Riddleston/Wincer Kievenaar Partnership

Off Whatfields, Whatfield, has good highway access already in place and could be developed for housing and relate well to the village.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.96.28.1 Whatfield is a small village with a limited range of facilities and public transport. It is not a village where development of any scale would be encouraged as it would not be sustainable. See also my report on Church Farm, Whatfield

3.96.28.2 Development on a site of some 6.6 hectares would be completely out of scale with the existing village. Under government guidelines on density the site could accommodate around 200 dwellings. This would more than double the size of the village to the detriment of its character and setting and have an unacceptably adverse impact on the countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.96.29 WHERSTEAD

The Objections

Clock Paddock

1137 The Paul Family/Bidwells

The site measures approximately 8.04 acres plus 0.8 acres open space and road improvements, is identified. The site falls within the IPA and abuts a major road junction on the A12. Land immediately to the east of the proposed allocation is the HQ of TXU Energy at Wherstead Park, a large employment site with appropriate infrastructure and car parking. The proposed residential allocation is contained by a walled garden and a parcel of land known as Clock Paddock. The allocation of this site for residential use and open

space would provide much needed improvements to the infrastructure surrounding the site. The proposed allocation would include a package for discharging highway problems by improvements including the widening and upgrading of The Street and a separate area of open space to serve the local community. Land to the north of The Street should therefore be included as an allocation under Policy HS09.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.96.29.1 The hamlet at Wherstead Street is a dispersed settlement with fewer than 20 dwellings, separated from Wherstead itself by the A14. Apart from those provided by E.ON (UK) plc and other employers there are no local facilities. Because of its size, location and lack of facilities the Council has not defined Wherstead Street with a Built Up Area Boundary or included it as a village under Policy HS03. The absence of a settlement boundary means that even a limited scale of infilling is regarded as inappropriate.
- 3.96.29.2 The area remaining of the Paul Family land after assigning 2.28ha for B1 office development would be about 1ha of walled garden with a notional capacity of about 30 dwellings. In my view housing development on greenfield land at Wherstead Street would be isolated and unsustainable, and would neither be an appropriate location for general needs or affordable housing. I have dealt with the suitability of the site for employment uses in the Economy and Employment Chapter of the Plan under Policy EM02d.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.97 PARAGRAPH 3.53 IPSWICH POLICY AREA

The Objections

2001 Messrs Sangster Bidwells/Carpenter Planning Consultant

Object to the terms of the policy and particularly to the absence of any recognition of the development potential of land in the Ipswich south-west fringe. The Issues Report (1999) canvassed the

development potential of this part of the district for 'major growth'. RPG for East Anglia also identifies Ipswich as a focal point for new development in the region while the Suffolk County Structure Plan builds on that with the confirmation that major housing and employment development is to take place in the Ipswich Policy Area. The Local Plan however identifies Sudbury and Hadleigh and a few other rural areas for housing allocations. The strategy of distribution is additionally flawed because of Council's failure to present an Urban Capacity Study before first deposit of the plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.97.1 Future development in the Ipswich Policy Area has been assessed on a county wide basis reflecting the strategy for the County as a whole in the Structure Plan. The importance of Ipswich has been recognised in the Plan but development has been concentrated on the northern and eastern parts of Ipswich. I have dealt with Omission Sites within the IPA on their own merits throughout the plan.
- 3.97.2 The Urban Capacity Study (CD41) was a core document to this Inquiry.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

3.98 POLICY HS10 IPSWICH POLICY AREA

The Objections

2000 Messrs Sangster Bidwells/Carpenter Planning Consultant

Object to the terms of the policy and particularly to the absence of any recognition of the development potential of land in the Ipswich south-west fringe. The Issues Report (1999) canvassed the development potential of this part of the district for 'major growth'. RPG for East Anglia also identifies Ipswich as a focal point for new development in the region while the Suffolk County Structure Plan builds on that with the confirmation that major housing and employment development is to take place in the Ipswich Policy Area. The Local Plan however identifies Sudbury and Hadleigh and a few other rural areas for housing allocations. The strategy of

distribution is additionally flawed because of Council's failure to present an Urban Capacity Study before first deposit of the plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.98.1 See paragraph 3.53 (3.97 above)

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection
