

#### 4.46 POLICY EM15 RURAL EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS AND ALLOCATIONS – Retention of Employment Sites

### **The Objections**

#### **128 Ipswich Borough Council/Hepher Dixon**

Object to Policy EM15 as its requirements are more onerous than those of its predecessor, Policy LP47. The wording of 'industrial and commercial sites' in the policy should include B1 employment land to allow flexibility for a possible change of use of the land.

#### **661 GO-East**

The development plan should offer certainty and clarity. The phrasing of plan policies is fundamental to this. Some phrases introduce doubt as to whether planning permission will or will not be granted and these should be avoided. Policies in the development plan are implemented not only by the District Council, but also the County Council, the planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State. Policies should not therefore include phrases such as "the District Council" or the "local planning authority".

#### **1463 Ralston Purina Northern Europe/RPS Consultants**

Delete Policy EM15 and its supporting text. Its requirement for a (public) marketing campaign could prevent the investigation of relocation and alternative redevelopment options for sites and could adversely affect existing staff and the business itself.

#### **1600 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

The policy should be drafted such that sites no longer suitable for continued business use, or where alternative uses are preferable, do not have to be subject to marketing campaigns prior to the grant of permission for alternative use(s).

#### **1919 Bellway Homes Ltd**

Policy EM15 rightly seeks to protect employment sites whilst recognising that this may not always be realistic. However, no provision is made for instances where agreement is not reached with an applicant regarding the terms of a marketing campaign (before it begins). Provision for arbitration is therefore necessary.

#### **2838 B & Q Plc/RPS plc**

The Council's flexible approach towards employment land in Policy EM15 is supported. However, the policy is too restrictive and overly prescriptive. Before developers are required to explore the retention of a site in employment use, the supply of sites in quantitative and qualitative terms should be assessed.

#### **5163 GO-East**

Policy EM15 appears to be delegating decisions to SPG, contrary to PPG12. The final paragraph does not appear to accord with Circular 1/97. It is difficult to see how a financial contribution toward

retraining would be directly related to the redevelopment of an employment site for an alternative use.

**5317 GO-East**

Policy EM15 appears to be delegating decisions to SPG, contrary to PPG12. The final paragraph does not accord with Circular 1/97.

**6873 BT Plc/RPS Planning Transport & Environment**

BT Property object to the term 'employment land' and seek confirmation that this term does not include public utility sites.

**6874 BT Plc/RPS Planning Transport & Environment**

Criterion 2 of Policy EM15 states that when an employment site is being disposed of it must be demonstrated that it is inherently unsuitable and not viable for all forms of employment use. BT objects to this criterion because it does not allow the merits of each site to be taken into account.

**6875 BT Plc/RPS Planning Transport & Environment**

S.54A of 1990 Act (as amended) states planning permission shall be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The SPG is a material consideration, however, the Local Plan wording sets it as a requirement that has to be accorded with.

**6876 BT Plc/RPS Planning Transport & Environment**

The paragraph of the policy states that in the event of the loss of an employment site the applicant should make a contribution to the Council to improve employment or training prospects. A decision should be made on the planning merits of the case.

**6917 Camstead Homes Limited/Taylor Vintners**

The final paragraph of Policy EM15, as drafted, does not reflect national planning policy advice in Circular 1/97. If the existing employment premises are vacant (for example, because of their inherent unsuitability), their loss will cause no impact and it would be wrong to seek a financial contribution from the developer. The final paragraph of the policy should be deleted.

**7096 Mr R J Prosser**

Policy EM15, as explained in paragraphs 4.45 - 4.48, is heavy-handed, too restrictive, inflexible and unnecessary. Council should now allocate sufficient employment land in this emerging Local Plan.

**7097 Mr R J Prosser**

The Policy now proposed is too inflexible on small redundant employment sites in villages and towns and does not take account of inherent problems concerning traffic, amenity or conservation.

**8442 Wardle Storeys (Property) Limited/Boyer Planning**

Object to the final paragraph of policy EM15. The approach suggested will delay the process of regeneration and should only be adopted, if at all, in exceptional cases.

**8443 Wardle Storeys (Property) Limited/Boyer Planning**

The principle of having to make a payment in compensation for loss of employment land (paragraph 4.46 and policy EM15) is novel in planning terms but is unjustified and as a consequence is unacceptable.

**8445 Wardle Storeys (Property) Limited/Boyer Planning**

We object to the first phrase of the second 'test' in policy EM15 which states "where agreed in advance", which is also replicated in paragraph 4.47. This will inhibit the application process as the policy already states "this proof must be to the satisfaction of the determining authority" so it is unnecessary to require the viability information to be agreed prior to the submission of an application.

**8466 Powergen UK Plc/DTZ Piedad Consulting**

Powergen object to this revision of Policy EM15 as paragraph 3.17 of PPG12 states that "plan policies should not attempt to delegate the criteria for decisions on planning applications to SPG's".

**8467 Powergen UK Plc/DTZ Piedad Consulting**

The revised Policy EM15 and paragraph 4.46 also require that "if the loss of an employment site or premises is permitted the applicant/developer will be expected to pay a financial contribution to the District Council to be spent on improving employment and/or training prospects in the District". This is negative and will restrict the supply of land brought forward for development over the Plan period.

**8926 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills**

Our concern and objection to this policy is levelled at that new text contained in the final paragraph which suggests that the applicant/developer will be expected to make a financial contribution to the District Council to be spent on improving employment and/or training prospects in the District. If it is the case that proof has been submitted to the planning authority that the employment site or premises is unsuitable or not viable then assumption must be that there is no adverse impact on employment supply if planning permission is to be granted. To suggest that a financial payment is required as a result of satisfying the local planning authority that the site or premises is not required for whatever reason is totally inappropriate.

**9072 RPS Planning, Transport & Environment**

The Council is not justified in expecting financial contributions in relation to this policy in every case.

**9193 B&Q PLC/RPS plc**

Policy is too restrictive and overly prescriptive. Where proposals can be shown not to have an adverse effect on the range of employment sites available, alternative uses should be considered acceptable, providing they satisfy the other policies set out in the plan.

**9229 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning**

We do not agree with the proposed modifications which seek financial contributions in lieu of retention of existing premises. The Council's policy is generally to retain employment uses, unless it can be demonstrated that sustaining that use is no longer practical or viable (criteria 1 and 2 of Policy EM15). If those criteria are met, then the benefit in planning terms will normally be to allow redevelopment to an alternative use, on the balance of the merits of each particular case. There should be no additional financial obligation on the applicant, and nor is the extraction of such a payment reasonable under the terms of government guidance. We accept that there may be very occasional circumstances where, as an exception to normal policy, the Council may accept a commuted payment in lieu of retention of existing employment, but that should not be taken to be the norm.

**9230 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning**

We do not consider that it is reasonable for a Local Plan to refer to applications for planning permission adhering to SPG, and particularly not when that SPG has not even been produced.

**9231 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning**

We do not consider that it is reasonable for an applicant to have to agree the content of an application in advance of submission.

**9232 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning**

The wording 'to the satisfaction of the determining authority' is not only superfluous but also unreasonable - at appeal, it would be irrelevant as to whether the submitted evidence were to the satisfaction of the District Council.

**9485 Tesco Stores Ltd/Littman & Robeson**

Text should be added so that redevelopment involving employment benefits should be waived from the requirement of contributions.

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy EM15 Pre-Inquiry  
Change 82**

Amend EM15 to read:

'Planning applications to redevelop or use existing or vacant employment land, sites and premises for non-employment purposes, will only be permitted if the applicant can demonstrate that their retention for an appropriate employment use has been fully explored. This may be undertaken in one of the two following ways:

1. by an agreed and sustained marketing campaign, undertaken at a realistic asking price; or
2. where agreed in advance, the applicant can demonstrate that the land, site or premises are inherently unsuitable or not viable for all

forms of employment related use. This proof must be to the satisfaction of the determining authority.

This policy may not be applied where vacant business premises form a smaller (and subordinate) but integral part of an existing dwelling in the same ownership. ~~Proposals will be expected to adhere to the supplementary planning guidance developed for this type of planning proposal.~~ If the loss of an employment site or premises is permitted the applicant/ developer will be expected to make a financial contribution to the District Council to be spent on improving employment ~~and / or training~~ prospects in the District.

### **The Objections**

None

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

4.46.1 I share the concern of the objectors about the last paragraph of the policy. I consider the financial link is tenuous. There are a wide range of circumstances pertaining to old employment generating uses, including vacancy over a long period. Policy EM15 accepts that there may be circumstances when planning permission would be granted leading to a loss of employment use. I do not consider such circumstances warrant a financial contribution linked to unspecified employment provision elsewhere in the district. No one reading the policy would have any idea of the extent of the financial burden which might be imposed upon them. Although there might occasionally be a situation where a commuted payment would be justified I do not consider it should form a specific part of this policy.

4.46.2 I do not disagree with the principle of requiring up to date marketing evidence. In my experience historical marketing records are often vague and unconvincing and I believe that Criterion 1 lays out clearly what is expected. There is an alternative at Criterion 2 which deals with the unsuitability of premises for continuing employment use. However, I see no reason to state the obvious in the last sentence of Criterion 2.

- 4.46.3 At the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage all employment land and premises were covered by this policy. This objection has been met.
- 4.46.4 The second criterion of the policy is now an alternative to marketing.
- 4.46.5 The policy has been rewritten to meet specific objections to the wording by GO-East and others E.g delegating decisions to SPG's, reference to Local Planning Authority's etc

## RECOMMENDATION

### Modify Policy EM 15 by

- a) deleting the last sentence from the policy requiring financial contributions
- b) delete the last sentence of Criterion 2
- c) otherwise modify in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 82

---

4.47 PARAGRAPH 4.47 RURAL EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS AND ALLOCATIONS – Retention of Employment Sites

### The Objections

#### **1466 Ralston Purina Northern Europe/RPS Consultants**

Delete Policy EM15 and its supporting text. Its requirement for a (public) marketing campaign could prevent the investigation of relocation and alternative redevelopment options for sites and could adversely affect existing staff and the business itself. Such consideration and negotiation would often need to be conducted confidentially, especially when dealing with very sensitive sites.

#### **8446 Wardle Storeys (Property) Limited/Boyer Planning**

We object to the first phrase of the second 'test' in policy EM15 which states "where agreed in advance", which is also replicated in paragraph 4.47. This will inhibit the application process as the policy already states "this proof must be to the satisfaction of the determining authority" so it is unnecessary to require the viability information to be agreed prior to the submission of an application.

In any event it will normally be expected that pre-application discussions, including issues such as this, would be held between the applicant and the Council as a matter of good practice.

**9224 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning**

We do not consider that it is reasonable for an applicant to have to agree the content of an application in advance of submission, or else be held to be contrary to the Local Plan/Section 54A for not having done so.

**9225 ICI Corporate Real Estate/Boyer Planning**

The wording 'to the satisfaction of the determining authority' is not only superfluous but also unreasonable - at appeal, it would be irrelevant as to whether the submitted evidence were to the satisfaction of the District Council, which we assume to be the meaning of the term 'determining authority'.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.47.1 See my report on EM15 and supporting text above.

**RECOMMENDATION**

See my recommendation at EM15 above.

---

4.48 PARAGRAPH 4.48 RURAL EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS AND ALLOCATIONS – Retention of Employment Sites

**The Objections**

**1467 Ralston Purina Northern Europe/RPS Consultants**

Delete Policy EM15 and its supporting text. Its requirement for a (public) marketing campaign could prevent the investigation of relocation and alternative redevelopment options for sites and could adversely affect existing staff and the business itself. Such consideration and negotiation would often need to be conducted confidentially, especially when dealing with very sensitive sites.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.48.1 See my report on EM15 and supporting text above.

**RECOMMENDATION**

See my recommendations on Policy EM15 above

#### 4.49 INS14 IPSWICH FRINGE

##### **The Objections**

##### **7959 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

Objects as it is important to highlight at this point that the shading of the former TXU site on the plan which appears in the Second Deposit Draft is somewhat misleading.

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

4.49.1 The Council is aware of the need to amend and clarify a few Inset maps prior to adoption.

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

Update and revise as required

---

#### 4.50 POLICY OR TEXT OMISSIONS

##### **The Objections**

##### **22 Ipswich Buses**

Ipswich Buses seek an alternative site and would welcome the former British Sugar site, Sproughton Road, Ipswich, being allocated in the Plan for such use. Relocation envisaged within the next 1-3 years. 3.5 acres / 1.4 hectares and buildings of 28,500 sq. ft. / 2,650 sq. m. required.

##### **258 Taylor Woodrow/Carpenter Planning Consultants**

The Ipswich Fringe Inset Map should identify the Chantry Vale site as a site suitable for prestigious business development.

##### **370 Sproughton Parish Council**

The now closed Sugar Beet Factory Site, Sproughton, should be mentioned in the plan and subject to a development / regeneration masterplan. The Plan should include a reference to the site, its redevelopment / regeneration and the need for local input into the process.

##### **488 The Bypass Nurseries/The Johnson Dennehy Planning Partnership**

In Capel St Mary there is a need for economic activity to provide employment, protect services and reduce travel-to-work

movements. Because the subject site is close to residential property, Class B1 uses are likely to be the most suitable, where there will be no adverse impact on residential amenity, by reason of noise, vibration, smell or fumes. The site is within the boundary of the built-up area and would be acceptable and appropriate for Class B1 uses and should be allocated as such.

#### **491 East of England Development Agency**

A key priority of the RES is to realise the economic potential of the region's transport gateways and its ports, including Felixstowe. Reference to its strategic importance should be included in the Plan.

#### **493 East of England Development Agency**

Whilst the RES is chiefly concerned with regional economic performance and development, it is equally important that social progress and environmental protection are addressed within the region's development.

The RES and Development Plan processes should be mutually reinforcing. It would therefore be appropriate to include commentary on the strategy in the Plan, particularly in relation to its Employment chapter.

#### **543 Mr and Mrs J M Craske/Elsom Spettigue Associates**

The site has a gross area of 40 acres / 16.2 hectares. It has an extensive frontage to the A1071 (Hadleigh by-pass) and access to the by-pass will avoid commercial vehicles using Historic Hadleigh Town Centre. It can be serviced within land cost/value budgets. A substantial portion of the gross area could be utilised for landscaping purposes to protect residential uses in Castle Road and any strategic planting necessary fronting the by-pass and Friars Road. The location is a natural extension of Hadleigh and would not adversely affect existing development/users. The location would establish a western employment area for the town to complement the eastern area of Lady Lane. The landowners are the owners of the majority of the land, north of the A1017 and can therefore if necessary offer and create off-site landscaping to provide additional screening.

#### **1013 Hadleigh Town Council**

There is no reference in the Plan to [the need for amelioration of] impacts on the local community arising through development. This especially applies to key public services (e.g. schools and health).

#### **1122 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce**

In the context of commuting there is a lack of reference to the threats/opportunities of proximity of the Sudbury area to Stansted airport. Further development at the airport, transport improvements between it and the Sudbury area and wage rate differentials may serve to impact seriously on the Sudbury labour market.

#### **1123 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce**

Paragraph 4.5 refers to the poor transportation network in Sudbury but appears not to properly consider this within the preparation of the overall Local Plan.

**1125 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce**

With the exception of Northern Road, no new primary routes have been established around Sudbury. The Chamber considers that there should be no further peripheral development at Sudbury until new primary transport routes are in place, providing by-pass / traffic relief.

**1126 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce**

Whilst making special provision for 'off plan' locations, the Plan makes no special provision for science park type development. Sudbury's poor transport network does not lend itself to such a promotion..

**1190 Albert E Webb Ltd/Edward Gittins & Associates**

This objection seeks an amendment to the existing boundary around Acton Place Industrial Area so as to include an additional piece of land proposed here to be adjoined to the estate and allocated for employment use.

5 specific grounds of objection submitted. See also related rep. on Policy EM08.

**1571 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 the subject of a current planning application. The farm land they own north of the eastern by pass is operated from their home at Potters Tye Farm, Newmans Green. This site is therefore redundant. The owners wish to object as this site is not included for any allocation. The District Council are requested to give consideration to allocating the site of Bartholomew's Farm for employment use. It is envisaged this would take the form of restoring and retaining the existing farmhouse, Chapel and Listed Barn to some form of commercial/employment use, whilst removing the remaining modern farm buildings. Bartholomew's farm would be unattractive as a single residence and a commercial/employment use is therefore the only viable alternative to enable the historic buildings to be retained. The site's proximity to the established employment area of Woodhall Business Park and the town's bypass make it ideally located for commercial use.

**1572 A & V Hurrell/Whymark & Moulton**

A.E & V.M Hurrell are freehold owners of land and buildings to the northern end of Chilton Airfield. These buildings are currently, and have for a period of time, been used for industrial and employment

purposes. Planning permission has recently been granted for an additional building to one of the units, and a planning application is currently under consideration for part of the land as a small lorry park. This land and these buildings should be allocated and included as employment land. It enjoys dual access from Tentree Road, Great Waldingfield Road, or via the airfield runway to the main Sudbury/Great Waldingfield Road. Allocation of this land and buildings as general employment will allow for limited future expansion of a known extent. Para 12.19 acknowledges a lack of employment land available in the Chilton area. Para 4.38 and 4.39, Redundant Airfields, acknowledge the acceptable use of these sites for employment purposes. The field to the south of these buildings is also owned and a 1.5 ha woodland is in the process of being planned and planted. This will provide definite boundaries to the site and screening.

**1597 Tesco Stores Limited/Littman & Robeson**

An objective should be added to the effect that Sudbury and Hadleigh act as focal points for retail provision and thus benefit from the employment thereby generated.

**1713 T & A Bugg/Nicholas Percival**

Buildings on this site are considered to be suitable for conversion from agricultural (former intensive piggeries) to commercial use. This should be included as an employment site in the countryside.

**1851 Mrs R Summers/John Peacock Planning**

The Plan has supporting text which is generally favourable towards the expansion of existing firms on their current sites. However, it lacks a policy to reflect the aims of Structure Plan Policy ECON1. This would give certainty to prospective applicants and should be entirely in accordance with PPG7. New policy therefore proposed: 'Applications for industrial or commercial development involving extensions to existing premises, new building within an existing industrial curtilage or the extension of a curtilage will normally receive favourable consideration provided that the development is not of a scale which would cause overriding problems for transport, housing, the provision of services, impact on any neighbouring residential uses or the conservation of the environment.'

Inclusion of this policy would help to retain and expand the employment base of the district. It would also enable businesses to seriously consider developing their existing sites and would reduce the possibility that successful and expanding firms had to relocate away from their established workforce and outside the district, which would be likely to add to the outward commuting statistics cited in paragraph 4.4 of the Plan.

**2686 Hadleigh Town Council**

No mention is made of the existence of the Brett Works site on Pound Lane in Hadleigh and its important role in employment terms.

Whilst the Town Council recognises that this site is not very attractive visually, it has a value for the operation of small-scale businesses that choose not to relocate to an industrial site. Some reference should be made within the 'General Employment' section from paragraph 4.15 onwards and in Policy EM02.

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

- 4.50.1 I believe that Policy EM02c is worded in such a way that a bus depot could be incorporated into the BSC site. The policy accepts a range of land uses.
- 4.50.2 The Chantry Vale site was dealt with as a specific omission site objection at Inquiry. See my report earlier in this chapter.
- 4.50.3 Policy EM02c allocates the former BSC site for employment uses and contains a list of criteria to be met.
- 4.50.4 Policy EM09c was included at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit draft stage allocated this site for employment related use, including Class B1.
- 4.50.5 Reference to the East of England strategy was added to the objectives at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage as was the updated regional economic strategy. I consider these objections have been met.
- 4.50.6 I considered this site as an alternative to Grays Lane but concluded that Grays Lane is the better site. As only one new site is required in Hadleigh during the Plan period and the Council has chosen the Grays Lane site which I consider offers a range of benefits there is no need for me to investigate in any detail an alternative site. However, I saw from my visit that alternative site of about 19.2 hectares is very prominent within the Brett Valley Special Landscape Area and has a poor access.
- 4.50.7 Only services and facilities which are directly related to the development can be required under advice in Circular 1/97 (CD70). Planning obligations to achieve this would be negotiated under Policy LP01 of the Local Plan based on the particular requirements of the development. On some large developments additional

school or other community provision may be appropriate, but this would depend upon the extent of existing provision.

- 4.50.8 Transport network is dealt with in the Transport Chapter and through the Local Transport Action Plan. Detailed evidence on transport and the effects of traffic was given to Inquiry by Objectors and the highway authority when the Chiltern Mixed Used development was considered. See the Chilton Chapter.
- 4.50.9 Although I had some evidence about high technology science parks around Ipswich I had none which would lead me to conclude there was need for an allocation for specialist type industry in Sudbury. Allocations in Sudbury as elsewhere were based on the two Employment Land Studies. One concerned with the whole district, the other related to the Chilton development and Sudbury.
- 4.50.10 Policy EM09a was included at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage recognising part of the the Chilton airfield as a rural employment area. I consider this objection has been met.
- 4.50.11 Paragraph 4.17b and paragraph 4.22a provide background on the roles of Hadleigh and Sudbury. There are also separate chapters on Hadleigh Town and Sudbury Town recognising their importance within the district.
- 4.50.12 In my view Policy EM12a added at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage now adequately reflects Structure Plan Policy ECON1
- 4.50.13 St Bartholomew's Priory Farm is situated to the north west of Sudbury close to the built up area boundary. Although well related to the existing form of development I found it to be an open site which provides a pleasant setting for the listed buildings. In my view any intensive development here resulting from an allocation would have an unfortunate and unacceptable impact on very important listed buildings. However, I consider there may be some opportunity for limited development here but because of the various

restrictions on the land, this could best be assessed as an individual proposal, and not as an allocation.

- 4.50.14 I found the piggery site to be isolated from the village of Nayland. It is about 1km from its centre and remote from other facilities and any labour force. The site has poor vehicular access. The site is located within the Dedham Vale ANOB and would only be adequately screened from one direction. I consider development here would have an adverse impact in the landscape. I accept that there may be a need for some local employment in Nayland but regardless of its previous use the site is not a sustainable location for employment development
- 4.50.15 The Objection from Hadleigh Town Council has been overtaken by the allocation of the site under Policy HD01b for an employment generating retail use. I have dealt with objections to the supermarket separately in my report.
- 4.50.16 Apart from the alterations introduced at 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Draft stage and the Pre-Inquiry Changes already made which I have also dealt with elsewhere in the plan when dealing with particular site objections, I consider no further changes are required.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no further modifications to the Plan in response to these objections.

---

## 4.51 MISCELLANEOUS

### **The Objections**

#### **394 Miss B M G Winter**

Before opening up the area to further commerce or industry, it would be a good idea to take a general census to ascertain how many companies would be willing to move to the county, with a guarantee that such relocations would be long, rather than short

term. How many unemployed are there locally and how many current vacancies are there on the Job Centre books?

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

- 4.51.1 I consider that a general census of firms elsewhere in the country would be too general to be of much reliability in assessing the future employment development of Suffolk and particularly Babergh. Also current levels of unemployment are only of limited value for the future as the area will be subject to considerable change up to 2016.
- 4.51.2 An Employment Land Study in 2002 was followed by another consultants report for part of the district in 2004. Both concluded that there is a consistent demand for industrial property and a requirement for new land supply. They also concluded that some industries were not locating to the area because of a lack of choice of sites or premises.
- 4.51.3 Government Draft Regional Spatial Strategy envisages that the Haven Gateway sub region, which includes the southern part of the district, will support economic opportunities and sets a figure of 49,650 jobs in the sub region up to 2021.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

### **APPENDICES**

#### **Appendix 1 Objections to EM02a (IFF site)**

##### **3123 Mr A R Clayton**

Opposed as the IFF site policy (EM02a) states that there will be provision of satisfactory road access from the A1092 but makes no mention of closing the existing entrance at Liston. Concerned about increased traffic.

##### **4451 Mrs J Mayhew**

I am not supporting or objecting to the IFF site being retained for employment use. So long as there is no heavy traffic around these small country roads, and that there is excessive noise or air pollution coming from the site, but I would object to the site being used as an imposing factory as it would defeat the object of all the residents in Liston of living in the peaceful countryside.

**4452 Mrs J Mayhew**

Objects to provision of waste transfer station

**4559 Mr J H Heinrich**

We wish to ensure there is proper consultation with the residents of Liston and others of Braintree District Council.

**4560 Mr J H Heinrich**

The roads of Liston were not designed for industrial use - the large numbers of cars and the heavy vehicles associated with industry today. We also wish to ensure that the entrance from the Essex side is sealed off.

**5304 GO-East Conditional Withdrawal**

Policies EM02a, c, d and e all appear to delegate decisions to a planning brief, contrary to the provisions of PPG12.

**5308 GO-East Conditional Withdrawal**

EM02a and EM02e also appear to be delegating responsibility to the Environment Agency.

**5310 GO-East**

This policy also duplicates other policies in the plan which deal with development control issues.

**5352 Suffolk County Council**

The County Council would not object to this allocation subject to the provision of the new road link to the A1092.

**5460 Mr J A W North**

Approximately 80% of the former IFF site is within the boundaries of Braintree District Council. Looking at the Braintree DC Local Plan, there is absolutely no mention of plans for this site.

**5461 Mr J A W North**

Most bullet points are vague with no clear definition as to the exact meaning. What is a 'waste transfer station' and what kind of waste are talked about. There is mention of 'provision of satisfactory road access from the A1092' whilst this should be of paramount importance concerning any development of this site, there is no mention as to existing access via the country lanes.

**5466 Mr T P Hearn**

The site is located on a small country lane. Access from Glemsford direction is not possible for commercial vehicles other than vans as the road is too narrow. There is a weight restriction on the bridge at the Long Melford end of Liston and the road is too narrow to allow anything other than small vehicles to pass. This leaves the

turning off the Rodbridge - Foxearth road as the only access to the site for any of the larger vehicles.

**5467 Mr T P Hearn**

When IFF were operating and before them BBA, there were numerous minor accidents along this stretch of road with a lot of damage caused to objector's property. There are no pavements and few passing places for large vehicles.

**5468 Mr T P Hearn**

If permission is granted to allow the establishment of a waste transfer station at this site, this will greatly increase the number of cars that will visit the site.

**5469 Mr T P Hearn**

The provision of a proper access road off the Long Melford Cavendish Road (A1092) would allow all the needs of the site and the local residents to be met.

**5484 Mr J H Purser**

**5485 Mr J H Purser**

**5486 Mr J H Purser**

This area is currently one of the most appalling blots on an attractive landscape. As services are connected, the only logical use is for housing. Road links for industrial levels of traffic are equally poor.

**5914 Mr W A Evans**

It is fair to say that were the former IFF site not in existence, it would not be allowed under today's planning rules. Has demolition and clearance of this site not been considered.

**5915 Mr W A Evans**

We have seen at first hand how quickly the surrounding flood plain is inundated. How will flood protection be managed in accordance with your policy EN05 and to the standard required by PPG25 if the site is occupied by more than one operator, as EM02a seems to indicate.

**5916 Mr W A Evans**

Proposal includes eleven conditions, the last one of which requires that any future user of the site should make provision for the establishment of a waste transfer station.

**5917 Mr W A Evans**

We object to the proposal to establish a waste transfer site on EM02a and seek its re-location to a more appropriate site.

**5918 Mr W A Evans**

We wish to know these conditions will be implemented and monitored. If more than one operator is on this site, how will conditions such as land contamination, landscape and riverside enhancement and flood management be carried out effectively.

**7929 Foxearth & Liston Parish Council**

We would like clarification of the point "Provision for a site for the establishment of a waste transfer station".

**8410 Mr M S Pacey**

It is important to establish what uses would be permissible on the land not being retained for employment use.

**8411 Mr M S Pacey**

The site is totally inappropriate in location and is bounded on all sides by Special Landscape Areas.

**8421 Mr M S Pacey**

Object to the waste transfer station.

**8422 Miss P Mansfield**

Support to the extent that all use of the site is via A1092 and Liston access is stopped up.

**8423 Miss P Mansfield**

Waste transfer station is wholly inappropriate use of site.

**8424 Miss P Mansfield**

No (re-)development/use in the flood plain.

**8425 Miss P Mansfield**

No industrial use.

**8426 Miss P Mansfield**

Contamination: the site was known as the chemical works.

**8427 Miss P Mansfield**

Site should revert to the meadows.

**9235 Mr J Masters**

The Site Plan is materially incomplete. The Babergh D.C (and Braintree D.C) remit should cover the whole IFF site and environs.

**9236 Mr J Masters**

Babergh D.C have not established liaison with Braintree D.C. 75% of the Site is, as a fact, outside Babergh D.C's legal competence.

**9237 Mr J Masters**

Babergh D.C policies proposed for the site do not conform to their own general policies.

**9238 Mr J Masters**

The establishment of a 'Waste Transfer Station' (without definition) has been included as a proposed policy requirement for use of part or all of the site without any proper advice of proposal to the general public; it is proposed for a site within a known Flood Plain, within the Stour Valley Special Landscape Area and next to a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

**9239 Mr J Masters**

Recognition of the cost of site demolition and clean up, albeit with possibility of some funding from Central Government and the EU, should be made by flagging consent for a small non-industrial re-use/re-development upon a suitable part of the site (in its enlarged actuality) entirely accessed from the Clare Road, the A1092.

**9240 Mr J Masters**

The site falls within the areas of both Babergh and Braintree Councils. The 'Note' that a development brief will be produced in co-operation with Braintree D.C understates the legal requirement upon the two Councils to jointly develop a Policy for the Site. 75% of (the so far identified area of) the Site is within Essex - Braintree D.C area, and not at all within the Babergh D.C area in Suffolk.

**9241 Mr J Masters**

As presently drafted, this starts off by being (inadvertently) misleading. The IFF factory is closed and therefore it provides no employment, apart for security staff (and whom ever adds up the bill for the substantial light pollution of the Special Landscape Area). Understood this way around, it can be appreciated that, given that the Site is within a totally rural area, and the River Stour Special Landscape Area, it is in effect a Greenfield site for which no Planning Permission would normally be granted for any development of any nature, whether Babergh D.C or Braintree D.C.

**9242 Mr J Masters**

Given that there has been until a nearly a year ago, manufacturing use on the site, this gives an argument that there might be grounds to re-establish a manufacturing use, but (the understanding is) not all of the buildings, and possibly uses, on the site have a specific Planning Permission: they may, or may not, have had an "Established Use".

**9243 Mr J Masters**

It is not available to Babergh D.C to assume that any employment use should 'be retained' (in fact re-commence). All published Babergh D.C Policies, apart from this draft policy EM02a actually join together to specifically discriminate against any development of the site, or a site like the site. And the draft policy EM02a goes on to state (confirming one aspect of the just mentioned general observation), that residential development will not be permitted at this site. No reasoning is offered for this statement.

**9244 Mr J Masters**

Apart from stating that employment use should continue and that there should be no residential use, Babergh D.C actually do not say what is their thinking for a draft policy EM02a, save that if before a Development Brief is issued a Planning Permission was applied for then the 11 principles should apply.

**9245 Mr J Masters**

Immediately outside the Site, opposite the entrance that was used until recently, there is a tract of land which could clearly be used for residential development: and arguably this could be for a few affordable housing units. Braintree D.C Policy RLP 7

**9246 Mr J Masters**

Based upon Babergh D.C's own existing policies, should be either no re-use, or else a minimalisation of re-use and no new development.

**9247 Mr J Masters**

Site Surveys. The draft Policy EM02a suggests that Planning Permission could be granted 'subject to site surveys to establish whether any land contamination is present..' This materially derogates from Policy EN17, which states 'If contamination of land is known or where available evidence clearly indicates that contamination exists. Planning Permission will not be granted until detailed proposals..'.

**9248 Mr J Masters**

Waste Transfer Station. This is a major Policy issue and from enquiries, it is apparent that insufficient highlighted advice of this proposal, which must emanate from Babergh D.C and or Essex C.C and/or Suffolk C.C, has been given to the Public at large. It is extraordinary that such a station, which de facto creates and concentrates contaminants, and is a non-conforming use in all senses, should be proposed by Babergh D.C for a site which is within the Flood Plain and Special Landscape Area, and next to an SSSI.

**9249 Mr J Masters**

Objects due to consequential traffic generation, this will be considerably above any general Policy of Babergh D.C for a site such as this. A Waste Transfer Station is, presumably, a 'substantial trip generating development'. It will be known, or easily can be determined how many vehicle movements are generated at the Sandy Lane facility.

**9250 Mr J Masters**

It is observed that, for example, the Churchfield Road, Sudbury, commercial area is far better positioned and road-served to suit a Waste Transfer Station.

**9251 Mr J Masters**

Apply the criteria espoused in Policy SP03 to the site (assuming that draft Policy EM02a does not exist), and it is immediately clear that the site unquestionably, fails every applicable principle for use as a Waste Transfer Station. Thus, draft Policy EM02a is in serious conflict with Policy SP03.

**9252 Mr J Masters**

Although one of the 11 principles, this deserves its own heading. The previous access to the site has been along Liston Lane, situated entirely outside Babergh D.C's area. That lane and all the lanes/roads with which the site connects, are hopelessly under-standard for anything more than light vehicles. In many places there is no width for more than one vehicle. The bridge over the River Stour on the Essex/Suffolk border is a Bailey Bridge which although 'temporary' has all the signs of becoming a permanent fixture. The road at the bridge is subject to yearly flooding on both sides in relation to which, presumably because of need for

permitting the natural flood plain to properly operate, neither County Council has taken any action except, on one side, to clear drains which, of course, has had no effect because the flood level naturally remains. That bridge is single width only, with very poor visibility, and signing, at both ends. The junction of that road leading from the bridge at Rodbridge is the scene of many vehicular accidents, as recently high-lighted in the Press

**9387 Environment Agency**

Sites that fall within the 250m buffer zone of landfill sites should be assessed, so that appropriate mitigation measures are completed to ensure the safe occupancy of the development and prevent the contamination of controlled waters including groundwater.

**12255 Mr P Harvey**

General objection as does not know what the employment site will be and what it will entail.

**12288 Mr P Harvey**

Objects as concerned about the traffic and heavy goods vehicles.

**Appendix 2 – Objections to EM02b (Lady Lane development)**

---

**Covered at Inquiry 26/10/04**

**9035 The Lady Lane Consortium/Tim Harbord Associates**

Support for allocation in principle but also specific objections: Although costs have not yet been calculated it is apparent, having regard to the extent of road works required and the need to move statutory services including a pumping station, that this will be a very costly burden on the development. Other probable costs on the development will be the need to provide affordable housing, open space and possibly education payments to comply with the Council's policies on such matters. In addition, it is understood that the developer may have to provide a serviced site for the waste transfer station. Another cost on the viability of the development would be the potential loss of some land to accommodate the roundabout and its associated road improvements. In this context it is of considerable concern that the development will be inhibited if not rendered unviable by the phasing proposals in Policies HS01a and HS09h and insufficient residential land to act as the necessary catalyst for the employment area.

**9038 The Lady Lane Consortium/Tim Harbord Associates**

Support for allocation in principle but specific objections as follows:

In tandem with progressing the roundabout options the Consortium will be commissioning a landscape assessment leading to production of an illustrative Master Plan, to assess just how much developable land might be lost to the road improvements and structural landscaping. This will also be able to examine the potential to increase the amount of residential land by increasing the size of the overall development.

**Issue:** Brownfield land should be allocated in preference to greenfield land.

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**4768 Mr G Joseph;4808 Mrs P Joseph;4956 Mr A D Fraser;  
5843 Mrs B Bayford; 6456 Mr W H Bayford; 7119 Miss J A  
Hitchcock; 7150 Mrs T Fraser3936 Mr R Johnston; 4131 Mr J  
Browne; 4151 Mrs S E Dyer;4171 Mr R J Dyer; 4596 Mrs J  
Robinson; 4748 Mrs J Philpot;4788 Ms R Percival; 5803 Mrs K  
S Grandon-White;5945 Mrs J Sheldrick; 6155 Mr T W  
Greenaway; 6395 Mrs D Greenaway; 6416 Mr T E Sheldrick;  
6555 Mr N W Saunders;6579 Mrs J Saunders;6986 Mrs T L  
Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick; 8534 Mr B D Rich; 8574 Miss K  
Rich; 8614 Mrs M Rich; 3835 Mrs N J Funnell; 3786 Mr R C  
Funnell;3559 Mr H A Tribe; 3897 Mrs K D Whitmore;3909 Mr  
E A Whitmore;4074 Mrs Y D Ingram; 4086 Mrs S E Willis-  
Betts;4097 Mr K Scarff;4204 Mrs F Eves;4356 Mrs C Nokes;  
4375 Mr G Nokes;4460 Mrs M E Pipe;4474 Mr R G Pipe;4551-  
4552 Mrs O E Partridge;4594 Mrs J Osborne;4622 Mr C N  
Joseph;4886 Mr J Oxford;5266 Mr K J Davison;5388 Mrs B  
Senior;5401 Mr E Robins;5550 Mr N A William;6059 Mrs J M  
Keeble;6063 Mr T W Keeble;6094 Mrs E E Geller;6253 Mrs J  
Smith;6388 Miss G Green;6501 Mr W H Bayford;7365 Mrs E G  
Dendy;7373 Mr R B Kennell;8303 Mrs J S Hamilton;8319 Mr N  
J Hamilton;8388 Mrs M A Adams;9166 Mr R J Attridge;5565  
Mrs C J Williams;6388 Miss G Green;3801 Mr R C Funnell;  
3552 Mr H A Tribe; 3850 Mrs N J Funnell;4387 Mrs J  
Fleet;6502 Mr W H Bayford;6510 Mr W H Bayford;8393 Mrs M  
A Adams**

The loss of countryside to development can never be seen as good for our environment and this type of development is better made on Brownfield sites of which there are a number in Hadleigh and in Babergh District in general.

**3944 Mr R Johnston;4139 Mr J Browne;4159 Mrs S E Dyer  
4179 Mr R J Dyer;4604 Mrs J Robinson;4756 Mrs J Philpot  
4776 Mr G Joseph;4796 Ms R Percival;4967 Mr A D Fraser**

**5811 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5851 Mrs B Bayford;5952 Mrs J Sheldrick;6163 Mr T W Greenaway;6404 Mrs D Greenaway 6424 Mr T E Sheldrick;6464 Mr W H Bayford;6563 Mr N W Saunders;6587 Mrs J Saunders;6994 Mr T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7127 Miss J A Hitchcock;7161 Mrs T Fraser;8542 Mr B D Rich;8582 Miss K Rich;8622 Mrs M Rich; 3933 Mrs M Joseph;4431 Mr R J Turland;5023 Mr R Eves;5286 Mrs V Davison;7303, Mrs K M Belling; 7311 Mr K Belling;9161 Mrs S M Attridge**

Our Council should be encouraging the preservation of the countryside particularly areas such as this, that offer access to the public. They should not be destroying it.

### **Written**

**6030 Mr S G Smith;7269 Mrs E L Dowling; 7278 Mr G H Dowling;4470 Mrs M E Pipe;6222 Mrs I G Green;6272 Mrs D M McLeese;4595 Mrs J Osborne;3465 Rev J P Druce;3564 Mr H A Tribe;6210 Mrs J M Wilding;6205 Mr R E Wilding;4486 Mr R G Pipe;4469 Mrs M E Pipe;5024 Mr R Eves;4205 Mrs F Eves;7069 Mr & Mrs D P Smith; 7495 Hadleigh Town Council;7855 The Hadleigh Society;4977 Mr A D Fraser;12238 Mrs T Fraser**

Brownfield land should be allocated in preference to greenfield land and alternative brownfield sites available. A number of existing/brownfield sites suggested e.g former British Sugar Beet factory at Sproughton, sites in Ipswich, sites outside Hadleigh, Pond Hall Estate, Copdock & Washbrook and adj to former A12.

**3499 Mrs J L Boatman;3510 Mr D A Boatman; 3842 Mrs N J Funnell 3793 Mr R C Funnell; 4138 Mr J Browne;4158 Mrs S E Dyer;4178 Mr R J Dyer; 5951 Mrs J Sheldrick;6423 Mr T E Sheldrick;4755 Mrs J Philpot; 4603 Mrs J Robinson;6993 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;4795 Ms R Percival;6586 Mrs J Saunders;6562 Mr N W Saunders; 6162 Mr T W Greenaway;6403 Mrs D Greenaway;5810 Mrs K S Grandon-White;8541 Mr B D Rich;8581 Miss K Rich;8621 Mrs M Rich;3943 Mr R Johnston; 4775 Mr G Joseph;4815 Mrs P Joseph;4966 Mr A D Fraser;5850 Mrs B Bayford;6463 Mr W H Bayford;7126 Miss J A Hitchcock;7160 Mrs T Fraser;7359 Mr A P Jackson**

Concerned with the precedent that may be set by allowing development of greenfield land. Many describe is as "the thin end of the wedge".

**4434 Mr R J Turland**

Second deposit draft plan is misleading in that it implies only these areas would be developed; adjacent areas would be subjected to further development should this plan be allowed to go ahead.

**Issue:** Adverse impact on the environment and biodiversity (including infrastructure and pollution)

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**3788 Mr R C Funnell;3837 Mrs N J Funnell;3938 Mr R Johnston;4133 Mr J Browne;4153 Mrs S E Dyer;4173 Mr R J Dyer;4598 Mrs J Robinson;4750 Mrs J Philpot;4770 Mr G Joseph;4790 Ms R Percival;4810 Mrs P Joseph;5805 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5845 Mrs B Bayford;5947 Mrs J Sheldrick 6157 Mr T W Greenaway;6397 Mrs D Greenaway;6418 Mr T E Sheldrick;6458 Mr W H Bayford;6557 Mr N W Saunders 6581 Mrs J Saunders;6988 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7121 Miss J A Hitchcock;8536 Mr B D Rich 8576 Miss K Rich;8616 Mrs M Rich;4958 Mr A D Fraser;7152 Mrs T Fraser; 3108 Mr D N Curtis; 3405 Mr J F G Kilbey;3420 Mrs S D P Kilbey;3459 Rev J P Druce; 3502 Mrs J L Boatman;3513 Mr D A Boatman; 3899 Mrs K D Whitmore;3911 Mr E A Whitmore; 3934 Mrs M Joseph; 4078 Mrs Y D Ingram;4362 Mrs C Nokes;4380 Mr G Nokes;4393 Mrs J Fleet;4432 Mr R J Turland;4461 Mrs M E Pipe;4475 Mr R G Pipe;4623 Mr C N Joseph;4888 Mr J Oxford;5389 Mrs B Senior;5420 Mr T R Bell;5519 Mrs M R Bell;5526 Mr P D Bell;5536 Mrs H McRoberts;5541 Mr J McRoberts;5551 Mr N A Williams;5585 Mrs J A Bird;5973 Mrs M J Bottle;6036 Mr S G Smith;6061 Mrs J M Keeble;6065 Mr T W Keeble;6231 Mrs J R Brown;6266 Mr E McLeese;6503 Mr W H Bayford;7061 Mr & Mrs D P Smith;7272 Mrs E L Dowling;7281 Mr G H Dowling;7356 Mr A P Jackson;7366 Mrs E G Dendy;7396 Mr K Callaghan;7402 Mrs B Callaghan;7893 Mrs M J Bottle;8309 Mrs J S Hamilton;8325 Mr N J Hamilton;8381 Mr A J Hamilton;5539 Mr S L J McRoberts;5566 Mrs C J Williams; 6390 Miss G Green;7357 Mr A P Jackson**

Adversely impact the bio-diversity of the area which currently includes deer, foxes, owls, woodpeckers, bats, wetlands etc.

**3790 Mr R C Funnell;3839 Mrs N J Funnell;3940 Mr R Johnston;4135 Mr J Browne;4155 Mrs S E Dyer;4175 Mr R J Dyer;4600 Mrs J Robinson;4752 Mrs J Philpot;4772 Mr G Joseph;4792 Ms R Percival;4812 Mrs P Joseph;4960 Mr A D Fraser;5807 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5847 Mrs B Bayford 5949 Mrs J Sheldrick;6159 Mr T W Greenaway;6399 Mrs D Greenaway;6420 Mr T E Sheldrick;6460 Mr W H Bayford**

6559 Mr N W Saunders;6583 Mrs J Saunders;6990 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7123 Miss J A Hitchcock;7154 Mrs T Fraser;8538 Mr B D Rich;8578 Miss K Rich;8618 Mrs M Rich;3908 Mr E A Whitmore; 3932 Mrs M Joseph;4358 Mrs C Nokes;4409 Mrs B Blair;4463 Mrs M E Pipe;4624 Mr C N Joseph;4892 Mr J Oxford;4965 Mr A D Fraser;5284 Mrs V Davison;5398 Mr W E Robins;5521 Mrs M R Bell;5554 Mr N A Williams;5569 Mrs C J Williams;5971 Mrs J M Bottle;6091 Mrs E E Geller;7067 Mr & Mrs D P Smith;7159 Mrs T Fraser;7375 Mr R B Kennell;7934 Mr & Mrs H Mason;8390 Mrs M A Adams;4404 Mr J Blair;4421 Mr A Blair

Increase of pollution and reduce air quality in the local area through increased traffic and industrial activity.

3794 Mr R C Funnell;3843 Mrs N J Funnell;3945 Mr R Johnston;4140 Mr J Browne;4160 Mrs S E Dyer;4180 Mr R J Dyer;4605 Mrs J Robinson;4757 Mrs J Philpot;4777 Mr G Joseph;4797 Ms R Percival;4817 Mrs P Joseph;5812 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5852 Mrs B Bayford;5953 Mrs J Sheldrick;6164 Mr T W Greenaway;6405 Mrs D Greenaway;6425 Mr T E Sheldrick;6465 Mr W H Bayford;6564 Mr N W Saunders;6588 Mrs J Saunders;6995 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7128 Miss J A Hitchcock;8543 Mr B D Rich;8583 Miss K Rich;8623 Mrs M Rich; 3408 Mr J F G Kilbey;3423 Mrs S D P Kilbey;3495 Mrs J L Boatman;3506 Mr D A Boatman; 3504 Mrs J L Boatman;3515 Mr D A Boatman; 4039 Mrs J D Lane;4429 Mr R J Turland;4951 Mr A D Fraser;5590 Mr A R Bird;6090 Mrs E E Geller;6504 Mr W H Bayford;7145 Mrs T Fraser;7275 Mrs E L Dowling;7284 Mr G H Dowling;7313 Mr K Belling;7398 Mr K Callaghan;7404 Mrs B Callaghan;8291 Mrs C Heffer;9162 Mrs S M Attridge; 5264 Mr K J Davison

Concerned infrastructure can not cope. In recent years Hadleigh has seen a large increase in the number of families in the town. Aldham Hill has some 400 houses and is the latest in a series of major housing developments. Hadleigh does not have the infrastructure to cope with any further significant increase in the number of people in the town.

3795 Mr R C Funnell;3844 Mrs N J Funnell;3946 Mr R Johnston;4141 Mr J Browne;4161 Mrs S E Dyer;4181 Mr R J Dyer;4606 Mrs J Robinson;4758 Mrs J Philpot;4778 Mr G Joseph;4798 Ms R Percival;4818 Mrs P Joseph;5853 Mrs B Bayford;5954 Mrs J Sheldrick;6165 Mr T W Greenaway 6406 Mrs D Greenaway;6426 Mr T E Sheldrick;6466 Mr W H Bayford;6565 Mr N W Saunders;6589 Mrs J Saunders 6996 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7129 Miss J A Hitchcock;8544 Mr B D Rich;8584 Miss K Rich;8624 Mrs M

**Rich;5813 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5422 Mr T R Bell;6125 Mr J D Hackford**

There will be insufficient nursery, primary and secondary school places as a result of this development. The new primary school currently being built is already full and all other schools are at capacity. There is a lack of police presence on the streets.

**3845 Mrs N J Funnell;4142 Mr J Browne;4162 Mrs S E Dyer  
4182 Mr R J Dyer;4607 Mrs J Robinson;4759 Mrs J Philpot  
4779 Mr G Joseph;4799 Ms R Percival;4819 Mrs P Joseph  
5854 Mrs B Bayford;5955 Mrs J Sheldrick;6166 Mr T W  
Greenaway;6407 Mrs D Greenaway;6427 Mr T E Sheldrick  
6467 Mr W H Bayford;6566 Mr N W Saunders;6590 Mrs J  
Saunders;6997 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7130 Miss  
J A Hitchcock;8545 Mr B D Rich;8585 Miss K Rich;8625 Mrs M  
Rich; 3796 Mr R C Funnell;3947 Mr R Johnston; 3900 Mrs K D  
Whitmore;4952 Mr A D Fraser;6128 Mr J D Hackford;7146  
Mrs T Fraser;8605 Mr B D Rich;12285 Cllr D G Grutchfield;  
6038 Mr S G Smith**

Objects as there is insufficient police presence on our streets as demonstrated by the crime rates, particularly such crimes as vandalism and arson and this development will not improve the situation. The proposed increase of two constables only goes part way to redressing the problems caused by previous developments.

**3797 Mr R C Funnell;3846 Mrs N J Funnell;3948 Mr R  
Johnston;4143 Mr J Browne;4163 Mrs S E Dyer;4183 Mr R J  
Dyer;4608 Mrs J Robinson;4760 Mrs J Philpot;4780 Mr G  
Joseph;4800 Ms R Percival;4820 Mrs P Joseph;5855 Mrs B  
Bayford;5956 Mrs J Sheldrick;6167 Mr T W Greenaway;6408  
Mrs D Greenaway;6428 Mr T E Sheldrick;6468 Mr W H  
Bayford;6567 Mr N W Saunders;6591 Mrs J Saunders;6998  
Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7131 Miss J A  
Hitchcock;8546 Mr B D Rich;8586 Miss K Rich;8626 Mrs M  
Rich;4953 Mr A D Fraser;7147 Mrs T Fraser;8606 Mr B D Rich**

Objects as the development will increase pressure on our fire services. We have retained fire service - firemen have other full time jobs - and there are no funds available to improve this service.

**7143 Mrs T Fraser;4949 Mr A D Fraser**

This development cannot be easily accessed other than by motorised vehicle, which contradicts the main criteria, based policy (ECON2) of the S.C.C Structure Plan.

### **Written**

**8484 Suffolk Wildlife Trust**

Are concerned by the scale of development off Grays Close, Hadleigh (for both housing and employment).

### **8486 Suffolk Wildlife Trust**

Adjacent to the proposed development sites is an area of semi-natural habitats, including reed bed (biodiversity Action Plan habitat) hedgerows, scrub and wet grassland. There are at least two badger setts within 100 metres of the proposed development sites. All this semi-natural area will have a high biodiversity value and provides an important wildlife corridor from the surrounding countryside into the town.

### **8488 Suffolk Wildlife Trust**

The current land allocation for this proposal could be viewed as having a 'pincer' effect. This could disrupt the wildlife corridor and set a precedent for further development in this area in the future.

**Issue:** Waste Transfer Station

### **Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**3896 Mrs K D Whitmore;3910 Mr E A Whitmore;7271 Mrs E L Dowling;7894 Mrs M J Bottle;8305 Mrs J S Hamilton;8377 Mr A J Hamilton;6060 Mrs J M Keeble;6064 Mr T W Keeble; 7280 Mr G H Dowling;7360 Mr A P Jackson; 8321 Mr N J Hamilton; 6031 Mr S G Smith**

Waste Transfer Station : This should be on the existing Lady Lane Industrial Estate site.

**4950 Mr A D Fraser;5862 Mr W Bayford;6435 Mr T E Sheldrick;6475,6507 Mr W H Bayford; 6656 Mr T G Orton;7005 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T Sheldrick;7065 Mr & Mrs D P Smith;7144 Mrs T Fraser;7279 Mr G H Dowling; 7891 Mrs M J Bottle;5963 Mrs J Sheldrick;6598 Mrs J Saunders;7270 Mrs E L Dowling; 6220 Mrs I G Green; 6257 Mrs J Smith; 6574 Mr N W Saunders; 7933 Mr & Mrs H Mason;3904 Mrs K D Whitmore; 3903 Mrs K D Whitmore; 4098 Mr K Scarff; 8331 Mr N J Hamilton;8387 Mr A J Hamilton;8315 Mrs S J Hamilton; 6124 Mrs J Rowe;4464 Mrs M E Pipe; 4485 Mr R G Pipe; 8313 Mrs J S Hamilton;8329 Mr N J Hamilton**

Given the close proximity to residential properties the site is unsuitable for the location of a waste transfer station which should be sited well away from houses and people for obvious reason (noise, smells, vermin, insects, health etc).

### **Written**

#### **6657 Mr T G Orton**

Concerned the site will have an incinerator and burn rubbish giving off smells.

**Issue:** Hydrology/drainage

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**3787 Mr R C Funnell;3836 Mrs N J Funnell;3937 Mr R Johnston;4132 Mr J Browne;4152 Mrs S E Dyer;4172 Mr R J Dyer;4597 Mrs J Robinson;4749 Mrs J Philpot;4769 Mr G Joseph;4789 Ms R Percival;4809 Mrs P Joseph;4957 Mr A D Fraser;5542 Mr J McRoberts;5804 Mrs K S Grandon-White 5844 Mrs B Bayford;5946 Mrs J Sheldrick;6156 Mr T W Greenaway;6396 Mrs D Greenaway;6417 Mr T E Sheldrick 6457 Mr W H Bayford;6556 Mr N W Saunders;6580 Mrs J Saunders;6987 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7120 Miss J A Hitchcock;7151 Mrs T Fraser;8535 Mr B D Rich;8575 Miss K Rich;8615 Mrs M Rich;4433 Mr R J Turland;4479 Mr R G Pipe;5528 Mr P D Bell; 6035 Mr S G Smith**

Have a detrimental impact upon the wetlands area which is situated some 100 metres from the proposed development.

**4975 Mr A D Fraser;5863 Mrs B Bayford;5964 Mrs J Sheldrick;6127 Mr J D Hackford;6206 Mr R E Wilding;6211 Mrs J M Wilding;6218 Mrs I Green;6232 Mrs J R Brown;6436 Mr T E Sheldrick;6476 Mr W H Bayford;6508 Mr W H Bayford;6575 Mr N W Saunders;6599 Mrs J Saunders;7006 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7304 Mrs K J M Belling;7376 Mr R B Kennell;12236 Mrs T Fraser;5383 Mr J W Senior;3901 Mrs K D Whitmore;; 3501 Mrs J L Boatman;3512 Mr D A Boatman; 3912 Mr E A Whitmore; 4066 Rev J M Willis;4100 Mr K Scarff; 4435 Mr R J Turland;3501 Mrs J L Boatman;3512 Mr D A Boatman; 3912 Mr E A Whitmore;4465 Mrs M E Pipe; 8308 Mrs J S Hamilton;8380 Mr A J Hamilton; 8391 Mrs M A Adams;6132 Mr J D Hackford; 8307 Mrs J S Hamilton; 8323 Mr N J Hamilton;8379 Mr A J Hamilton**

This site has complex hydrology. The area around the Green is very wet. Water from this hill (the site) drains through the field to the Green and also through drains down into the Brett. This development will result in a large area being concreted and consequently a massive increase in run off which is likely to cause flooding on The Green, George Street and even possibly in the town.

**Written**

**6033 Mr S G Smith**

Global warming means increasing occurrences of prolonged heavy rainfall or cloudbursts. This would provide a heavy surface flow from the run off from roofs, roads and hard standings on the estate. This

not being absorbed by the soil plants or drains would quickly make its way down the valley causing more than the present level of flooding at the Green and further down into town.

**6034 Mr S G Smith**

The surface flow after raining would carry spillage, toxin and other contamination absorbed in the water down the valley and into the complex waterflows that feed the area. This area consist of meadowland, paddocks, rough woodland and a reedbed. Reedbed carries a very high environmental priority within the regulations governing development. Wildlife and animal life would be at risk.

**6271 Mrs D M McLeese**

In heavy rain with the slope on the land the water would run off downhill carrying nasty stuff with it which could affect the wildlife below including the badgers.

**7059 Mr & Mrs D P Smith**

There are a considerable number of natural springs in this area that feed towards the Green. When it rains heavily parts of the areas proposed are under several inches of water. The natural drainage for this is downhill towards the Wilderness area and progressing into the Green. Therefore building houses on this site would put even more pressure on the natural flow of water towards the Green and the centre of the town.

**12014 Mrs A J Bennett**

Objects as received an assurance from the Council that this would never be built upon because of the system of springs beneath. The infilling with rubble was stopped and no building took place.

**8324 Mr N J Hamilton**

The density and type of housing proposed is totally out of keeping with the ribbon type development in this part of town. Link the EM02b land to the HS09H land and add together the associated hard surfaces of roads, roofs and car parking areas, then it will effectively shoot water at colossal rate towards the Green, Angel and George Street through an 8 hectare concrete funnel with dire consequences.

**9388 Environment Agency**

Sites that fall within the 250m buffer zone of landfill sites should be assessed, so that appropriate mitigation measures are completed to ensure the safe occupancy of the development and prevent the contamination of controlled waters including groundwater.

**Issue:** Traffic/Transport/Highway issues

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**3798 Mr R C Funnell;3847 Mrs N J Funnell;3949 Mr R Johnston;4144 Mr J Browne;4164 Mrs S E Dyer;4184 Mr R J**

**Dyer;4609 Mrs J Robinson;4761 Mrs J Philpot;4781 Mr G Joseph;4801 Ms R Percival;4821 Mrs P Joseph;5814 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5856 Mrs B Bayford;5957 Mrs J Sheldrick;6168 Mr T W Greenaway;6409 Mrs D Greenaway;6429 Mr T E Sheldrick;6469 Mr W H Bayford;6568 Mr N W Saunders;6592 Mrs J Saunders;6999 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7132 Miss J A Hitchcock;8547 Mr B D Rich;8587 Miss K Rich;8627 Mrs M Rich;4954 Mr A D Fraser;5396 Mr W E Robins;5412 Mr H H Ingram;5423 Mr T R Bell;7148 Mrs T Fraser;4954 Mr A D Fraser**

Parking in the town centre is at capacity and this development would create additional need that the Council can simply not provide for.

**4145 Mr J Browne;4165 Mrs S E Dyer;4185 Mr R J Dyer 4610 Mrs J Robinson;4762 Mrs J Philpot;4782 Mr G Joseph 4802 Ms R Percival;4822 Mrs P Joseph;5815 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5857 Mrs B Bayford;5958 Mrs J Sheldrick 6169 Mr T W Greenaway;6410 Mrs D Greenaway;6430 Mr T E Sheldrick;6470 Mr W H Bayford;6569 Mr N W Saunders 6593 Mrs J Saunders;7000 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7133 Miss J A Hitchcock;8548 Mr B D Rich 8588 Miss K Rich;8628 Mrs M Rich; 3799 Mr R C Funnell; 3050 Mr A Weston; 3378 Mr A Daniels;3500 Mrs J L Boatman;3511 Mr D A Boatman; 3561 Mr H A Tribe; 3848 Mrs N J Funnell; 3950 Mr R Johnston;4357 Mrs C Nokes;4376 Mr G Nokes;4388 Mrs J Fleet;4406 Mr J Blair;4626 Mr C N Joseph;4890,4894 Mr J Oxford;4946,4947 Mr A D Fraser;5283 Mrs V Davison;5265 Mr K J Davison;5378 Mr G T W Fildes;5395 Mr W E Robins;5397 Mr W E Robins;5410 Mr H H Ingram;5553 Mr N A Williams;5568 Mrs C J Williams;5587 Mrs J A Bird;6123 Mrs J Rowe;6129Mr J D Hackford;6198Mr A Smith;6270 Mrs D M Mcleese;6392 Miss G Green;6505 Mr W H Bayford;7066 Mr & Mrs D P Smith;7140-7142 Mrs T Fraser;7314 Mr K Belling;7305 Mrs K J M Belling;7368 Mrs E G Dendy;7399 Mr K Callaghan;7651 Sqn Leader J N Bloomfield;7853 The Hadleigh Society;7392 Mr & Mrs H Mason;7954 Mrs I Mason;8392 Mrs M A Adams; 4423 Mr A Blair; 4948 Mr A D Fraser; 7932 Mr & Mrs H Mason;5382 Mr J W Senior; 8330 Mr N J Hamilton;8386 Mr A J Hamilton; 8314 Mrs J S Hamilton; 4076 Mrs Y D Ingram; 6455 Mr W H Bayford;8328 Mr N J Hamilton;8384Mr A J Hamilton;8312 Mrs J S Hamilton**

Traffic in Hadleigh is already a major problem, which is getting worse with new housing and retail developments already underway or planned. The streets are not designed for lots of cars and vans.

In this aspect the District Council describes Hadleigh as quote 'being close to its environmental capacity.'

**4972 Mr A D Fraser; 12233 Mrs T Fraser**

Access is unclear from the plan and is likely to cause a problem.

### **Written**

**3379 Mr A Daniels; 3554 Mr H A Tribe; 6219 Mrs I G Green**

Concerned about the safety of the general public in relation to increased traffic from the allocated site.

**3421 Mrs S D P Kilbey; 3406 Mr J F G Kilbey; 4040 Mrs J D Lane**

Concerned about the effect of additional traffic on the environment and listed buildings in Hadleigh.

**6229 Mrs J R Brown**

A development such as this must generate a lot more traffic via George Street as people employed there travel to and from work.

**6230 Mrs J R Brown**

If the same mistake should happen at the Roundabout on the Bypass as has occurred at the end of Lady Lane Industrial Estate where it is closed off it will create more unnecessary traffic problems.

**4484 Mr R G Pipe;** Much has been made of the proposed roundabout that would be constructed at the developer's expense in excess of £0.5m should planning permission be granted. It is the housing not the industrial units that would create profits to enable this carrot to be dangled in front of the Council. There are cheaper alternatives to enhance the safety of the A1071. Among these are traffic lights and a reduced speed limit from the Montessori School to Calais Street or even enforcement of the existing 60 mph limit.

**4478 Mr R G Pipe**

Modern goods vehicles need roads of substantial construction if there is not to be ongoing inconvenience by reason of repairs to the carriageway. The A14 is an example of such a road. The A1071 is already endowed with a significant number of accident black spots, in particular the junction with Lady Lane.

**7997 Mr and Mrs J M Craske/Elsom Spettigue Associates**

Vehicular access from the Hadleigh Bypass at this point will create a traffic hazard at an already dangerous junction.

**Issue:** Sufficient Employment land

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**3800 Mr R C Funnell; 3951 Mr R Johnston; 4146 Mr J Browne  
4166 Mrs S E Dyer; 4186 Mr R J Dyer; 4611 Mrs J Robinson**

4763 Mrs J Philpot;4783 Mr G Joseph;4803 Ms R Percival  
4823 Mrs P Joseph;5282 Mrs V Davison;5816 Mrs K S  
Grandon-White;5858 Mrs B Bayford;5959 Mrs J Sheldrick  
6170 Mr T W Greenaway;6411 Mrs D Greenaway;6431 Mr T E  
Sheldrick;6471 Mr W H Bayford;6570 Mr N W Saunders;6594  
Mrs J Saunders;7001 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick  
7134 Miss J A Hitchcock;8549 Mr B D Rich;8589 Miss K Rich  
8629 Mrs M Rich; 3049 Mr A Weston;3203 Mr J Browne;3298  
Mr D R Lewis;3377 Mr A Daniels;3380 Mr A Daniels; 3496 Mrs  
J L Boatman;3507 Mr D A Boatman; 3849 Mrs N J Funnell;  
3906 Mr E A Whitmore; 4063 Rev J M Willis;4075 Mrs Y D  
Ingram;4096 Mr K Scarff; 4107 Mrs P J Scarff;4359 Mrs C  
Nokes;4403 Mr J Blair;4408 Mrs B Blair;Mr A Blair;4438 Mr R  
J Turland;4467 Mr M E Pipe;4483 Mr R G Pipe;4620 Mrs J E  
Sandford;4621 Mrs P Hooker;4625 Mr C N Joseph;5263 Mr K  
J Davison;5379 Mr G T W Fildes;5381 Mr J W Senior;5390  
Mrs B Senior;5424 Mr T R Bell;5522 Mrs M R Bell;5529 Mr P D  
Bell;5535 Mrs H McRoberts;5537 Mr S L H McRoberts;5552  
Mr N A Williams;5567 Mrs C J Williams;5586 Mrs J A  
Bird;5592 Mr A R Bird;6122 Mrs J Rowe;6197 Mr A  
Smith;6203 Mr R E Wilding;6208 Mrs J M Wilding;6215 Mrs I  
G Green;6227 Mrs J R Brown;6254 Mrs J Smith;6263 Mr E  
McLeese;6269 Mrs D M McLeese;6654 Mr T G Orton;6984 Mr  
P C Alleston;7267 Mrs E L Dowling;7276 Mr G H  
Dowling;7306 Mrs K J M Belling;7312 Mr K Belling;7647 Mr D  
W Adams;8389 Mrs M A Adams; 4420 Mr A Blair;4552 Mrs O  
E Partridge;4619 Mr G J Sandford;6208 Mrs J M Wilding;  
7369 Mrs E G Dendy

Hadleigh does not need additional employment land within the plan period since there is already substantial undeveloped employment land at Lady Lane following the Council's decision to significantly extend this site.

3952 Mr R Johnston;4108 Mrs P J Scarff;4147 Mr J Browne  
4167 Mrs S E Dyer;4187 Mr R J Dyer;4612 Mrs J Robinson  
4764 Mrs J Philpot;4784 Mr G Joseph;4804 Ms R Percival  
4824 Mrs P Joseph;5817 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5859 Mrs B  
Bayford;5960 Mrs J Sheldrick;6171 Mr T W Greenaway  
6412 Mrs D Greenaway;6432 Mr T E Sheldrick;6472 Mr W H  
Bayford;6571 Mr N W Saunders;6595 Mrs J Saunders  
7002 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7135 Miss J A  
Hitchcock;8550 Mr B D Rich;8590 Miss K Rich;8630 Mrs M  
Rich;4360 Mrs C Nokes;4405 Mr J Blair;4422 Mr A Blair;4439  
Mr R J Turland;4471 Mrs M E Pipe;4481 Mr R G Pipe;5972 Mrs  
M J Bottle;6255 Mrs J Smith;7268 Mrs E L Dowling;7277 Mr G  
H Dowling;7648 Mr D W Adams;7650 Sqn Leader J N

**Bloomfield;8374 Mr A J Hamilton; 6092 Mrs E E Geller; 6032 Mr S G Smith; 8302 Mrs J S Hamilton; 8318 Mr N J Hamilton**

Further development in addition to that already planned at Lady Lane would not create jobs for locals, but simply serve to 'suck in' people and traffic from around the region.

**4148 Mr J Browne;4168 Mrs S E Dyer;4188 Mr R J Dyer  
4613 Mrs J Robinson;4765 Mrs J Philpot;4785 Mr G Joseph  
4805 Ms R Percival;4825 Mrs P Joseph;5818 Mrs K S  
Grandon-White;5860 Mrs B Bayford;5961 Mrs J Sheldrick  
6172 Mr T W Greenaway;6413 Mrs D Greenaway;6433 Mr T E  
Sheldrick;6473 Mr W H Bayford;6572 Mr N W Saunders  
6596 Mrs J Saunders;7003 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E  
Sheldrick;7136 Miss J A Hitchcock;8551 Mr B D Rich  
8591 Miss K Rich;8631 Mrs M Rich; 3930 Mrs M Joseph;3953  
Mr R Johnston;4109-4110 Mrs P J Scarff;4377 Mr G  
Nokes;4390 Mrs J Fleet;4945 Mr A D Fraser;5287 Mrs V  
Davison;5866 Mrs B Bayford;6093 Mrs E E Geller;7401 Mr K  
Callaghan;7406 Mrs B Callaghan;7931 Mr & Mrs H  
Mason;8290 Mrs C Heffer;8304 Mrs J S Hamilton;8320 Mr N J  
Hamilton;8376 Mr A J Hamilton;8611 Mr B D Rich;9167 Mr R  
J Attridge;7139 Mrs T Fraser;4378 Mr G Nokes;7852 The  
Hadleigh Society; 5588 Mrs J A Bird**

Based upon visual evidence, there is currently a surplus of employment land in the district with many units at various sites standing empty. In addition to this development, a number of major redevelopments of Brownfield sites are envisaged in the plan including the Brantham Industrial Estate and the Sugar Beet Factory on Sproughton Road which will only serve to increase supply. The Suffolk County Council echoes this view on supply of employment land. Brownfield development should be the priority not Greenfield. The District Council should not make it easy for developers by proposing Greenfield site.

### **Written**

**6175 Mr T W Greenaway;6394 Mrs D Greenaway;6506 Mr W H Bayford;7290 Hadleigh Town Council**

Refer to the Babergh Employment Land Study which states 'a further ten to twenty hectares of employment land needs to be allocated across Babergh.' The Council has stated that the employment location at EM02b will be five hectares. This statement indicates that Hadleigh would be providing at least twenty five percent of the need and at the most fifty percent. This is a grossly unfair distribution. There should at least be an even allocation across the district.

**5409 Mr H H Ingram**

Do not want a repetition of the present really run down appearance of the industrial estate which would not be an inducement for prospective clients to increase trading prospects.

**Issue:** Security issues

**Written**

**7274 Mrs E L Dowling; 7283 Mr G H Dowling; 4477 Mr R G Pipe; 4472 Mrs M E Pipe**

Objectors' properties border the employment allocation and the feel vulnerable to intrusion. Serious concerns about the future security if the development proceeds, and the effect on the landscape of close boarded fencing that they feel compelled to erect along the boundary.

**4480 Mr R G Pipe; 12284 Cllr D G Grutchfield**

Security costs for industrial units are massive. The introduction of a relatively small site such as the proposed development make for a position in which a small number of businesses have to shoulder this burden. The site is adjacent to a proposed new area of high density, low cost housing. The two add up to a recipe for unaffordable insurance premiums to be borne by the occupiers of the units. This will make the units an unattractive investment.

**Issue:** Recreation/access/enjoyment of footpaths

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**4436 Mr R J Turland**

All trees, orchards and mature hedgerows on and adjacent to the site have preservation orders and it is essential that these orders are strictly respected and maintained.

**8326 Mr N J Hamilton; 8382 Mr A J Hamilton; 8310 Mrs J S Hamilton**

It is clearly stated that a tree preservation order has been placed on all trees but this does not seem to be the case, as no one at the Council can list the trees and their species. Legally no tree is considered unworthy of a TPO and the animals whose habitat this area forms would certainly agree.

**8311 Mrs J S Hamilton; 8327 Mr N J Hamilton; 8383 Mr A J Hamilton**

The map used by the Council to illustrate the development does not show all of the public footpaths and rights of way. It does misleadingly show a roundabout on the bypass which does not exist.

**Written**

5555 Mr N A Williams; 5570 Mrs C J Williams; 3462 Rev J P Druce; 3838 Mrs N J Funnell; 3789 Mr R C Funnell; 4079 Mrs Y D Ingram; 4043 Mrs J D Lane; 3939 Mr R Johnston; 4154 Mrs S E Dyer; 4174 Mr R J Dyer; 5948 Mrs J Sheldrick; 6419 Mr T E Sheldrick; 6221 Mrs I G Green; 6264 Mr E McLeese; 4751 Mrs J Philpot; 5421 Mr T R Bell; 5543 Mr J McRoberts; 7374 Mr R B Kennell; 5806 Mrs K S Grandon-White; 6398 Mrs D Greenaway; 6393 Miss G Green; 6582 Mrs J Saunders; 4791 Ms R Percival; 5527 Mr P D Bell; 5520 Mrs M R Bell; 5380 Mr G T W Fildes; 8617 Mrs M Rich; 7273 Mrs E L Dowling; 8537 Mr B D Rich; 6558 Mr N W Saunders; 6158 Mr T W Greenaway; 4476 Mr R G Pipe; 4462 Mrs M E Pipe; 4599 Mrs J Robinson; 6989 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick; 7282 Mr G H Dowling; 8577 Miss K Rich; 4134 Mr J Browne; 4771 Mr G Joseph; 4811 Mrs P Joseph; 4959 Mr A D Fraser; 5846 Mrs B Bayford; 6459 Mr W H Bayford; 7122 Miss J A Hitchcock; 7153 Mrs T Fraser; 4099 Mr K Scarff; 4892 Mr J Oxford; 4964 Mr A D Fraser; 7158 Mrs T Fraser

Blight a country walk that is promoted in guides by the local tourist office, that many locals and ramblers enjoy.

**6131 Mr J D Hackford**

Consideration does not appear to have been taken to recreational facilities.

**7062 Mr & Mrs D P Smith; 6207 Mr R E Wilding; 6212 Mrs J M Wilding**

The ancient footpaths and a bridleway that run through the site are not shown on the plan and no proposal has been made to divert them.

**4473 Mrs M E Pipe**

If proposal goes ahead, I would like to see consideration given to re-routing the footpath around the outside of the site, erecting high security fencing around the site and for the structural landscaping to be a minimum width of 20 metres.

**Issue:** Scale of proposal/effect on townscape/character of the town/area

**Written**

**3422 Mrs S D P Kilbey; 3407 Mr J F G Kilbey**

Concerned because this development would result in the area in between it and the town being filled in.

**3424 Mrs S D P Kilbey; 3409 Mr J F G Kilbey**

Site of development. If the proposal had been for a small number of houses to face the ones in Grays Close of a similar size it would have been difficult to object.

**3840 Mrs N J Funnell; 3791 Mr R C Funnell; 3941 Mr R Johnston; 4136 Mr J Browne; 4156 Mrs S E Dyer; 4176 Mr R J Dyer; 5950 Mrs J Sheldrick; 4753 Mrs J Philpot; 6160 Mr T W Greenaway; 6991 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick; 7057 Mr & Mrs D P Smith; 4793 Ms R Percival; 6421 Mr T E Sheldrick; 8619 Mrs M Rich; 6584 Mrs J Saunders; 6400 Mrs D Greenaway; 5808 Mrs K S Grandon-White; 8539 Mr B D Rich; 6560 Mr N W Saunders; 8579 Miss K Rich; 4601 Mrs J Robinson; 4773 Mr G Joseph; 4813 Mrs P Joseph; 4961 Mr A D Fraser; 5848 Mrs B Bayford; 6461 Mr W H Bayford; 7124 Miss J A Hitchcock; 7155 Mrs T Fraser**

Impact negatively upon the townscape from both sides of the valley by extending the sightline of industrial units.

**5538 Mr S L J McRoberts**

Object on the basis of visual appearance. Development will be an eye sore.

**3852 Mrs N J Funnell**

Objects because wants to maintain the character of the town.

**8306 Mrs J S Hamilton; 8322 Mr N J Hamilton; 8378 Mr A J Hamilton**

Whether we face it or not we are in a recession and more and more local businesses are relocating abroad or going to wall. Really do not think that this desecration of the countryside is needed. Apart from the appalling visual and noise impact that visitors and residents alike would suffer. The siting of industrial areas on both sides of the main route into Hadleigh is hardly going to attract visitors to the Historic town.

**4150 Mr J Browne; 4170 Mrs S E Dyer; 4190 Mr R J Dyer  
4615 Mrs J Robinson; 4767 Mrs J Philpot; 4787 Mr G Joseph  
4827 Mrs P Joseph; 5820 Mrs K S Grandon-White; 5864 Mrs B Bayford; 5965 Mrs J Sheldrick; 6174 Mr T W Greenaway  
6415 Mrs D Greenaway; 6437 Mr T E Sheldrick; 6477 Mr W H Bayford; 6576 Mr N W Saunders; 6600 Mrs J Saunders  
7007 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick; 7138 Miss J A Hitchcock; 7149 Mrs T Fraser; 8553 Mr B D Rich; 8593 Miss K Rich; 8633 Mrs M Rich; 3803 Mr R C Funnell; 3955 Mr R Johnston; 4077 Mrs Y D Ingram; 6389 Miss G Green; 4627 Mr C N Joseph; 4955 Mr A D Fraser; 5267 Mr K J Davison; 5408 Mr H H Ingram; 5591 Mr A R Bird; 5970 Mrs M J Bottle; 6089 Mrs E E Geller; 7400 Mr K Callaghan; 7892 Mrs M J Bottle; 8292 Mrs C Heffer; 4407 Mrs B Blair; 4430 Mr R J Turland; 7405 Mrs B Callaghan; 6509 Mr W H Bayford**

Hadleigh is a small market town of historic significance and should be preserved as such. Without a major development of new infrastructure and roads, which would totally change the nature of our town any significant further development of housing or industrial units such as this is not justified as sustainable now or in the future.

**Issue:** Loss of residential amenity (including noise pollution)

**Covered at Inquiry 27/10/04**

**3802 Mr R C Funnell;3851 Mrs N J Funnell;3954 Mr R Johnston;4149 Mr J Browne;4169 Mrs S E Dyer;4189 Mr R J Dyer;4614 Mrs J Robinson;4766 Mrs J Philpot;4786 Mr G Joseph;4806 Ms R Percival;4826 Mrs P Joseph;5819 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5861 Mrs B Bayford;5962 Mrs J Sheldrick 6173 Mr T W Greenaway;6414 Mrs D Greenaway;6434 Mr T E Sheldrick;6474 Mr W H Bayford;6573 Mr N W Saunders;6597 Mrs J Saunders;7004 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick 7137 Miss J A Hitchcock;8552 Mr B D Rich;8592 Miss K Rich 8632 Mrs M Rich; 3460,3464 Rev J P Druce; 3497 Mrs J L Boatman;3508 Mr D A Boatman; 3555 Mr H A Tribe; 3895 Mrs K D Whitmore; 3931 Mrs M Joseph; 4041 Mrs J D Lane; 4065 Rev J M Willis;4085 Mrs S E Willis-Betts;4968 Mr A D Fraser;5377 Mr G T W Fildes;5391 Mrs B Senior;5425 Mr T R Bell;6216 Mrs I G Green;6228 Mrs J R Brown;7162 Mrs T Fraser;7358 Mr A P Jackson;7493 Hadleigh Town Council;7649 Mr D W Adams;8300 Mrs J S Hamilton;8316 Mr N J Hamilton;3907 Mr Whitmore;4389 Mrs J Fleet;4410 Mrs B Blair;4468 Mrs M E Pipe;4616 Mr B W Partridge; 5969 Mrs M J Bottle; 6058 Mrs J M Keeble;7854 The Hadleigh Society; 8372 Mr A J Hamilton;4969 Mr A D Fraser**

Consider the extent and positioning of this development to be wholly inappropriate since it effectively creates a residential island (existing and proposed) almost encircled by industrial units. This is not good planning and will create a host of potential problems for residents - current and potential alike.

**3792 Mr R C Funnell;3841 Mrs N J Funnell;3942 Mr R Johnston;4137 Mr J Browne;4157 Mrs S E Dyer;4177 Mr R J Dyer;4602 Mrs J Robinson;4754 Mrs J Philpot;4774 Mr G Joseph;4794 Ms R Percival;4814 Mrs P Joseph;4962 Mr A D Fraser;5556 Mr N A Williams;5571 Mrs C J Williams 5809 Mrs K S Grandon-White;5849 Mrs B Bayford;5950 Mrs J Sheldrick;6161 Mr T W Greenaway;6401 Mrs D Greenaway**

**6422 Mr T E Sheldrick;6462 Mr W H Bayford;6561 Mr N W Saunders;6585 Mrs J Saunders;6992 Mrs T L Robinson/Mr T E Sheldrick;7125 Miss J A Hitchcock;7156 Mrs T Fraser 8540 Mr B D Rich;8580 Miss K Rich;8620 Mrs M Rich; 3458 Rev J P Druce; 3461 Rev J P Druce;3463 Rev J P Druce;3494 Mrs J L Boatman;3505 Mr D A Boatman;3498 Mrs J L Boatman;3509 Mr D A Boatman;3894 Mrs K D Whitmore; 3898 Mrs K D Whitmore;4064 Rev J M Willis; 4080 Mrs Y D Ingram;4099 Mr K Scarff;4970 Mr A D Fraser;6062 Mr T W Keeble;6217 Mrs I G Green;7064 Mr & Mrs D P Smith;7367 Mrs E G Dendy;7397 Mr K Callaghan;7403 Mrs B Callaghan;7953 Mrs I Mason;8301 Mrs J S Hamilton;8317 Mr N J Hamilton;12231 Mrs T Fraser;6037 Mr S G Smith; 6256 Mrs J Smith;7952 Mrs I Mason; 8373 Mr A J Hamilton; 12283 Cllr D G Grutchfield**

Have an immediate and real detrimental impact on the environment and quality of life of many residents, particularly the elderly living adjacent to the proposed development.

### **Written**

#### **3867 Mr R Eves; 4207 Mrs F Eves**

The noise pollution would travel much further, being on the side of a valley and affect people living below any proposed such site.

#### **3902 Mrs K D Whitmore**

Chemical spillage causing health hazard.

#### **5411 Mr H H Ingram**

The outcome of the new proposal will turn the town into a concrete jungle with high pollution and an increasing noise factor.

#### **6130 Mr J D Hackford**

Consideration does not appear to have been taken to future development needs.

#### **7163 Mrs T Fraser**

At this location there is limited potential beyond this site to realistically develop any further employment land (houses maybe). If the Council genuinely believes that further employment land will be required in the future then they should choose a site that gives opportunity for expansion and which is not right next to the residential development.

#### **6204 Mr R E Wilding;6209 Mrs J M Wilding**

Regarding the waste site shredding plant, will involve movement of huge commercial vehicles 10 hours a day, 6 days a week and there is to be a massive crushing machine. This will be absolutely intolerable for the residents of the surrounding area with view to the fact they are mostly elderly people, this would also effect their

stress levels and their health in general. It is going to bring more pollution.

**7652 Sqn Leader J N Bloomfield**

In the Lady Lane area the proximity of businesses to houses leads to a severe loss of amenity for residents. To deliberately mix housing and employment use will make for a loss of amenity for new and existing residents. The new housing should be kept for local needs and not allocated to the MOD.

**Miscellaneous Objections**

**Written**

**3503 Mrs J L Boatman; 3514 Mr D A Boatman**

Objector would like to question the accuracy of this map.

**3866 Mr R Eves; 4206 Mrs F Eves**

Believe that once planning permission is granted local authorities are unable to enforce the conditions placed on planning consents.

**4042 Mrs J D Lane; 7058 Mr & Mrs D P Smith; 6653 Mr T G Orton**

Sand and gravel pits in the area of the allocation, and query the suitability of building on this land.

**5413 Mr H H Ingram**

The cost of provision for increased town staffing would only add to the already high council taxes.

**4391 Mrs J Fleet**

Would not contribute to local economy.

**7060 Mr & Mrs D P Smith**

Would like to obtain any geological survey that has been carried out regarding this area, the results should have been considered before any such development is proposed.

**3557 Mr H A Tribe; 4361 Mrs C Nokes; 4379 Mr G Nokes; 4392 Mrs J Fleet; 5540 Mr S L J McRoberts; 7056 Mr & Mrs D P Smith; 4437 Mr R J Turland; 9168 Mr R J Attridge; 3913 Mr E A Whitmore; 7361 Mr A P Jackson; 3905 Mrs K D Whitmore**

Concerns with devaluation of property near the allocated site. The outline and appearance of Hadleigh would be devalued by the erection of another industrial site, and the attraction of the town to potential buyers would disappear.

**6126 Mr J D Hackford; 6391 Miss G Green**

Concerns and objections on the basis of sewage disposal.

**7068 Mr & Mrs D P Smith**

The proposed road being a dead end will open up an ideal site for travellers/gypsies causing a nuisance and encouraging more crime within the area.

**7157 Mrs T Fraser; 4963 Mr A D Fraser**

Potentially pollute householders water since a number of houses in the area do not have mains water and rely on bore holes.

**7999 Mr and Mrs J M Craske/Elsom Spettigue Associates**

It has not been illustrated by the allocation that the site is economically viable as a development. Such a deficiency will lead to the site being undevelopable, as has happened in the past.

**4482 Mr R G Pipe**

There has been talk about high-tech industry using the new development. This employment sector will be heavily dependent on major developments near to Cambridge Airport. Travel facilities from Hadleigh to Cambridge are poor.

**8000 Mr and Mrs J M Craske/Elsom Spettigue Associates;**

**4974 Mr A D Fraser;12235 Mrs T Fraser**

The site is lacking under all known sustainable criteria.

**4973 Mr A D Fraser; 12234 Mrs T Fraser**

I am not an expert but I believe this development does not follow certain local, regional and national policy guidelines.

**7998, 8001 Mr and Mrs J M Craske/Elsom Spettigue Associates**

Insufficient land has been allocated for employment purposes, and that a 16.2 hectare site off the western end of the A1071 Hadleigh by-pass should be allocated instead of the Grays Close site.

**5530 Mrs D W Hunt**

Objection to policy EM02b but no specific details have been given.

**4971 Mr A D Fraser; 12232 Mrs T Fraser**

The shape and scale of the development is not well thought out with much of the development being on the side of a hill. (The actual map as opposed to the inaccurate illustration circulated with the objection forms).

**4976 Mr A D Fraser;12237 Mrs T Fraser**

Whilst I am aware that my personal views carry no weight in the argument for the Council it is important that I express how appalled I am at this proposal which appears to be motivated by nothing other than greed.

**Appendix 3 Objections to EM02d (former Powergen site)**

**Inquiry**

**6100 The Paul Family/Bidwells**

Given that the policy positively encourages employment use on the site, there is no need to make reference to residential use within the policy context.

**7955 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

**7956 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

Objects to the further 3.3ha of agricultural land immediately to the west for this purpose. The word 'village' has been used here as it is the term used historically on signposts etc to describe the group of properties bordering The Street and the start of Vicarage Lane. It is also the term used in the Local Plan. However, this description is incorrect and, in fact, very misleading as it would suggest that the scale of residential development is larger than it is.

The fact of the matter is that Wherstead 'village' only comprises a total of 16 residential properties - there are no public services and thus by Babergh District Council's own definition is at most a hamlet or simply a small cluster of residential properties within open countryside.

**7957 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

Objects as the reality is that the hamlet will have lost its open countryside location forever.

**7958 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

Objects to conversion of buildings.

Neither the proposed Local Plan Alteration nor the Employment Land Study (as discussed later) refer to the recent planning consents granted for the change of use of the existing Grade 2 listed barns to small hi-tech office units or the change of use of the large area of redundant farm buildings adjacent to light industrial/warehouse use, both to the immediate south of the hamlet.

**7960 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

In order to achieve an appropriate financial return to make the scheme commercially viable, the type of development proposed for the additional land would have a much denser footprint area and thus a significantly greater impact on the hamlet.

**7961 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

As the AONB is of major national importance, the Council believes that, when viewed in conjunction with all the other factors raised, the designation of a new area of greenfield land for employment here is unnecessary and wrong.

**7962 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

Concerned about the impact on residential properties that are listed buildings. 6 out of 12 are listed.

**7963 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

In view of the potential threat to both the walled garden and the hamlet we would request that the review of the hamlet for conservation area status take immediate priority.

**7964 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

Babergh D.C have advised that the proposed allocation of the additional land for employment use would have the benefit of creating a new vehicular access on to the A137/A14 junction and thus avoid any further traffic movements along The Street to the Powergen Buildings. Whilst the hamlet has experienced problems in the past with traffic congestion at peak flow times, the relief to The Street is the only consideration/advantage offered by the proposed additional development. It is the view of the Parish Council that the overwhelming impact of the proposed additional development is too great a sacrifice to pay. The proposed 'business park' type development would offer little, if any, local employment opportunity and have no 'financial spin-off' for the local community, as there are no amenities such as shops etc as stated earlier to benefit from potential additional trade.

**7965 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

In assessing local public response, the District Council should take note that 9 of the 16 residential properties which make up the hamlet are rented to the occupants by the landowner of the land in question and some are employees of the same.

**7966 Wherstead Parish Council/Albion Planning Consultants Limited**

It is our suggestion that the three storey atrium space within the body of the main building could be infilled. Also, the existing single storey twentieth century buildings to the north of the main body of the building could be demolished and replaced by two or three storey accommodation without significant impact on either the mansion house or the hamlet.

**8474 Powergen UK Plc/DTZ Piedad Consulting**

Amend policy to

At the Powergen site proposals for Class B1 office or residential development site will be permitted. A further 3.3ha of land immediately to the west is allocated for B1 development, as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987 (as amended). The new allocation site must be developed in the context of proposals for its adjacent site and subject to compliance with an approved planning brief. Should any proposals come forward for determination in advance of an approved planning brief, permission will only be granted subject to:

Protection of the setting of the listed building;

Protection of the Playing Fields;

Retention of mature landscaping belts;  
No adverse landscape impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heath Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;  
The preparation of a full transportation assessment in support of any planning application;  
No adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity;  
Production of a green travel plan; and  
Contribution(s) to provision of local bus services.

### **Written Representations**

#### **4840 Mrs A Sewell**

Objecting to para 4.17c / EM02d: the change of use for the 3 hectares of land to B1 classification.

#### **4841 & 6934 Mrs A Sewell**

The change of use will destroy the rural character and ambience of the village community that currently exists.

#### **4842 Mrs A Sewell**

The peace and tranquillity of the countryside will be overshadowed by the increased noise and activity caused by the additional business use in the area.

#### **4843 & 6935 Mrs A Sewell**

There is already significant light pollution caused by the atrium on the existing Powergen site which would only increase as further buildings are erected.

#### **4844 & 6936 Mrs A Sewell**

There is no need to change the classification of this piece of land as there are significant number of brownfield sites within the A14 boundary that could be used for business without the need to further encroach into greenfield sites that are marked as an area of 'outstanding natural beauty' such as Wherstead village.

#### **4899 Mr J W Luke**

I feel very strongly there is already a large proportion of the village in commercial use. There is no need for extra employment land.

#### **4900 Mr J W Luke**

Concerned that it will have an impact on the character of the village. It will dominate the village and further unbalance the combination of residential and commercial use.

#### **4901 Mr J W Luke**

Objects as any development of this nature would add more traffic.

#### **4902 Mr J W Luke**

Objects as any development of this nature would add more noise and light pollution.

#### **7015 Mr D W Cobb**

The area of land in question is close to a number of listed buildings and the Walled Garden part of the area is in fact joined to a listed building.

**7016 Mr D W Cobb**

The area of land in question is next to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and therefore is not suitable for the type of development proposed when looking to protect the Powergen Site for future employment.

**7017 Mr D W Cobb**

Accept the need for better access to the Powergen site i.e a private entrance via this piece of land however cannot accept the need to further develop this area with either office buildings or light industrial units.

**7018 Mr D W Cobb**

If the site is sold and a new owner purchase this area for private access then the area should be landscape to therefore keep it in keeping with the countryside type landscape of that area of the village.

**7019 Mr D W Cobb**

Should this area be allowed to develop as the Council wish it to be then the current residential properties will be isolated from the remains of the village by being surrounded on three sides by industrial properties of various types.

**7020 Mr D W Cobb**

Being surrounded by industrial properties of various types will completely destroy the area of Wherstead.

**7021 Mr D W Cobb**

Question how the Council feel there is a need for further expansion of the Powergen site and just where is the employment need. At present Ipswich has large areas of office space available and also large areas in the town that are already looking for companies to undertake development.

**7222 Mr G Silwood**

Principle objection lies in our closeness to the area of outstanding natural beauty. It will spoil the village nature of the immediate area.

**7223 Mr G Silwood**

Objects as it will have a impact on the village. The proposed development is outside the area, it is close enough to have a detrimental effect on the area of beauty in addition to that of the village of Wherstead.

**7224 Mr G Silwood**

Objects as it will cause an increase in traffic which will bring further noise and pollution.

**7862 Mr P G Seager**

Strongly objects as would be detrimental to the village and to the area that attracts lots of wildlife.

**7863 Mr P G Seager**

Objects to development being so close to houses as many of the houses are at least 150 years old, some even older.

**7864 Mr P G Seager**

Objects as it would clearly spoil the views as you approach the street and drive along it, making the village appear an industrial estate on the edge of Ipswich rather than the quiet country village it is now.

**7865 Mr P G Seager**

Objects as it will cause noise and light pollution. (There has already been problems with the security alarms sounding on the Peninsula Barns).

**7866 Mr P G Seager**

Objects as not only would it spoil our enjoyment of living where we do it will also greatly impact on the value and desirability of the property.

**7877 Mr P G Seager**

For a hamlet Wherstead already provides a large number of commercial properties. The Powergen offices (which already create a traffic queue through the village at peak times). The Peninsula Barns at Park Farm which are continuing to expand, a large nursing home and of course the farms - surely that is enough industry for one tiny village?

**7878 Mr P G Seager**

If it is deemed necessary to develop the land in any way I feel that the only reasonable change should be an access road to the Powergen offices through the land leaving it wild either side.

**7881 Mrs L J Seager**

Strongly objects as would be detrimental to the village and to the area that attracts lots of wildlife.

**7882 Mrs L J Seager**

Objects to development being so close to houses as many of the houses are at least 150 years old, some even older.

**7883 Mrs L J Seager**

Objects as it would clearly spoil the views as you approach the street and drive along it, making the village appear an industrial estate on the edge of Ipswich rather than the quiet country village it is now.

**7884 Mrs L J Seager**

Objects as it will cause noise and light pollution. (There has already been problems with the security alarms sounding on the Peninsula Barns).

**7885 Mrs L J Seager**

Objects as not only would it spoil our enjoyment of living where we do it will also greatly impact on the value and desirability of the property.

**7886 Mrs L J Seager**

For a hamlet Wherstead already provides a large number of commercial properties. The Powergen offices (which already create a traffic queue through the village at peak times). The Peninsula Barns at Park Farm which are continuing to expand, a large nursing home and of course the farms - surely that is enough industry for one tiny village?

**7887 Mrs L J Seager**

If it is deemed necessary to develop the land in any way I feel that the only reasonable change should be an access road to the Powergen offices through the land leaving it wild either side.

**8515 Mr C N Pinner**

Objecting on the grounds that it will bring more traffic in Wherstead and the road is insufficient for it. There is already much traffic.

**8516 Mr J T Barrett**

This area of land is next to a Hamlet of houses and is therefore regarded as countryside in your own agenda and consequentially should not be considered for development.

**8517 Mr J T Barrett**

The size of development would totally overawe the Hamlet and completely spoil the setting.

**8518 Mr J T Barrett**

Wherstead as a whole has the Powergen site as employment status also we have the converted barns at Park farm as Office development, plus the whole site of park farm has been passed for employment use. We also have the nursing home and Foxes Marina. Surely we as a community have more than our fair share of employment status. Also, your plans do not show the amount of existing employment status already available in Wherstead therefore what you show is totally misleading.

**8519 Mr J T Barrett**

It would be unreasonable to expect a high level of objection to this development because most of the houses are owned by the land owner and are rented out. All the people who own their own houses object but this is only 7 houses in total so therefore you cannot use the excuse of not many objections as a green light for the development.

**8520 Mr J T Barrett**

As you state in your description of the site it is fringed with some very historic listed buildings so I would suggest that no industrial buildings however cosmetically designed would do any justice to the existing buildings. Also, there is a very large listed walled garden in the development and you have not made any mention of this or how you would protect such an important part of the original Wherstead Hall listing.

**8521 Mr J T Barrett**

You say the benefit to the local residents would be the new access road. I would suggest that the proposed development is far too high a price to pay for one benefit when the access road could be built through the field with out any development. This was proposed once before by a previous owner of the site.

**8522 Mr J T Barrett**

In your own assessment of the site the disadvantages outweigh the advantages and I would take issue with some of the so called advantages, also 4 out of 5 of the advantages have a question mark next to them meaning they could be questionable.

**8654 Mrs H Jenkins**

Strongly objects as there are already enough problems with traffic noise without any more.

**8657 Mrs S A Matthewson**

Objects on grounds of traffic and noise because there is already currently a lot .

**9100 Mr D Baldry**

Question the basis on which this land has been identified in the plan for this type of development. The employment land study refers to "The reuse of the former TXU HQ for employment uses; and/or". This seems to imply that the site is soon to become vacant and this development would be crucial to attracting a new major site employer. The employment study also refers to the fact that within the "Ipswich Fringe" there is already a substantial existing allocation of land allocated for "high technology" which has yet to be taken up in Sprites Lane.

**9101 Mr D Baldry**

Wherstead Park has listed buildings and several of the neighbouring houses are listed. The area is next to an AONB and is just outside a conservation area. The proposed B1 development would in effect swallow up the village and transform it into a fringe industrial estate.

**9389 Environment Agency**

Sites that fall within the 250m buffer zone of landfill sites should be assessed, so that appropriate mitigation measures are completed to ensure the safe occupancy of the development and prevent the contamination of controlled waters including groundwater.

**8797 Taylor Woodrow/Carpenter Planning Consultants**

Objection to the allocation of an additional 3.3ha of land at Wherstead for employment. It is not a sustainable location for further employment growth, it is not well related to public transport or residential areas.

**8470 Powergen UK Plc/DTZ Pieda Consulting**

Powergen UK plc are the owners of this site. Accordingly all references to E.ON and TXU should be removed from both the

wording of the Policy EM02D and the supporting text as it is confusing.

**8471 Powergen UK Plc/DTZ Piedad Consulting**

The site comprises approximately 2.5 hectares of developed land currently utilised as Class B1 offices with the remainder of the site (approximately 5.4 hectares) currently being used as open space and sports facilities. It is clear however that the former use of the site was a large formal house. It is argued therefore that this site should be allocated as part of a wider mixed use allocation (to include the new 3.3 ha of employment land) over the whole site.

**8472 Powergen UK Plc/DTZ Piedad Consulting**

The Local Plan Alteration allocates a ready supply of employment land. If this site were reutilised for uses other than B1 offices, the reduction of approximately 2.5 hectares from the employment land supply would not materially affect the needs of the District over the plan period. Furthermore, it is argued, that the site constraints (referred to at paragraph 4.17c) would impact on the relative attractiveness of the site to be reutilised for B1 office uses; consequently it could be argued that the site could be better reused for housing in the future.

**5306 GO-East Conditional Withdrawal**

Policies EM02a, c, d and e all appear to delegate decisions to a planning brief, contrary to the provisions of PPG12. Planning briefs should only be used to offer guidance and not set policy.

**5312 GO-East**

This policy also duplicates other policies in the plan which deal with development control issues.

**Appendix 4 Objections to EM08 (Bull Lane/Acton Lane)**

**278 Revd. D L C Rutherford**

Objection on the basis of road safety of school children who attend the nearby Middle School and conflict with industrial / commercial traffic and other traffic associated with the estate.

**293 Mr G H Potts**

It would be sensible to access the trading estate directly from the bypass, thereby avoiding heavy lorries using its existing, inadequate minor road for access to it (with associated danger of accidents).

**295 Mrs M Potts**

No more development should be allowed on the estate until the roads serving it have been made suitable for heavy traffic.

**305 Mr L E Ball (DECEASED)**

No expansion of Acton Place industrial estate towards Acton village should be permitted. If expansion is necessary it should be towards the A134, preferably with a new link road to connect them. This

would reduce unsuitable traffic on the C class road through Acton village.

**351 Mr K B Atkinson**

Objection to any further expansion of the two industrial estates. They are untidy and of poor construction. Access is via a narrow C class road. If expansion is necessary, its case should be proven, but this should not be allowed to encroach towards Acton or Newmans Green. Also, major road improvements should be made to cope with the current throughput of traffic and the estate cleaned up.

**383 Mr P M Worton**

The principle of industrial estates being in locations away from villages is accepted but any expansion should not bring Acton Place industrial estate closer to Acton village but should be towards the A134 (Melford by pass). This would also allow better access than the existing C class road.

**385 Mrs A E Worton**

The two industrial estates provide much needed jobs for the local area and an allocation to provide for future development is supported. However, expansion towards the village should be avoided.

Expansion towards the bypass is very acceptable and an access road from the A134 would be welcomed. The current access road is narrow and inadequate for modern lorries.

**391 Mr and Mrs A & D Parmenter**

Objection to expansion of Bull Lane Industrial Estate on grounds of traffic generation through Acton High Street, with traffic levels already too high. Most traffic for the estate goes through the village.

**451 Mr P C Richardson**

A minor extension of the industrial estates is accepted as necessary but traffic levels generated by it are already considerable. Any extension should be linked to a new road direct from the A134. Some form of traffic regulation and calming should be introduced to limit traffic passing through Acton village, particularly in view of possible traffic associated with the Chilton development (if it proceeds). Further tree screening should be planted between the estate's eastern edge and the village.

**501 Mr C S Moss/Acton Parish Council**

Proposed industrial estate expansion not supported because:  
access from the existing C class road to both estates is poor and should instead be from the nearby A134;  
any Bull Lane estate extension should be accesses from the A134, allowing the Bull Lane access point to be closed;  
Improvements to the estates' internal road network are supported prior to any expansion but doubts expressed over whether these are possible.

**551 Mr C Dark**

Objection to any extension of the industrial estates as this would increase the volume of heavy goods traffic through Acton village, where the High Street is not suitable for such vehicles. The village is already used as a short cut for through traffic.

**717 Albert E Webb & Son Ltd/Edward Gittins & Associates**

The policy is unsatisfactory by virtue of its prohibition of expansion until access improvements are achieved. It does not state how such improvements to overcome the perceived problems are to be made. Also it needs to be clearer about the exact measures it requires to be carried out.

It is also unclear whether improvements to the Bull Lane / bypass junction are required to be carried out before any further development is allowed.

**939 Mrs S Purser**

No further industrial development in the Sudbury area until a by pass is provided for better communications.

Plan does not make it clear that there are three separate estates, not the two cited in the Deposit Plan.

Access to the estates is poor, via a C class road.

No further development of the estates towards Acton

Any further development should be via a new access road, direct from the A134, thereby allowing the existing unsatisfactory access to be closed.

Any development should be subject to a binding agreement for provision and maintenance of woodland screening.

**1323 Mr S Bill**

extension to Acton Place Industrial Estate not acceptable.

The C class access road cannot accommodate extra traffic.

Access should be from the A134 Long Melford by pass.

No expansion towards Acton village.

**1552 Mr A C Sawyer**

Any extension to the two industrial estates would not be acceptable. Access is only via C class road.

If any further development towards Long Melford, access should be direct from the A134. More heavy traffic through Acton is not wanted.

Any development should be subject to an improved road network.

**1580 Mr J H Purser**

1. No further industrial development in Sudbury area until a by-pass is built. Also, wider problems of poor road infrastructure in the area.

2. This area consists of 3 separate estates, not 2, as stated.

3. Their access is poor, via a C class road.

4. No further development at Acton Place towards Acton.

5. If further development contemplated at Bull Lane estate, this should be via a new access onto the A134.

6. Any further development should be subject to provision and maintenance of woodland screening.

**1773 Mrs L J Verhaest**

1. The estates' access is poor, via a heavily used, C class road.
2. No further development at Acton Place towards Acton.
3. If further development contemplated at any of these estates, this should be via a new access road onto the A134.

**1776 Mr A J Vooght**

1. No objection to controlled expansion of Acton Place Industrial Estate.
2. No further development at Acton Place towards Acton village, but towards the A134 instead.
3. If further development contemplated at any of these estates, this should be via a improved road access onto the A134 and should not be permitted until such time.

**1976 Acton Parish Council**

The proposed extension to Acton Place Industrial Estate is unacceptable, with both estates accessed from a C class road carrying excessive traffic. Traffic for the estate should use the A134 so any expansion should be in that direction. The current proposal is by itself insignificant in resolving local traffic problems. No objection to westward expansion is raised to this subject to the highway improvements set out in the Plan.

The intention to prohibit any further estate extension until highway improvements are in place is supported.

**309 Mr L A Pittock; 335 Miss H Andrews/Acton Parish Council**  
Support for the comments made by Acton Parish Council in relation to Acton Place Industrial Estate. [See Rep. 1976].

**1532 Mr D G Frost; 1537 Miss S Wells; 1548 Mr E A Battman**

**1559 Mrs V J Wright/Acton Parish Council**

**1561 Mr R C Wright/Acton Parish Council**

**1973 Mrs D M Went; 1981 Mr R C Lloyd; 2677 Mr G G Calver**

The comments of Acton Parish Council are endorsed (see rep. 1976).

**1977 Mr D L Johnson**

In 1993 at the Local Plan Inquiry for the Babergh Local Plan Alteration No. 1, the Inspector did not support further development at this industrial site taking its access from a minor road. This situation has not changed and the roads have become busier in the interim.

The proposed estate extension in the area closest to Acton village is opposed since so many local people requested that such expansion takes place on the opposite side, towards the A134. This request seems reasonable, given that it is only a small area of unnecessary development.

**1983 Mr & Mrs T R Bloomfield**

Expansion of the estates should only take place towards the A134, not the village. The access road is a very narrow and dangerous C class road. It is unsuitable for heavy commercial vehicles. Any traffic volume increase will increase the danger on a road frequently used by farm vehicles that experiences accidents in poor weather. Any expansion towards the A134 should be served by a new access road, relieving the current minor road.

**1989 Mr I O Hill**

Expansion of the estates should only take place towards the A134, not the village. The access road is a very narrow and dangerous C class road. It is unsuitable for heavy commercial vehicles and has seen a large increase in traffic volume over recent years. This is most noticeable when using a cycle on these roads.

Any expansion towards the A134 should be served by a new access road to take the extra traffic. Traffic may already be using Bull Lane as a short cut from the A134 to the Colchester road..

**2614 Mrs A E Chapman**

Expansion of the estates should only take place towards the A134 by-pass, not the village. The access road is a busy C class road. Any extension of industry towards Acton may not be able to sustain a traffic volume increase and this is not acceptable.

Any expansion towards the A134 should be served by a new access road, relieving the current minor road.

**2638 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council**

Access to the estates should be direct from the under-used A134, avoiding heavy traffic through Acton village on the unsuitable / overloaded C class road. Any further estate expansion is likely to increase local traffic volumes and problems.

**2678 Mr and Mrs W J Gabbey**

In relation to any extra traffic from the industrial estates accessing the A134 (associated with estate expansion), the A134 should be subject to a 50 mph speed limit for 0.75 miles either side of the junction with Bull Lane, to make access from and exit onto the A134 much safer.

**3670 Revd. D L C Rutherford/Acton Parish Council**

The access roads to the industrial estates including the C711 from the Long Melford Bypass should be upgraded so as to make them more suited to the heavy lorry traffic currently using them.

**3671 Revd. D L C Rutherford/Acton Parish Council**

In order to screen the proposed areas from the village the existing estate should be properly landscaped and screened with trees. This should be done before any more building takes place.

**3672 Revd. D L C Rutherford/Acton Parish Council**

Any new buildings placed on the proposed extension should have a height restriction placed upon them so that no over large (height wise) buildings can be erected.

**4225 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council**

Acton Place is close to Acton and being an area for manufacturing/services/industrial should necessarily not be allowed to affect the beauty of the area. It should be remembered that one can see Melford church from Acton, making the views in that direction something to be preserved and cherished.

**4226 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council**

Landscaping of the area and suitable height hedges must be given priority status when laying out conditions.

**4227 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council**

No case for any new building to be higher than those which are at present on the site. Many are modern and therefore should be the guide for the maximum height for any new structure.

**4234 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council**

Increase in industrial traffic passing through the village.

**4235 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council**

Small village road not suitable for heavy traffic.

**4249 Mr P M Worton/Acton Parish Council**

Adequate screening and landscaping required.

**4250 Mr P M Worton/Acton Parish Council**

Height of buildings should not exceed the height of existing.

**4251 Mr P M Worton/Acton Parish Council**

No development until road connections to the two sites are set up.

**4252 Mr P M Worton/Acton Parish Council**

Alternative access to site should be from Long Melford Bypass.

**5033 Acton Parish Council;5063 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5077 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council 5088 Mrs M Howard/Acton Parish Council;5106 Mrs P D Deacon/Acton Parish Council;5134 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council;5178 Mrs D M Went/Acton Parish Council 5182 Mrs Y B Border/Acton Parish Council;5191 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;5198 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;5718 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council;5748 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council;7520 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;8859 Mr D L Johnson/Acton Parish Council;9135 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council 9153 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

The Parish Council has previously been opposed to the inclusion of the site because it is anxious that for traffic reasons, the industrial estates should be made to develop westwards towards the A134 Melford Bypass rather than eastwards towards the village of Acton. However, as the land is already being used for purposes ancillary to an established business, it is accepted that it should be properly controlled and the best way to do this is to include it in the Local Plan proposals. Nevertheless, there is still concern over the possible impact this development might have and because the site

is on rising ground and visible from the village there should be definite proposals within the Plan for landscaping and tree screening, and a restriction to prevent buildings being erected which would be higher than the existing Webb Engineering buildings or buildings for which planning consent already exist. The parish council's objection to the proposal would be satisfied by the inclusion of landscaping and tree screening and a restriction on the height of buildings.

**5034 Acton Parish Council;5064 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5078 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council 5089 Mrs M Howard/Acton Parish Council;5107 Mrs P D Deacon/Acton Parish Council;5125 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council;5135 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council 5179 Mrs D M Went/Acton Parish Council;5183 Mrs Y B Border/Acton Parish Council;5192 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;5199 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;5719 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council;5749 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council;7521 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;8860 Mr D L Johnson/Acton Parish Council;9136 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9154 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9400 Mr C S Moss/Acton Parish Council;9402 Mr J M Moss/Acton Parish Council;9431 Mr & Mrs Lean/Acton Parish Council**

The statement in the Plan that "the Acton Place extension area will not be permitted until the highway improvements have been implemented" must remain in place and adhered to. This is very important because the road layouts on both industrial estates and both junctions with the C711 are currently inadequate. This was established at the previous Local Plan Inquiry and there has been no improvements since then.

**5065 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council**

Error on Proposals Map Inset No. 4 relating to Policy EM08. See representation 5035.

**5066 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council**

Object to any new building being higher than existing buildings.

**5067 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council**

Landscaping and tree screening should be implemented before any building commences.

**5068 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council**

A road management scheme to reduce the flow of commercial traffic through Acton village, ideally a dedicated road from Melford Bypass to Acton Industrial estate and closing the two entrance roads from the C711.

**5095 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council**

The site is on rising ground and there should be definite proposals within the Local Plan for landscaping and tree screening.

**5096 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council**

A restriction to prevent any building being erected which would be higher than the existing buildings should be included in the plan.

**5109 Mr D G Frost/Acton Parish Council**

The buildings should be kept to a reasonable height i.e single storey.

**5110 Mr D G Frost/Acton Parish Council**

Trees should be planted to screen the development.

**5111 Mr D G Frost/Acton Parish Council**

Access should only be made from the Melford Bypass with a weight restriction on the C1117 through Acton the Great Waldingfield.

**5119 Mrs Z Murray/Acton Parish Council**

Without certain planning controls in place, as the site is on rising ground the views over the surrounding countryside would be marred.

**5120 Mrs Z Murray/Acton Parish Council**

If the industrial estate is to grow in size the increased traffic will only increase safety risks at already dangerous junctions.

**5121 Mrs Z Murray/Acton Parish Council**

Concerned about the road layouts on both industrial estates in the area and both junctions with the C711 are already inadequate.

**5122 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council**

By including this area of land in the existing estate would tidy the boundaries and since it has been used to store items from the neighbouring units.

**5123 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council**

Provision would have to be made to make sure any new buildings would not be higher than the existing ones as the land rises and high units would be seen from the village (Acton).

**5124 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council**

Landscaping and tree screening would have to be mentioned in the Local Plan as well as the height restrictions.

**5127 Mrs D J Lane/Acton Parish Council**

Concerned that without planning controls the views over the surrounding countryside will be spoiled.

**5128 Mrs D J Lane/Acton Parish Council**

If the industrial estate is expanded the increased traffic will pose an even greater safety risk at junctions.

**5129 Mrs D J Lane/Acton Parish Council**

Concerned that road layouts and junctions leading to the industrial estate are already inadequate.

**5149 Miss H E Andrews/Acton Parish Council**

Whilst accepting the need to improve conditions by regularising the unauthorised uses on the site, the Plan should include provision for environmental improvements to the area.

**5150 Miss H E Andrews/Acton Parish Council**

Considerable mature landscaping including adequate tree screening should be included in the plan.

**5151 Miss H E Andrews/Acton Parish Council**

Any new buildings should be no higher than existing development.

**5152 Mr R C East/Acton Parish Council**

Supporting the proposal in principle but with the provision that a height restriction should be put on any buildings erected (i.e higher than existing buildings).

**5153 Mr R C East/Acton Parish Council**

Some sort of landscaping and tree screening will be needed as the site is visible from the village of Acton.

**5154 Mr R C East/Acton Parish Council**

Road improvements must be made on the junctions at the C711 and the Long Melford bypass junction.

**5169 Mr A C Sawyer**

The site is on rising ground and should be landscaped and tree screened.

**5170 Mr A C Sawyer**

There should be improved road layouts on both junctions with the C711. If these improvements do not take place then objector will object to the whole policy.

**5180 Mr G H Potts/Acton Parish Council**

Support the plan in principle but the site should be screened by landscaping and planting of trees to hide the development from Acton.

**5187 Mr C I Dark**

Objects because the site is on rising ground and visible from the village. There should be landscaping and screening.

**5188 Mr C I Dark**

Objects as there should be a restriction to prevent any building being erected higher than those already in place.

**5189 Mr C I Dark**

Objects as believes no further development should take place until improvements have been implemented to the junctions to both industrial sites as they are currently inadequate.

**5195 Mr & Mrs Lean/Acton Parish Council**

The site is on rising ground and visible from the village. There should be definite proposals within the Plan for landscaping and screening by trees.

**5196 Mr & Mrs Lean/Acton Parish Council**

There should be a restriction to prevent any building being erected which would be higher than the existing buildings.

**5201 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

Against development of the site as it will bring the industrial estate closer to the village of Acton. Duplicate with rep. 5202.

**5202 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

Against development of the site as it will bring the industrial estate closer to the village of Acton. Duplicate with rep. 5201.

**5203 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

The road system in the estates is inadequate for traffic as the two estates are not joined.

**5204 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

The public roads leading to the estates are not designed for large vehicles and large volumes of vehicles. Further expansion would also increase traffic movements through local and delivery vehicles taking short cut to gain access to the estates.

**5205 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

If a definite boundary could be agreed and established then objector might agree with proposal.

**5206 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

Landscaping and building restrictions should be agreed for the site.

**5207 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

Roads should be constructed from the Melford Bypass to take and control traffic.

**5482 Mr J H Purser**

The industrial areas in this location are, in fact, three in number - Acton Place, Bull Lane and the single, large area owned by Mr Webb. The first two areas have no internal link and access to the Webb site is over the Bull Lane site. This complex arrangement is confusing. No further development should take place until road access improvements recommended in the last Plan are implemented.

**5483 Mr J H Purser**

Any development at the site(s) should include a substantial amount of screening by trees/soft landscaping. The site is highly visible, particularly in winter and the use of evergreens over deciduous trees should be made.

**5724 Mr & Mrs T R Bloomfield/Acton Parish Council**

Bull Lane and Acton Place estates join onto Bull Lane which is a narrow and twisting road. Existing traffic from these two industrial estates already put a strain on the road, constitute a danger and degrade and damage the road/road edges. Before extensions is made there must be improvements to the road and junctions first.

**5725 Mr & Mrs T R Bloomfield/Acton Parish Council**

Existing buildings on the estate are already visible from the village. Steps must be taken to ensure that the visible amenity of the village is not further damaged by the development.

**5730 Mr J B Moulton/Acton Parish Council**

Any building erected should not be higher than any existing building.

**5731 Mr J B Moulton/Acton Parish Council**

In order to safeguard the view from the village of Acton there should be a tree screening and landscaping of the perimeter on the Acton village side.

**5732 Mr J B Moulton/Acton Parish Council**

It was agreed that there would be no further development on Acton Place or Bull Lane Industrial Estates until there had been improvement to the highway leading to the Estates.

**8189 Mr R A Godfrey/Acton Parish Council**

Because the site is on rising ground and visible from the village there should be landscaping and screening.

**8190 Mr R A Godfrey/Acton Parish Council**

Because the site is on rising ground and visible from the village there should be a restriction to prevent any building being erected which would be higher than the existing buildings.

**8191 Mr R A Godfrey/Acton Parish Council**

The statement in "The Acton Place extension area will not be permitted until the Highways improvements have been implemented" must remain in place and be adhered to. This is very important because the road layout on both industrial estates and both junctions with the C711 are currently inadequate.

**8192 Mr G G Calver/Acton Parish Council**

All highway improvements must be put in place first as already in the last 5 years we have noticed a great increase in heavy goods vehicles using the main road through the village, which is not acceptable.

**8193 Mr G G Calver/Acton Parish Council**

We would like to see a height restriction put on any new building which should go no higher than the existing building.

**8194 Mr G G Calver/Acton Parish Council**

Would like to see landscaping and tree planting to screen it a bit from the village.

**8197 Mr A H Semmens/Acton Parish Council**

Sees no real objection other than the area should have adequate landscaping and tree screening.

**8198 Mr A H Semmens/Acton Parish Council**

Sees no real objection other than tall buildings not being permitted.

**8849 Mr H Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

A landscaped band to be provided around the area to soften the edge of development adjacent the open countryside.

**8850 Mr H Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

A height restriction to be placed on all future buildings to limit the impact on the open countryside. Would suggest no higher than existing building.

**8851 Mr & Mrs T O'Riordan/Acton Parish Council**

Objects as would like to see the area set out with trees and landscape appropriately.

**8852 Mr & Mrs T O'Riordan/Acton Parish Council**

Objects as does not want building to obscure the sky line.

**8861 Mr D L Johnson/Acton Parish Council**

Noted that there is an error on the Proposals Map for Acton Place in that a small area of land included in the First Deposit Draft as 'possible industrial estate extension' is shown in the Second Deposit Draft as 'existing employment allocation'.

**9155 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

Noted that there is an error on the Proposals Map for Acton Place in that a small area of land included in the First Deposit Draft as 'possible industrial estate extension' is shown in the Second Deposit Draft as 'existing employment allocation'.

**9399 Mr C S Moss/Acton Parish Council;9401 Mr J M Moss/Acton Parish Council**

There should be definite proposals within the Local Plan for landscaping and tree screening or the area prior to use for industrial purposes, and that there should be a restriction in maximum height to be no greater than existing buildings on the site.

**9430 Mr G H Potts/Acton Parish Council**

The entrance to both estates are dangerous and should be widened to allow better access.

**Appendix 5 Objections to EM09a (Tentree Road, Great Waldingfield)**

**Highways and Traffic Issues:**

**Inquiry**

**5027, 5028, 5029, 5030 Acton Parish Council**

The parish council doubts that the highway authority have been consulted on this. The C711 (road between Great Waldingfield and the Melford Bypass) is not a suitable road to serve an industrial area. There are already two industrial estates served by the road through Acton (Bull Lane and Acton Place) and there is planning permission granted for a third estate at Babergh Heath Farm, Acton. The Tentree Road proposal would make four. Even if the entrance was from the B1115 lorries coming from the north would still approach it through Acton High Street rather than travelling south to Sudbury on the A134 and back towards Great Waldingfield on the B1115. There are already too many lorries travelling through Acton to and from industrial estates. The parish council is currently in discussion with SCC to provide some form of traffic calming in the centre of the village.

The junction of the C711 and B1115 at Great Waldingfield PO is extremely poor and at a difficult angle for large vehicles to negotiate. There would have to be improvements to the junction if this proposal went ahead.

The proposal could be improved by making the entrance off the B1115 rather than the C711, but even then it would not be acceptable to people living in Acton because traffic from the Bury St. Edmunds direction would still approach via Acton High Street. Vehicles collecting from and delivering to both the proposed Great Waldingfield site and the existing Acton Place/Bull Lane site would travel via Acton High Street.

**5480 Mr J H Purser**

The only road transport links are through the villages of Great Waldingfield, Lavenham and Acton and industrial traffic that 2.5ha of development would bring is far in excess that which it is reasonable for these centres of population, given the existing industrial development.

**5481 Mr J H Purser**

The point was made in the previous District Plan that the logical extension of Industrial zones in this area is to the west of Bull Lane and Acton Place Industrial Estates, when better links to the A134 are in place. It is, again, disappointing to note that staff at Babergh D.C are unwilling to incorporate schemes that have been recommended from previous plans.

**9303 Ms J A Moore**

Objects as feels should not have to put up with industrial traffic going through it. Great Waldingfield would not gain from such a development.

**9304 Ms J A Moore**

Objects as Tentree Road would not be at all suitable as an entrance to the development. It already causes many accidents.

**3467, 3470 & 3471 Mr G Albion**

Concerned about access route and the entrance from Tentree Road. Concerned about the extra volume of traffic the development would bring. The egress is close to the junction at the Great Waldingfield post office, there are bus stops also in the vicinity.

**6909 & 9322 Miss S A Moore**

The increase in commercial traffic to the area would pollute the area, cause havoc on the roads and would immeasurably damage the area.

**9313 Mr & Mrs R Ibbetson**

Objects because the proposed road from the units onto Tentree Road would cause traffic problems near an already difficult junction and bus stop.

**13257 Mrs J Moore/Keep Waldingfield Green**

Objects to proposed entrance

## **Written**

### **3129 Great Waldingfield Parish Council, 3268 Great Waldingfield Bowls & Social Club**

Allowing heavy goods and other traffic to enter and leave the site as shown into Ten Tree Road would significantly increase traffic flow in the centre of the village and in particular at the already dangerous cross-road outside the Post Office Stores. This is already the subject of traffic calming proposals.

### **3130 Great Waldingfield Parish Council**

The proposal to stop traffic from using Acton Lane would result in an increase in traffic flow to/from Acton which would compound the problem described on rep 3129.

### **3132 Great Waldingfield Parish Council**

Access to the site should be as present, direct from the B1115 at Chilton.

### **3269 Great Waldingfield Bowls & Social Club**

The road past our club is narrow and very poorly drained. Upgrading to a size suitable for such an extension would result in an unacceptable level of noise and development pollution. We would then expect the vibration from development and increased traffic to directly affect our building.

### **3270 Great Waldingfield Bowls & Social Club**

Disturbance to our members car parking facilities, their access to the club and increase in traffic danger in the area to car drivers and pedestrians alike.

### **7787 Mr W Weir**

Whilst supporting the proposed development at this location in principle, as a point of detail, a more suitable entrance could be made further north of the site along Ten Tree Road, to keep traffic away from the Bowls Club.

### **7950 & 7951 Mrs E F Bates**

Objects as does not want to use entrance by Bowls Club. Thinks we should consider next entrance (towards Acton off Tentree Road). Objects as thinks road access across airfield needs improving so traffic can avoid crossroads by Great Waldingfield Post Office.

### **7941 Great Waldingfield Parish Council**

The access road which runs behind Green Acre needs to be made up as currently lorries are very noisy. Against bringing heavy vehicles in/out past the Bowls Club into Ten Tree Road.

### **3271 Great Waldingfield Bowls & Social Club**

Such an extension to this industrial/commercial site is only acceptable if adequate provision is made for the substantial increase in construction and industrial traffic via a properly sited and

constructed road network. Simply grafting on an area of 3.25 hectares without any supporting roads development is a recipe for future problems. Since we would likely be the most directly affected, we object to this proposal.

**5050 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5057 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5071 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council;5082 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council;5091 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council;5100 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council 5115 Mrs Z Murray/Acton Parish Council;5139 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council;5157 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;5753 Mr & Mrs J Marsh;/Acton Parish Council 5766 Mrs J M Moss/Acton Parish Council;5770 Mr C S Moss/Acton Parish Council;5774 Mrs P E Miles/Acton Parish Council;7514 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;7705 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;8809 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council;9140 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9147 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council; 5160 Mr & Mrs Lean /Acton Parish Council**

The parish council doubts that the highway authority has been consulted on this.

**3394, 3395, 3396 & 3399 Mrs M Leeks, 3538, 3539, 3540 Mr P M Worton/Acton Parish Council, 3665, 3666, 3667, 3668, Revd. D L C Rutherford/Acton Parish Council, 3687 & 3688 Mrs S Boreham, 4054 Mrs M Howard/Acton Parish Council, 4192 Mr T Claydon/Acton Parish Council, 4221, 4222, 4223 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council, 4505 & 4506 Mr C I Dark, 4521 Mr R C East/Acton Parish Council, 5051 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5058 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5072 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council;5083 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council;5092 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council;5101 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council 5140 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council;5158 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;5754 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council;5775 Mrs P E Miles/Acton Parish Council 7515 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council 7706 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;8810 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council;9141 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9148 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council; 5159 & 5161 Mr & Mrs Lean/Acton Parish Council**

The C711 (road between Great Waldingfield and the Melford Bypass) is not a suitable road to serve an industrial area. There are already two industrial estates served by the road through Acton (Bull Lane and Acton Place) and there is planning permission granted for a third

estate at Babergh Heath Farm, Acton. The Tentree Road proposal would make four. Even if the entrance was from the B1115 lorries coming from the north would still approach it through Acton High Street rather than travelling south to Sudbury on the A134 and back towards Great Waldingfield on the B1115.

**5052 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5059 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5073 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council;5084 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council;5102 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council;5141 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council 5755 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council;5776 Mrs P E Miles/Acton Parish Council;7516 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;7707 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;8811 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council 9142 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9149 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

There are already too many lorries travelling through Acton to and from industrial estates. The parish council is currently in discussion with SCC to provide some form of traffic calming in the centre of the village.

**5053 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5060 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5074 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council;5085 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council;5093 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council;5103 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council 5142 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council;5756 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council;5777 Mrs P E Miles/Acton Parish Council;7117 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;7517 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;7708 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;9143 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9150 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

The junction of the C711 and B1115 at Great Waldingfield PO is extremely poor and at a difficult angle for large vehicles to negotiate. There would have to be improvements to the junction if this proposal went ahead.

The proposal could be improved by making the entrance off the B1115 rather than the C711, but even then it would not be acceptable to people living in Acton because traffic from the Bury St. Edmunds direction would still approach via Acton High Street. Vehicles collecting from and delivering to both the proposed Great Waldingfield site and the existing Acton Place/Bull Lane site would travel via Acton High Street.

**5046 Mr & Mrs Donovan, 5097 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council, 5112 & 5113 Mr D G Frost/Acton Parish Council, 5116 & 5130, 5117 & 5131 Mrs Z Murray, Mrs D J Lane /Acton Parish Council, 5144, 5146 & 5147 Miss H E**

**Andrews/Acton Parish Council, 5165 Mrs D M Went/Acton Parish Council, 5171, 5172 & 5175 Mr A C Sawyer, 5186 Mrs Y B Border/Acton Parish Council, 5194 Mr R C East/Acton Parish Council, 5209 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council, 5212 Mr G H Potts/Acton Parish Council, 5442 Mrs D G M Judd, 5721 & 5723 Mr & Mrs T R Bloomfield/Acton Parish Council, 5727 5728 Mr J B Moulton/Acton Parish Council, 5734 & 5735 Mrs W S Rose  
5738 5741 & 5744 Miss A L Grimsey/Acton Parish Council  
5760 Mrs E B Headicar, 5761 Mrs I B Watt, 5762 Mr B Dawson,  
5764 Mrs J M Moss & 5768 Mr C S Moss /Acton Parish Council  
5765 Mrs J M Moss & 5769 Mr C S Moss /Acton Parish Council  
5779 Mrs B Collins/Acton Parish Council, 5782 Mr R F Collins/Acton Parish Council, 7116 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council, 7395 Mr S Mitchell/Acton Parish Council, 7407 Mr & Mrs T O'Riordan/Acton Parish Council, 7408 Mr & Mrs T O'Riordan/Acton Parish Council, 7699 Mr D L Johnson/Acton Parish Council, 7700 Mr D L Johnson/Acton Parish Council  
7702 Mr D L Johnson/Acton Parish Council, 8184, 8185 & 8186 Mr R A Godfrey/Acton Parish Council, 8199 8200 & 8201 Mr A H Semmens/Acton Parish Council, 8214 Mr D Eggleton (+ 8814 Duplicate of rep. 8214), 8853 Mrs P D Deacon/Acton Parish Council, 8855 Mr H Tatum/Acton Parish Council, 857 Mr H Tatum/Acton Parish Council, 9278 Mr & Mrs J Hutchings  
9284 J & P Maisey, 12010 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council**

The junction of the C711 and B1115 at Great Waldingfield PO is extremely poor and at a difficult angle for large vehicles to negotiate. There would have to be improvements to the junction if this proposal went ahead.

The proposal could be improved by making the entrance off the B1115 rather than the C711, but even then it would not be acceptable to people living in Acton because traffic from the Bury St. Edmunds direction would still approach via Acton High Street. Vehicles collecting from and delivering to both the proposed Great Waldingfield site and the existing Acton Place/Bull Lane site would travel via Acton High Street.

**12015 Mrs V A Jones**

All village connection roads should be clearly marked "For access only" and limited to vehicles under 7 tonnes, except with police escort.

**12016 Mrs V A Jones**

As far as traffic via Acton is concerned I would like to suggest the installation of three mini-roundabouts.

1. At Vicarage Road and then back to the through road.
2. Outside Bob's shop with the circular deviation well into Queensway.
3. Outside the Crown P.H.

**Issue: No need for jobs in the village/availability of employment land elsewhere**

**Written**

**4219 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council**

The proposal suggests that all existing land with building consent for industry is fully utilised. This is clearly not so as there are many areas available which are not used.

**4426 Mrs E M Brotherwood**

Great Waldingfield does not want new employment. We are a village, not an industrial estate, and not a town.

**5164 Mrs D M Went/Acton Parish Council**

Do not need any more industrial estates as two are already in existence and a third on planned.

**5208 & 5211 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

There is no reason for the proposed industrial estate in the village. There is adequate industrial areas in and around Sudbury with many estates having large areas of vacant premises and land.

**5722 Mr & Mrs T R Bloomfield/Acton Parish Council**

There is no demand for additional industrial development land that is not covered by existing plans.

**5733 Mrs W S Rose**

The proposed industrial units would be of no benefit to the village as it would not provide employment on any significant scale.

**5742 Mr B C Grimsey/Acton Parish Council**

With the pending agreement to approve further development to Acton Bull Lane site. Industrial development on both ends of the village is not needed nor wanted.

**5763 Mr B Dawson**

Objects as would seriously question what evidence is available to justify this proposal.

**5780 Mrs B Collins/Acton Parish Council**

Is this proposal needed? There are units empty in the existing industrial estates.

**5784 Mr R F Collins/Acton Parish Council**

There is already ample capacity available for industry. There is workshops available at both Bull Lane and Acton Place industrial estates. There is also a large amount of land at Chilton which has not been taken up.

**9301 Ms J A Moore**

Objects as employment opportunities for the village people are not required.

**9315 Mrs K E Sutherland**

Objects as there is already available space for industrial/business use in Sudbury which is unused - there is no need to develop yet another area in this way.

**Issue: Preference for alternative sites in Acton and elsewhere in the Sudbury area.**

**Inquiry**

**5031 Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is needed for industry it should be to the west of the Bull Lane Industrial Estate with proper provision being made for access off the A134 Melford Bypass.

**6910 Miss S A Moore**

Objects and thinks the development could be relocated to one of the business parks in Sudbury.

**Written**

**3400 Mrs M Leeks**

Objects because feels there is a more suitable site the other end of the village near Chilton Grain on the big field and come out on to Sudbury Road.

**3541 Mr P M Worton/Acton Parish Council**

If land is needed for light industry it should be an alternative location to the west of Bull Lane Estate Industrial Estate, Acton.

**3669 Revd. D L C Rutherford/Acton Parish Council**

It has been the long stated objective of the Parish Council that any further development of industrial estates in the village boundary should take place to the West of Bull Lane Industrial estate with access from the Long Melford by-pass.

**4055 Mrs M Howard/Acton Parish Council**

Should further industrial expansion be necessary, then I suggest it should be sought on the west side of the Action and Bull Lane sites, with an eye to using the A134 as access at a point on the Long Melford by-pass. Find the proposal totally unacceptable.

**4193 Mr T Claydon/Acton Parish Council**

If any extra industrial development is required in the area it should be at the Bull Lane industrial estate which is close to the Melford bypass or Chilton on the other side of Waldingfield. Both these

option could take further expansion and allow easy traffic management options from existing 'B' roads.

**4224 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land for industry is needed the Bull Lane Industrial estate should be enlarged and the road from the Melford Bypass could be straightened, widened and given the necessary status to ensure that in bad winter conditions only that section of the road to the A134 needs priority clearance. Infrastructure for one large estate has to be more economic than that for three estates.

**4428 Mrs E M Brotherwood**

Alternative site locations available at Ballingdon Industrial Estate, Woodhall Business Park, and Churchfield Road.

Acton Lane industrial estate has vacant units it cannot fill.

If employment is concentrated to specific areas, public transport can be used to its capacity.

**4509 Mr C I Dark**

If extra land is needed for industry then surely a better position would be to site it to the West of Bull Lane industrial estate with a link road being made off the A134 Melford by-pass.

**5054 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5061 Mr E A Battman/Acton Parish Council;5075 Mr & Mrs R C Wright/Acton Parish Council;5086 Mrs B M Battman/Acton Parish Council;5094 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish Council;5104 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council;5143 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council;5757 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council;5778 Mrs P E Miles/Acton Parish Council;7118 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;7518 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;7709 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council ;9144 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9151 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is needed for industry it should be to the west of the Bull Lane Industrial Estate with proper provision being made for access off the A134 Melford Bypass.

**5114 Mr D G Frost/Acton Parish Council**

Extra land could be used west of Bull Lane after a proper road has been made to serve this from the Melford Bypass.

**5118 Mrs Z Murray/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is required for industry the existing estates at Bull Lane and Acton Place should be expanded (to the West of Bull Lane Industrial Estate) with improved access included from the A134 Melford Bypass.

**5132 Mrs D J Lane/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is required for industry the existing estates at Bull Lane and Acton Place should be expanded (to the west of Bull Lane Industrial Estate) with improved access included from the A134 Melford Bypass.

**5148 Miss H E Andrews/Acton Parish Council**

If there is a need for increased industrial provision then such land should be located with direct access from as Classified 'A' road.

**5162 Mr & Mrs Lean/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is needed for industry it should be to the west of Bull Lane Industrial Estate with proper provision made for access of the A134 Melford Bypass.

**5166 Mrs D M Went/Acton Parish Council**

A better alternative would be to enlarge Bull Lane Estate. The whole proposal appears to be an ill conceived afterthought - should the Highway Authority have been consulted?

**5185 Mrs Y B Border/Acton Parish Council**

There is already too many lorries travelling through Acton. If extra land is needed for industry it should be to the west of the Bull Lane Industrial estate with an access off the A134 Long Melford Bypass.

**5213 Mr G H Potts/Acton Parish Council**

The trading estate should be sited adjacent to a main highway and an entrance from the Long Melford Bypass to the west of Bull Lane estate.

**5736 Mrs W S Rose**

Why cannot land at existing nearby industrial estates be utilised which do not impinge on the villages of Great Waldingfield and Acton?

**5739 Miss A L Grimsey/Acton Parish Council**

Why not add onto the Long Melford Bypass sites already in place, where there is easy access without going through any village. Do not want a huge industrial site eventually on the old airfield.

**5740 Miss A L Grimsey/Acton Parish Council**

Any further industry should be either at Bull Lane or Chilton end of airfield where there already is industry, but these sites should be limited.

**5743 Mr B C Grimsey/Acton Parish Council**

Industrial units ought to be located at the Chilton end of the airfield and number of units should be restricted.

**5746 Mrs C J Grimsey/Acton Parish Council**

Any further industrial development should be moved to Bull Lane where there is access from the Long Melford Bypass and already existing industries.

**5767 Mrs J M Moss/Acton Parish Council**

Any additional land required for industry should be to the west of Bull Lane industrial estate with proper access from A134 Melford Bypass.

**5771 Mr C S Moss/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is required for industry it should be sited to the west of Bull Lane Industrial Estate with access being made from the A134 Melford Bypass.

**8187 Mr R A Godfrey/Acton Parish Council**

Any additional industrial capacity should be provided on to the less of the Bull Lane Industrial Estate with proper provisions being made for access off the A134 Melford bypass.

**8196 Mr G G Calver/Acton Parish Council**

Thinks alternative site would be better. Could make better use of land on the Chilton Estate with access on to the bypass or better still why not use the land to the West of Bull Lane Industrial Estate but firstly make proper in and out access straight onto the A134 Melford bypass which would not add to the traffic problems.

**8202 Mr A H Semmens/Acton Parish Council**

Alternative site. There are a number of areas which must be available for additional industry, with provision made off the main roads into such areas, the Melford Bypass being a prime example.

**8854 Mrs P D Deacon/Acton Parish Council**

Objects as feels and alternative site to the west of Bull Lane Industrial Estate would be better suited if a new road was made onto the Melford by-pass.

**8856 Mr H Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

If an additional area of land is required then it should be adjacent the existing sites on the west of Bull Lane industrial estate where access can be on to the Melford by-pass or adjacent the proposed and previously agreed industrial area on Chiltern Corner where access can be taken from the Sudbury by-pass.

**9302 Ms J A Moore**

Objects as there are alternative sites and this should be conserved due to its wildlife. Further industrial development should take place where it has already been established ie. Acton Industrial Estate.

**9438 Mr J B Moulton/Acton Parish Council**

Land for Industrial development would best be made near to the Melford Bypass on land West of Bull Lane Industrial Estate with easy access.

**12011 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council**

If extra land is needed for industry it should be to the west of the Bull Lane Industrial Estate with proper provision being made for access off the A134 Melford Bypass.

**Issue: Loss of countryside, over-development, impact on wildlife, visual impact, not previously developed land, outside built-up area boundary, and Chilton should be developed before Tentree Road.**

**Inquiry**

**3468 Mr G Albion**

Nature. Concerned that the entrance from Tentree Road past the existing bowls club would result in the removal of established trees.

**6908 Miss S A Moore**

Objects to proposal because the airfield and its margins are a County Wildlife site which contains rare species.

**9321 Miss S Moore**

Objects as it contains many rare and endangered species of Flora - such as spreading hedge parsley and shepherds needle. Any proposed development is sure to disrupt the fine balance that allows these rare plants to grow.

**9323 Miss S Moore**

Objects because as a keen conservationist, I can not understand how these sites can even be considered for development, both of which are outside the village development boundary line. In the country, we need green corridors, to allow biodiversity to flourish - if we destroy these precious few natural habitats, then that would be not only hugely sad but a criminal act.

**Written**

**3131 Great Waldingfield Parish Council**

The mature screening around the existing storage building would be partially destroyed.

**3397 Mrs M Leeks**

Concerned about the potential loss of wildlife: in particular, there are wild flowers growing on this piece of land.

**4053 Mrs M Howard/Acton Parish Council**

Objection on grounds of Siting and access. These had not figured in earlier plans and hints at a further encroachment on the small piece of green belt still surviving on the southeast approach to Acton.

**4220 Mrs D Gabbey/Acton Parish Council**

This is a greenfield site where Brownfield sites are available.

**4508 Mr C I Dark**

Concerned about the loss of wildlife, building on this land would mean further decline of these species.

**5173 Mr A C Sawyer**

The six acre proposal borders onto a protected wildlife site and it is inevitable that there will be rare species on the new proposed site.

**5174 Mr A C Sawyer**

The extra noise and traffic would not be good for the wildlife area.

**5443 Mrs D G M Judd**

The proposed site contains valuable and sensitive flora and fauna and should be protected from development for the community and future generations.

**5444 Mrs D G M Judd**

The proposed site should be protected for use as a community woodland (Branchlines project).

**5783 Mr R F Collins/Acton Parish Council**

The proposal will affect the wildlife on the airfield.

**9291 Mr P Claridge**

Objects as it is wrong to keep losing more and more of the countryside in the area to development.

**9292 Mr P Claridge**

Hopes that the area on Chilton Industrial site would be filled with industrial development first.

**9300 Ms J A Moore**

Objects as much of this area is already named a county wildlife site with rare species of plants growing there.

**9312 Mr & Mrs R Ibbetson**

Objects because understands site has been declared a wildlife site by Suffolk C.C and is one of only two places in the country where spreading hedge parsley and shepherds needle can be found.

**9316 Mrs K E Sutherland**

Objects as the endangered plant which you high-lighted - the hedge parsley - is rare and only exists in one other area of the country. I am sure that Babergh District Council and Suffolk Wildlife would not wish to be held responsible for the destruction of any plant of such rarity.

**9564 – 10514 Keep Waldingfield Green  
Petition Organiser Jane Moore**

1. The airfield has been named a County Wildlife Site. The airfield and its margins are the only extant site in the County for spreading hedge parsley, which is a nationally scarce species. Other rare species, which occur on the site, are two species of fluellen and shepherds needle.
2. The proposed development would border the site, with probable destruction/disturbance of the hedges, natural habitats of the rare flora.

**Issue: Amenity issues**

**Written**

**3398 Mrs M Leeks**

Concerned about the noise the units are going to make.

**4427 Mrs E M Brotherwood**

Already enough aggravation from the noise pollution of grain stores running their dryers, day and night along with the lorries going down the old runway.

**5045 Mr & Mrs Donovan**

Concern is not only the increase in traffic but the noise and pollution that comes with it. It is not relevant to say that the lorries will use the bypass because time is money and they will use Acton as a cut through.

**5210 Mr K B Atkinson/Acton Parish Council**

This is an agricultural not industrial area and development would lower the standard of living for all in the immediate and surrounding area.

**5441 & 5446 Mrs D G M Judd**

The area of 2.50ha to the north on the existing site would have a detrimental affect on the residential and environmental amenity and highway safety of Great Waldingfield. Stricter limitations be placed on the use of the site, hours of operation, vehicular access.

**9285 J & P Maisey**

This is a rural village and does not have the facilities to support the inevitable increase in both people and traffic having only one shop, a small primary school and narrow roads.

**9314 Mrs K E Sutherland**

Objects as this area is one of few remaining in the district offering open space with a minimum of traffic. Whilst I accept there is some industrial use of the site, the traffic caused is sustainable at present. Any increased building works and subsequent traffic use by firms using the park will be detrimental to the villages beyond Chilton.

**Miscellaneous/individual issues**

**Inquiry**

**3469 Mr G Albion**

Concerned as there is no mention of the existing road to the existing workshops (mostly former military accommodation i.e. nissen huts.)

**5025 Acton Parish Council**

Proposal is unacceptable. It lies within the parish of Great Waldingfield but could have a major impact on life in Acton.

**5026 Acton Parish Council**

The proposal is not included in the First Deposit Draft of the Local Plan and seems to be an ill conceived and opportunist afterthought. It is not good planning.

**Written**

**9311 Mr & Mrs R Ibbetson**

Objects because currently you can move safely away from the traffic on the airfield but this development would threaten that safety. Also, they enjoy the open space but industrial units would encroach on that.

**4191 Mr T Claydon/Acton Parish Council**

The proposal is unacceptable and not well thought out.

**4507 Mr C I Dark**

The proposed site is very close to a popular footpath that cross the airfield and farmland, an industrial site would eventually mean an end to public access.

**5048 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5055 Mr E A**

**Battman/Acton Parish Council;5069 Mr & Mrs R C**

**Wright/Acton Parish Council;5080 Mrs B M Battman/Acton**

**Parish Council;5098 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish**

**Council;5137 Mrs B Kilmister/Acton Parish Council**

**5155 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton Parish Council;5751 Mr & Mrs J**

**Marsh/Acton Parish Council;5772 Mrs P E Miles/Acton Parish**

**Council;7512 Mr & Mrs A & D Parmenter/Acton Parish**

**Council;7703 Mr I O Hill/Acton Parish Council;8807 Mr R K**

**Toms/Acton Parish Council;9138 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish**

**Council;9145 Mr P G Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

Proposal is unacceptable. It lies within the parish of Great Waldingfield but could have a major impact on life in Acton.

**5049 Mrs C E Morris/Acton Parish Council;5056 Mr E A**

**Battman/Acton Parish Council;5070 Mr & Mrs R C**

**Wright/Acton Parish Council;5081 Mrs B M Battman/Acton**

**Parish Council;5091 Mrs L J Verhaest/Acton Parish**

**Council;5099 Mrs K M Frost/Acton Parish Council**

**5115 Mrs Z Murray/Acton Parish Council;5138 Mrs B**

**Kilmister/Acton Parish Council;5156 Mrs O F Cadge/Acton**

**Parish Council;5752 Mr & Mrs J Marsh/Acton Parish Council**

**5766 Mrs J M Moss/Acton Parish Council;5773 Mrs P E**

**Miles/Acton Parish Council;7513 Mr & Mrs A & D**

**Parmenter/Acton Parish Council;7704 Mr I O Hill/Acton**

**Parish Council;8808 Mr R K Toms/Acton Parish Council**

**9139 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council;9146 Mr P G**

**Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

**5445 & 5447 Mrs D G M Judd**

Access be changed to make use of the disused taxiway to the west of the proposed site. An investigation be made of the effect on the village electrical power supply which is already poor and suffers frequent power cuts. Also, an investigation into the effect on sewerage and other utilities.

**5726 Mr J B Moulton/Acton Parish Council**

The village of Acton is slowly becoming enclosed by Industrial estates.

**5737 Mrs W S Rose**

The objection would be greatly mitigated if land could be allocated to the Great Waldingfield Community Wood Project at the site now being proposed for industrial use. The village is deficient in leisure areas and public green spaces. The parish council has no objection to this suggestion and SCC has expressed willingness to help the project if suitable land became available.

**5745 Mrs C J Grimsey/Acton Parish Council**

Once planning is passed on the old airfield, this will encroach more and more and leading eventually to a huge industrial site.

**5781 Mrs B Collins/Acton Parish Council**

Before the proposed increase in industry and housing are even considered, there should be an hospital with an A & E department to cater for accidents and illnesses which will inevitably occur. Can the local medical and dental practises cope with the increase of patients?

**7110 Mays Farm Haulage Ltd/Whymark & Moulton**

The site of Mays Farm Haulage is within the area confirmed on the Proposal Map as existing employment land.

The site is well screened and there are no amenity objections.

Other nearby businesses include concrete and stone crushing, grain storage (10,000 tonnes) and a concrete paving manufacturer.

Access to the public highway is via the former airfield and not via either of the villages of Great Waldingfield or Acton. The Highway Authority have supported the objector's use of the site.

An opportunity to discuss this matter with the Planning Authority prior to the Public Inquiry is requested.

**7942 Great Waldingfield Parish Council**

Objects because how would existing services cope with extra use eg. Electricity and water.

**7943 Great Waldingfield Parish Council**

Objects as a site of approx 2 acres was required for a community woodland.

**8195 Mr G G Calver/Acton Parish Council**

Objects as would result in overdevelopment of area. The villages of Acton and Great Waldingfield would just disappear from sight.

**8212 Mr D Eggleton (+ 8812 Duplicate of rep.8212)**

Strongly opposed to this development. The local industrial areas are already sufficiently fragmented (e.g. Bull Lane, Chilton, Church Fields, Bulmer Road, Woodhall) without looking to build a further fragmented industrial estate on a greenfield site.

**8213 Mr D Eggleton (+ 8813 Duplicate of rep. 8213)**

If a new industrial area has to be built where is the sense in proposing that it is built next to an existing residential area? It will result in trouble.

**8805 Mrs D G M Judd**

Para 1.30 states that the Proposals map illustrates the Plan's policies and proposals. It also stated that if the maps and written statements are contradictory the written statement will prevail. Policy EM09a (and HS09Q) contradict policy HS02 in that the proposed development is on agricultural land that falls outside the BUAB for the village. The proposed development contradicts the BUAB for Gt Waldingfield, which has led local residents to believe that this boundary is still valid. The failure to clearly present the full proposal (second deposit) in a clear manner has materially affected the validity of the public scrutiny. Policy HS02 should be upheld in that development outside BUAB (HS09Q and EM09A) should not be permitted.

**9139 Mrs J Tatum/Acton Parish Council**

The proposal is not included in the First Deposit Draft of the Local Plan and seems to be an ill conceived and opportunist afterthought. It is not good planning.

**9279 Mr & Mrs J Hutchings**

Objects as there would be a great concern the nature of the proposed 'industrial' development on the site. We would need much greater detail about it to come to any conclusion. It appears that countryside is steadily disappearing.

**9293 Mr P Claridge**

If the airfield is developed then I only hope that it would be minimal and screened from the immediate surroundings so that it appears any development is so discrete that you would hardly know it was there.

**9317 Mrs K E Sutherland**

The development would destroy the unique character of the villages in that region, which are at present distinct from each other, having fields and woods separating them; any buildings would begin to "join up" Sudbury, Chilton and Great Waldingfield.

**9564 – 10514 Keep Waldingfield Green**

**Petition organiser Jane Moore**

**Petition against the proposed business development at Waldingfield Airfield, three issues raised.**

3. This area is outside the Councils own housing development boundary line, and therefore should not be available for any extensive construction, for who knows where it will end.

**5145 Miss H E Andrews/Acton Parish Council**

Incorrectly recorded representation number.

**12017 Mr P Jones**

Incorrectly recorded representation number.

**Appendix 6      Objections – EM09c      Capel St Mary**

**3009 Mr P H Frost**

Objector thinks area could with some advantage be designated as residential with some advantage to the house building policy.

**3178 Mrs T Lari**

**3179 Mrs T Lari**

Traffic concerns. Objects as the A12 is noisy enough and would object to any extra heavy vehicle use. The area is close to the objector's house and objector does not want the land used for industrial purposes.

**3330 Mrs J Fancy**

**3332 Mrs J Fancy**

**3333 Mrs J Fancy**

Objects against any industrial or haulage uses on the present nurseries site. would like to see prestigious retailing outlets (not units) like the current businesses already retailing.

Would like to see an old age home built there.

**3642 Mr C Read**

**3643 Mr C Read**

**3644 Mr C Read**

**3645 Mr C Read**

**3646 Mr C Read**

**3651 Mr C Read**

Site proposed would conflict with the scale and character, residential and environmental amenity, of the village and such use would compromise highway safety. A comprehensive development scheme with the adjoining site would generate unacceptable levels of traffic including the use of large lorries. The proposed Use Classes are considered wholly inappropriate for the village. The uses proposed noise pollution to an unacceptable level, and at unsociable hours which will have adverse impact on residential amenity.

Notwithstanding the close proximity of the A12, it is considered that this site would be more suitable for residential development.

**3869 Mr W Gorvin**

**3875 Mr W Gorvin**

Objection to site being used [retained] for employment purposes (under Policy EM09c) because this type of site is not needed in Capel St Mary. Build affordable houses for people to live in.

**3876 Mrs T M Estcourt**

**3877 Mrs T M Estcourt**

**3878 Mrs T M Estcourt**

**3879 Mrs T M Estcourt**

**3880 Mrs T M Estcourt**

Concerned about any possible extra volume of traffic and HGV's associated with any new business use, possible extra pollution and longer working hours. Objection to any proposal that brings more noise to the area.

**4034 Mrs J A Sunderland**

**4035 Mrs J A Sunderland**

**4036 Mrs J A Sunderland**

**4037 Mrs J A Sunderland**

**4038 Mrs J A Sunderland**

Strongly object to provision within policy for potential of B2 use - general industrial re-use of the present nurseries site. This policy could lead to the existing haulage company expanding, creating increasing noise and pollution during the night and early mornings. Whilst I appreciate our village requires employment, keep it as shop outlets or offices without strong movement of traffic, food and drink, or better still, starter homes for young people - thus allowing them to live and bring up families within the village with the added benefits that village life has to offer.

**4502 Mrs R A Leonard**

Housing of both affordable homes for the younger people in the village or sheltered type housing for older residents are both high priorities for the village. In fact sheltered housing with a community centre would create a degree of employment.

**4503 Mrs R A Leonard**

This project is of great concern to me as a considerable length of the boundary borders my garden. As Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning Act states "A B1 use must be capable of being undertaken in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.

**4504 Mrs R A Leonard**

The whole project as described would increase greatly the amount of traffic in London Road which is already being used as a 'rat run'.

**4513 Mr P L Bryant**

**4514 Mr P L Bryant**

**4515 Mr P L Bryant**

**4516 Mr P L Bryant**

**4517 Mr P L Bryant**

**4518 Mr P L Bryant**

**4519 Mr P L Bryant**

**4520 Mr P L Bryant**

Objects because the proposed changes will result in increased heavy goods traffic and noise and affect scale and character of village. Changes will be very intrusive and cause loss of visual amenity and will have a detrimental affect on the value of my

property. Objects because property has the benefit of right of access which is adhered to without problem by current occupants of the lorry park site. I would naturally be concerned about this becoming a problem by an increased and different workforce. It is my view that the area in question should be used for residential development which would keep in character with the village. This would benefit the village as a whole.

**4868 Mrs V A Rew**

**4869 Mrs V A Rew**

**4870 Mrs V A Rew**

**4872 Mrs V A Rew**

Oppose to the development of the lorry depot on the grounds it will cause more disruption and noise and pollution. We have had to put up with large lorries in and out of the yard causing damage to the road. Objects to workshop units as will probably be the cause of increased traffic to and from the site. Deliveries to the site (possibly large vehicles again) will create just as many problems for local residents. I am in agreement with the site owner that a change to residential use would be more satisfactory, especially if it were for 'starter homes' for couples wishing to live in the village.

**5315 GO-East**

EM09b and EM09c both identify land in out of centre locations for a range of travel intensive uses including A1, A3 and B1. Travel intensive uses should be located in accordance with a sequential approach. The plan does not accord with government policy and should be amended.

**6095 A H Philpot & Sons Ltd/Bidwells**

Objects as would not meet objective of the policy. Allocation EM09c will not provide a balance between employment and housing for Capel St Mary, as the uses already existing on land between the A12 and London Road provide a valuable economic service. Policy EM09c suggests virtually every use class but in essence would not represent a more appropriate B use class employment site.

**6930 Mrs J Lawrence**

**6931 Mrs J Lawrence**

Articulated lorries using London Road had increased dramatically over the past two years. They run through day, night and weekends, totally ignoring the lorry restriction signs. To turn this yard into industrial units will only increase traffic and congestion.

**7777 The Bypass Nurseries/The Johnson Dennehy Planning Partnership**

Objector would like to seek a minor change to the area of proposed employment allocation, to take account of existing residential property.

**7921 Mr C Read/Edward Gittins & Associates**

No site specific reference is made to the bypass nurseries site. Paragraph 4.29d states that "no new employment sites are proposed at present..". However policy EM09c and Inset 12 propose a new employment area on the bypass nurseries site which is not so defined within current village planning policy. It is therefore contrary to what is said in the text.

**7924 Mr C Read/Edward Gittins & Associates**

In terms of Policy EM09c, we object to its provision for a comprehensive scheme that covers both employment sites. The objection also seeks the removal of the objection site from the employment allocation and its inclusion within the village settlement boundary for residential purposes. This will require an amendment to the text of 4.29d and to Policy EM09c.

**7925 Mr C Read/Edward Gittins & Associates**

Comprehensive approach: there would be a strong opposition to the use of the access serving the haulier's yard being used to serve an enlarged employment area.

**7926 Mr C Read/Edward Gittins & Associates**

An enlarged employment area would generate increased traffic flows in close proximity to the established residential properties and seriously affect residential amenity.

**9446 Mr A Harrison**

Comment. If houses and/or employment outlets are implemented then there is an obvious need for traffic calming measures on London Road.

**9449 Mrs G Mills**

**9450 Mrs G Mills**

**9451 Mrs G Mills**

If the lorry depot, warehouse and nursery were converted to industrial use it is quite probable that the units would stand empty and unused. If used it is unlikely that they would provide jobs for local people as any business taking them on would bring their existing employees. The lorry depot and warehouse would be put to far better use as affordable 2 and 3 bedroomed homes which the village lacks. Capel youngsters need cheaper homes in the village if they are to stay. The nursery and restaurant sites are fine as they are. If change has to happen then maybe leisure facilities should be considered over and above industry - again something the young people of the village to use and enjoy.