12. CHAPTER 12 - THE CHILTON MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

12.1 PARAGRAPH 12.7 BACKGROUND

The Objections

6777 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting to the text additions of "further development" and "of being extended to form a distributor road."
6779 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting to the traffic coming off the MacDonalds roundabout without stopping or slowing down. This hazard will get worse as traffic levels increase.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.1.1 I find the text additions to be statements of fact. Traffic management measures may be necessary to ensure better use of the roundabout but they are not a matter for a local plan policy.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

12.2 PARAGRAPH 12.10 BACKGROUND

The Objections

1828 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Last bullet point referring to "other major road concerns" is unclear.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.2.1 These words were deleted at the 2nd Deposit Draft Stage. No further action is required

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

12.3 PARAGRAPH 12.11 BACKGROUND

The Objections

1829 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Suggest revision to text to say the Master Plan will take into account concerns expressed regarding the proposed Chilton Development Package. (See representation 2244).
6797-6798 Chilton Parish Council
8843 Mr S Cheese
Neither the tenant farmers in the area or the Chilton Parish Council feel that they have been directly consulted about these plans. Chilton Parish Council would wish to be a full participant and fully represented in the creation of any "Master Plan" as it pertains to all matters relevant to the proposed Chilton development.
Object to Policy wording - "consultations with a wide range of interested parties" since this is laughable.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.3.1 From evidence at Inquiry I find this revised paragraph to be a statement of fact. See my report on the Chilton proposals below at CP01.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

12.4 PARAGRAPH 12.12 BACKGROUND

1132 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce;1418 Tesco Stores Limited / Healey & Baker;2110 ICI Corporate Real Estate / Andrew Martin Associates
Objects to dependence on completion of bypass before Chilton is developed. Concerned about deliverability of the Chilton Mixed-Use Development package, in relation to the time frame of the Local Plan, the bypass provision, dependent on support from Essex CC and that the discrepancy of programming between both CCs as well as the phasing of residential and employment land.
1830 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Argues that reference to Sudbury Western Bypass should be removed since the linkage is not justified for a number of reasons. In this paragraph, the text should read: "The District Council shares concern about the possible effect of the scale of development on the

highway infrastructure of Sudbury town centre and the amenity of residents living next to principal traffic routes. The development masterplan should include a package of transport measures consistent with the Local Transport Plan."

5405;5407 Mr N A Bennett

Objection against the high traffic flows on the highway, management is not enough. The key to reducing the effect is the construction of the Sudbury western bypass and related highway management measures. Objector would like a bypass.

5406 Mr N A Bennett

12.12 contradicts earlier parts of the local plan. Without a bypass, the A131 remains the only route south and it remains impossible to get traffic and lorries out of the town centre, historic core and conservation area.

6774 Mr V Herbert

Since the previous objection there is an increase in traffic because of larger employment areas such as a new Hospital site, the new Homebase, MacDonalds, and Shawlands retail sites, and a Waste Transfer site.

6775 Mr V Herbert; 6792-6794;6796 Chilton Parish Council
8838 Mr S Cheese

Objecting to the impact of the traffic on Sudbury and an increase in traffic as a result from the retail developments. All Chilton traffic bound for Sudbury must tend to use the Northern Road Roundabout, then down Gallows Hill and into East Street which is so narrowed by parked cars that two lorries cannot pass. It then reaches traffic lights at a busy junction with Girling Street. There is no attempt to provide or encourage an easy alternative access route from Chilton Town Centre.

Objecting to development until serious consideration is given to the upgrading of the B1115 as it is unable to handle traffic and will become dangerous with the increase of traffic. You will have to run across the B1115 on a virtually blind bend. Objector would like a Western By-Pass for Sudbury to take much of the existing through traffic.

6891 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker

Tesco Stores generally supports the revised text that states there is no need for the Sudbury Western Bypass to be completed prior to the development commencing. However, do object to the precise wording. It is considered that the new sentence should be re-drafted to be more specific as to what development the sentence relates to. The new sentence should read as follows: "There is no proven need for the proposed Sudbury Western Bypass to be completed before the development of the Chilton Mixed Use development Package commences. This finding has arisen.."

7710;8242 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart

Objects as unacceptable now given the delay in the Western Bypass Scheme simply to state that "highway measures will be worked up in more detail in the Master Plan".

7711;8243 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart

Disagree that there is no proven need that the Sudbury Western Bypass should be completed before development begins.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.4.1 Both revised paragraphs 12.12 and 12.12a describe a range of highway management measures. These were added at the 2nd Deposit Draft stage. I have dealt with the highway objections as an integral part of my report on the Chilton Mixed Use development at Policy CP01.

RECOMMENDATION

See my report on Policy CP01.

12.5 PARAGRAPH 12.12a BACKGROUND

The Objections

5440 Mrs D G M Judd;6773 Mr V Herbert;7980 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker

The Local Plan states that "the road infrastructure can support this development". Springlands Way is currently attracting high traffic volumes. A significant proportion is traffic from the Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill direction wishing to avoid the town centre and travelling through towards Colchester and vice versa. The additional residential development will create extra traffic leading to yet more traffic down Gallows Hill and into the already congested area of Sudbury town centre.

Development will have an adverse effect on the traffic density in Great Waldingfield due to the use of routing using Acton Lane.

Do not believe that 'traffic management' will be sufficient to prevent the use of Aubrey Drive and the Church Field roundabout as a short cut.

6893-6894 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker

This paragraph implies access to the employment areas will be taken directly via the Tesco roundabout rather than the distributor road as implied elsewhere in the plan. Considers an additional bullet point should be added to the paragraph that reads:

"access to the Chilton Mixed Use development will be taken off the proposed distributor road, accessed off the Tesco roundabout."
6892 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Considers this paragraph to be too vague, and that it does not reflect other statements in the plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.5.1 I have dealt with highway considerations at Policy CP01

12.5.2 I agree with the Objector that it should be made clear that the access to the employment area will be from the distributor road and not directly from the roundabout. Access off the roundabout is already mentioned in the second bullet point and I have not repeated it.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by adding a further bullet point to paragraph 12.12a **access to the Chilton Mixed Use development will be taken off the proposed distributor road**

12.6 PARAGRAPH 12.14 THE CHILTON MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PACKAGE

The Objections

1831 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggest deletion of SCC ownership and minor changes.
364 Chilton Parish Council;7712 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
7983 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker;8249 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
Strongly dispute that "the road infrastructure can support this development." The B1115 is narrow, dangerous and cannot take an increased volume of traffic.
The closure of Acton Lane between the proposed distributor road and Springlands Way will also add to further traffic to the Tesco roundabout as all the vehicles from the Acton direction will need to use this route.
7713 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8250 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
"The package will include on and off site transport improvements consistent with sound principles of sustainable development." The package as presently proposed does not include such proposals,

whilst pressing ahead with the proposed development is unfair to local residents.

7714 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart

The paragraph sets out the perceived advantages but fails to mention that on the "Well being" "Brownfield" and "Agriculture" criteria of the Council's sustainability studies, this Mixed Development Package received adverse scores.

7982 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker

The proposed distributor road is only shown on the plan with full traffic status as far as the second roundabout, from there on the dotted line shows that this road will be for local traffic only. In spite of this designation however most of the traffic bound for the eastern side of Sudbury, Great Cornard and in the Lavenham direction will continue to use the distributor road from the centre point eastwards rather that travelling back to the Tesco roundabout and then eastwards via Springlands Way.

Although the Sudbury western bypass has yet to be constructed, its construction will have very little impact on the Chilton development and it is not therefore essential for the Sudbury western bypass to be built before the Chilton development takes place.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.6.1 Ownership of land is not relevant to the land use merits of the scheme and has been deleted. Paragraphs 12.13 and 12.14 as revised at the 2nd Deposit stage list the advantages and conclude that the Chilton Mixed Use package represents the most sustainable solution for the growth of Sudbury. I agree that other locations appear to have insurmountable environmental constraints and Chilton is the logical location in principle. See my report at Policy CP01 on the merits of the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

12.7 PARAGRAPH 12.15 THE CHILTON MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PACKAGE

The Objections

1832 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons

Proposals Map has not been agreed, and SCC together with a development partner wishes to work up detail with BDC.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.7.1 paragraph 12.15 has been deleted

RECOMMENDATION

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

---

12.8 PARAGRAPH 12.15a THE CHILTON MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PACKAGE

The Objections

6883 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Tesco Stores has not been involved in any joint working exercise for the layout of the Chilton Mixed-Use package, and therefore considers the wording of this paragraph to be inaccurate and misleading.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 178 to Paragraph 12.15a

The layout of the Chilton Mixed-Use package ~~has resulted from a joint working exercise with interested parties. It~~ is for indicative purposes only as the proposed Masterplan will provide more detail.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.8.1 This paragraph has been amended for accuracy.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 178

12.9 PARAGRAPH 12.16 HOUSING

The Objections

782 GO-East
Advise that the specified density of 37 dwellings per hectare is not within the Government`s target for making the most efficient use of land.
1833 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggest revision to land allocation for housing, and deletion of detailed open space provision.
1834 Suffolk County Council/ Donaldsons
Density of housing should not be prescriptively defined in the Local Plan.
6785 Chilton Parish Council;12229 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Object to the proposals for the demolition of the existing houses and orchards at Chilton Priory. Concerned that the land at Chilton Priory, including the orchard, is to be included.
6786 Chilton Parish Council
Chilton Parish Council considers the housing development here and to the east of Chilton Priory would be the loss of yet another green area and an unnecessary further encroachment into the rural landscape.
7593 Mrs V R Hall;7601 Mr & Mrs R D Brown;7716 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8244 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
Objection to the housing density. The density of the housing proposed is not keeping with the surrounding area. Objecting to the increase of 34ha for housing as it will result in less land for public open space and the failure to specify the allocation of land as public open spaces.
7717 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
The allocation of housing to this area seems in breach of the Council's stated objectives.
12230 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
There is no landscaping or tree belt along Grove Lane and the proposed provision along the B1115 is inadequate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.9.1 Some of the above objections are to the 1st Deposit Draft. The relationship between housing and open space has been revised to make it less prescriptive. The density of 37 per hectare is within the 30 – 50 dwellings per acre in PPG3 and is related to the total of 700 dwellings proposed in total for the site. As a total is given and having regard to Policy HS11 of the Plan, mention of density in this paragraph is not essential, but it does indicate that

the density would be within an acceptable range. The detailed proposals for the site will be a matter for the Master Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

12.10 PARAGRAPH 12.17 HOUSING

The Objections

1835 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggests that it is inappropriate to specify the level of affordable housing provision, and that it is only necessary to state that such provision would be in line with national and local policy.
4494 Bovis Homes Limited;8947 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills;8948 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills
Objecting because there is no justification as to why the development at Chilton must provide for 35% of the affordable housing, while the remainder of the residential sites in the District must only provide for 20-35%. Objector would like 12.17 to be redrafted so that all areas require equal amounts.
35% does not reflect the figures set out in paragraph 3.41e, as it fails to accurately describe the appropriate amount of affordable housing required for the Chilton project.
8949 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills
The prescriptive nature of a single figure and not range could be misleading, given that housing needs to be a fluid issue and new studies will be needed every 3 years or so.
8950 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills
The text should state the following: "these properties are likely to be managed by registered social landlords or other providers compliant with Circular 6/98."

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.10.1 As the Council has identified affordable housing needs for the Sudbury and Great Cornard Area there is no reason why this figure should not be specified under advice in paragraph 9a of Circular 6/98. The Council has merely "set indicative targets for specified suitable sites". This percentage approach is supported by the East of England Plan. The supporting text states that properties *are likely* to be held by registered social landlords, not that they

have to be. I have dealt with this matter in the Housing Chapter of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

12.11 PARAGRAPH 12.18 HOUSING

The Objections

1836 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Welcomes the invitation to work up a Master Plan, and that work should start immediately.
6895 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Does not agree with the proposed deletion of the text "at the earliest opportunity" with regard to the production of the Master Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.11.1 These objections have been met. As a Master Plan has already been produced in evidence the words "at the earliest opportunity" are now superfluous.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

12.12 PARAGRAPH 12.19 EMPLOYMENT

The Objections

1837 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Insufficient analysis has been carried out to identify the level of employment land need.
1839 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggest minor rewording of last paragraph in 12.19 (second).
7719 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8254 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
Object to increased allocation of employment land from 11.6 hectares to 19.8 hectares.
7720 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8255 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart

The proposal to merely "encourage" business traffic to access and leave by the new distributor road is unacceptable. There must be a requirement for business traffic to use this road, with the necessary infrastructure put in place to ensure this occurs.

9125 Messrs F, J & A May/Fenn Wright

It is challenged whether the allocation of 19.8 hectares of employment land is sufficient.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 179 to Paragraph 12.19

Second paragraph

12.19**a** Overall, approximately 19.8 hectares of undeveloped land is allocated, with the majority (14.5 hectares) on new sites adjacent to, and accessed by the new distributor road**. Traffic management measures will ensure that** ~~B~~business traffic ~~will be encouraged to~~ accesses~~-~~and leaves the new employment area via the 'Tesco' roundabout route ~~to avoid any undue mix of residential and business traffic~~ **and will preclude access eastwards to avoid any undue mix of residential and business traffic.**

The Objections

13251 Mr & Mrs J Burke

To attempt differential control between heavy goods and private traffic will increase the likelihood of shifting of traffic volume onto Mills Lane.

13254 Mr S J Blackwell

Object to traffic management measures and suggest alternative solution.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.12.1 An Employment Land Study (CD42) was a core document at Inquiry. See also my report on the Chilton development at CP01.

12.12.2 The wording of this paragraph has been revised by pre-inquiry change to include traffic management measures. Detailed requirements would be assessed at the Master Plan stage.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 179

12.13 PARAGRAPH 12.21 SCHOOLS AND PLAYING FIELDS

The Objections

2247 Suffolk County Council
More information needed on extent of "shared facilities" on school campus.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.13.1 I consider these objections have been met with Pre-Inquiry Changes 178 to 199.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Changes 178 to 199

12.14 PARAGRAPH 12.22 SCHOOLS AND PLAYING FIELDS

The Objections

1840 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggest the Master Plan will be used to detail aspects of the development. Land allocation for schools has not been substantiated, and Local Plan is too prescriptive.
2248 Suffolk County Council
The Master Plan should be used to design safe routes. School playing fields are not "public", as they come under the jurisdiction of school governors.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.14.1 I consider these objections have been met by Pre Inquiry Changes 178 to 199

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Changes 178 to 199

12.15 PARAGRAPH 12.23 COMMUNITY AND RETAIL FACILITIES

The Objections

907 Mrs J Antill
Community facilities, local shops, church proposal ill thought out. Not viable with Tesco expansion.

1841 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Land allocation for community use has not been substantiated, and Local Plan is too prescriptive.

4493 Bovis Homes Limited;6896 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker;8952 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal
Delete the phrase "and the relocation of the Tescos superstore." This is repetitious of the earlier reference to the provision of retail facilities.
Object to the changes made to paragraph 12.23 with specific regard to the inclusion of the text "and the relocation of the Tesco superstore". It is accepted that there will have to be retail facilities within the Chilton area however Tesco do not wish to relocate from their existing site and move their store. Therefore, request that the end of the sentence be removed from the paragraph.

4012 Sudbury Town Council;5374 Suffolk County Council
Sudbury Town Council wishes to see the maximum space made available for leisure and community facilities.
Given that there is likely to be significant growth at Chilton, the County Council is concerned to see that there is no reference to library services. Although much of the housing development at Chilton is phased towards the latter part of the Plan period, the County Council would wish to see some reference the need to consider such provision possibly as a branch of the current (already insufficient) Sudbury Library. It is understood that public service provision will be considered as part of the masterplanning for the development and a new library could form a centrepiece of the new suburb's 'heart'.

8951 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal
Delete the words "the development," insert "for this part of Sudbury."

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 180 to Paragraph 12.23

A total of ~~4.7~~ **3.1** hectares are allocated for community and retail facilities. This would enable the creation of a neighbourhood centre

to establish a focus for ~~the development,~~ **this part of Sudbury**, to accommodate new community and retail facilities. ~~and the relocation of the Tesco superstore~~. These facilities, including any ~~community~~ retail buildings, will ~~adjoin~~ **be in close proximity to the** playing field area and will also be well placed geographically to serve residents. A school drop-off ~~location~~ **provision** will be made at this location.

The Objections

13246 Chilton Parish Council
Objects to the removal of "the development" and its replacements by "this part of Sudbury". Whilst we are very conscious of our proximity to Sudbury and our interlinking with it, Chilton remains a distinct area and community in its own right. The development of additional housing and a community centre will strengthen this, not diminish it. Suggest the wording "this part of Sudbury" is replaced by "the Chilton development".

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.15.1 From the evidence at Inquiry I consider that the need for retail and community facilities has been established. I do not consider the supporting text needs to go into any greater detail than allocate a total area and its approximate location, as the refinement of the facilities to be provided and their precise location will evolve in the Master Plan. The pre-inquiry change has met other objections which have been conditionally withdrawn.

12.15.2 Although the neighbourhood centre will act as a focus for the development it may also serve the needs of those living not far from, but outside, the development. This is recognised by the revised wording "This part of Sudbury".

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 180

12.16 PARAGRAPH 12.24 RETAIL EXPANSION

The Objections

1842 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Suggest revision of text as it is too specific in relation to the number of dwellings.
908 Mrs J Antill;2623 Mr P J Holbrook
Tesco should not be allowed to expand, as it would threaten the viability of the town centre.
6884 Tesco Stores Ltd / Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Object to the deletion of Paragraphs 12.24 and 12.25 allocating land for the future expansion of the Tesco food store at the western end of the Chilton Development Area.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 181 to Paragraph 12.24
Re-insert
The District Council considers it prudent to allow for the future expansion of the Tesco superstore at the western end of the Chilton development area. The store may wish to grow in the future, given that 700 new dwellings with a population of perhaps 1,600 people, in addition to new development recently built on the opposite side of the road – in the Springlands area north of Sudbury – will be its catchment.

The Objections

13255 Mr S J Blackwell
The population of 700 new houses at Chilton is initially more likely to be 2,100 with concurrent provision need for more cars parking overnight.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.16.1 With an additional population of some 1600 people in my view there could be no objection in principle to the expansion of the existing Tesco store.

12.16.2 Reducing family sizes have resulted in the Structure Plan occupancy rate of 2.25 persons per household. I do not consider a projected population based on 3.0 would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 181

12.17 PARAGRAPH 12.25 RETAIL EXPANSION

The Objections

1416 Tesco Stores Limited / Healey & Baker
Considers paragraph to over-prescriptive.
1843 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Consider level of detail to be unnecessary and premature.
6885 Tesco Stores / Ltd Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Object to the deletion of Paragraphs 12.24 and 12.25 allocating land for the future expansion of the Tesco food store at the western end of the Chilton Development Area.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 182 to Paragraph 12.25
Re-Inert
Rather than eliminate the possibility of expansion by developing around the store on all sides, it is sensible to allow for some growth on the western side, between the store and the new distributor road, should this be necessary and acceptable in relation to Local Plan retail policies and protection in particular of the vitality and viability of both the Town Centre and the proposed Chilton Neighbourhood Centre.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.17.1 With an additional population of some 1600 people in my view there could be no objection in principle to the expansion of the existing Tesco store. This is a reasonable safeguard by recognising expansion of the store may be an element of the Chilton development.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 182

12.18 PARAGRAPH 12.24a RETAIL EXPANSION

The Objections

4011 Sudbury Town Council
If Tesco were to remain at their current site, then an alternative location would be needed for the retail of bulky goods.
5903 Mr J D Burke;5907 Mrs L K Burke
Objecting to the increased traffic associated with the proposals for bulky goods retailing.
6886 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Objects to the insertion of new Paragraph 12.24a and the principle of allocating the site for alternative uses whilst the site is in use as a food store.
6887 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
9126 Messrs F, J & A May/Fenn Wright
Contrary to paragraph 12.24a Tesco have not expressed a wish to relocate from their existing site to another site within the Chilton Mixed Use Development Area. Object to the proposal to relocate them from their existing store and reallocate their existing site.
6888 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Object to the proposal to obtain access to the Chilton Development Area through their land whilst the site is in active use as a food store. The store is located in an ideal location accessible to its core catchment area and the wider rural market and with good accessibility.
8953 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal
Delete the remainder of paragraph 12.24a after the phrase "provision of bulky goods retailing" and replace with: "The Chilton Inset suggests (as an indicative proposal) that this may be accommodated on the site of the current superstore adjacent to Springlands Way, the A134. In the event that this preferred location is not available within a reasonable period of time then an alternative site should be considered within the development area at Chilton and with satisfactory access from the distributor road."

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 183 to Paragraph 12.24a

~~The Retail Capacity Study 2002 carried out for the Council identified the need for a further allocation of 1.0 hectare in Sudbury for the provision of bulky goods retailing. Tesco have expressed a wish to relocate their existing store, which provides the opportunity to gain access to the development through their land. The availability of their current site (1.7 hectares) means that it can be allocated for the retail need identified in the study.~~
12.25a The Retail Capacity Study 2002 carried out for the Council identified a need for a possible further 10,000 square metres of floorspace in Sudbury for the provision of bulky goods retailing. The Council will make provision of a site

adjacent to the employment allocation for approximately 1.6 hectares of bulky comparison goods retailing and will monitor future need for additional bulky goods floor space.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.18.1 The rewording introduces an alternative site for bulky goods retailing. This will be close to the employment location and off the distributor road.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 183

12.19 PARAGRAPH 12.26 COMMUNITY WOODLAND

The Objections

1000 Mrs J Antill
Concerned that woodland screen is unviable and will not be provided.
1844 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Suggest that precise areas of woodland cannot be defined at this point.
8954 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal
Delete the phrase "visually tree planting will screen the whole fringe of the development."
8955 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal
Delete the sentence "an essential requirement... specified in the masterplan."
8956 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal
The new figure of 30.2ha relates purely to the indicative drawings that are contained in Inset 1c, and must be treated with caution since it will be the function of the masterplan to define such areas in more detail rather than assuming a certain figure and trying to design such a discrete figure.

8957 Ashwell Developments Limited/FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

Object to intention to restrict commencement of development until the woodland has been planted at Chilton. Ashwells are aware of the need to ensure planting begins in parallel with development to ensure there is a minimisation of impact of new development and to ensure that it takes place both in terms of timing and also in appropriate locations. However it would be unreasonable to require substantial areas of new planting un-related to sites which are under construction.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 184 to Paragraph 12.26

The community woodland defining the northern edge of the development area will extend to some 30.2 hectares. Some areas in the allocation will be left as small meadows or glades, to improve aesthetic appreciation and biodiversity through visually **important** tree planting **that** will screen the whole fringe of the development~~. An essential requirement is for the woodland to be planted before development begins and which will be specified in the Master Plan.~~ **Appropriate phases of the woodland will be planted before each phase of the development begins.**

The Objections

13239 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart

The wording should provide for a legally binding and enforceable obligation to procure the planting and subsequent maintenance and support of the community woodland before any development either under current provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or any subsequent legislation.

13247 Chilton Parish Council

Parish Council does not understand why the tree planting which was "an essential requirement" is suddenly not essential. We believe the tree planting actually defines the development (to be called Chilton Woods) and is an essential feature of it.

Propose amendment be removed and the earlier intention reverted to.

13252 Mr & Mrs J Burke

Objects to phased woodland planting.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.19.1 See my report on the Chilton Mixed Use development at Policy CP01 where I have considered objections related to community woodland.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 184

12.20 PARAGRAPH 12.27 COMMUNITY WOODLAND

The Objections

1845 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggest that restriction of new planting to indigenous species is restrictive.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 185 to Paragraph 12.27

Where it covers the Waldingfield Airfield Arable Margins County Wildlife Site, or may have an effect on the ~~weel~~ **well**-known local reptile populations, care will be taken at the design stage to ensure that there is no adverse impact.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.20.1 As this is expected to be a "natural" woodland I believe that indigenous planting would be most appropriate. I do not feel strongly about the inclusion of some non-indigenous species but it is not clear to me what species are being suggested and the reason for them.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 185

12.21 PARAGRAPH 12.29 CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ROUTES

1846 Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Suggest deletion of reference to strategic cycle route.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.21.1 At the 2nd Deposit Draft stage this paragraph was revised. It now refers to the Local Transport Action Plan and the strategic cycle network in context.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

12.22 PARAGRAPH 12.30 PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Objections

1847 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Suggest minor revision to text.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.22.1 Minor change made

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

12.23 PARAGRAPH 12.31 PUBLIC TRANSPORT

1848 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons
Object to prescriptive nature of paragraph.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.23. Although the paragraph is prescriptive it relies on the detail in the Local Transport Action Plan. Public transport is an important part of the Chilton package and I see no reason why the important links should not be emphasised.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

12.24 PARAGRAPH 12.32 PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Objections

6780 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting against 12.32c as traffic congestion would increase on the B1115, and this road is not designed for heavy usage.
6781 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting against 12.32c because it's location is very close to Chilton Hall.
6782 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting against 12.32c. Although the current proposal only refers to using the site for recyclate materials, there is no guarantee that it will not be used for the temporary or long-term storage of dirty waste.
6783 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting against 12.32c because the proposed site is too near to the residents of Chilton Grove and as yet no tree barrier has been suggested between them and the proposed installation.
6784 Chilton Parish Council
Objecting against 12.32c because noise and smells may affect local residents and Chilton Hall.
6791 Chilton Parish Council
In 12.32g, map inset 1 doesn't show part of the cycle track and there is no obvious explanation for the green hatched area immediately to the east of this missing track.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.24.1 The pre-inquiry change relocates the waste transfer station, recycling and refuse depot in the main Chilton employment area. The waste transfer would be in a specially designed enclosed building and in accordance with recommendations in the emerging Suffolk Waste Local Plan. One of the recommended locations for such a facility is within an industrial area, (B2) either existing or proposed as at Chilton. In my view it should rightly be planned as an integral part of the development to serve the needs of the area.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

12.25 POLICY CP01

The Objections

See Appendix at end of this chapter for list of detailed objections.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 186 to Policy CP01
(First paragraph)
The following mixed land-use allocation proposed in the Chilton and Woodhall area north of Sudbury will be required to have an approved Master Plan. Development Briefs will be prepared and submitted at the appropriate time having regard to any proposed phasing programme. The planning application must be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.25.1 I am satisfied from my consideration of the housing and employment needs of the district elsewhere in the Plan that the urban expansion at Sudbury is fully in accordance with advice on major development in the Structure Plan of 2001 and followed the search requirements in Planning Policy Guidance No. 3.

12.25.2 Most of the evidence before me at Inquiry did not raise objection to the principle of such development but to the traffic implications of the urban expansion without a western by pass, which was recently rejected by Ministers (2003). Other objections at Inquiry related to the Council's approach to the community woodland and how it should be planted and maintained.

12.25.3 From my visits to the site and surrounding area of Sudbury, and the evidence on the progression of the Master Plan, I consider the Council has indicated how its objective to create a sustainable community well related to the existing market town would be achieved. Chilton Woods would be self -contained in its range of uses yet provide convenient employment opportunities for those

in the town. New development will obviously increase road traffic but pedestrian, cycle and bus links have been carefully considered in relation to the proposed land uses following advice in Planning Policy Guidance No. 13 to encourage the use of means of travel other than the private car.

12.25.4 Although concern was expressed that the areas of land had changed between the 1st and 2nd Deposit versions of the Plan, the area of 19.0 ha for housing remains the same, although open space and green corridors have been increased. As the need for more employment land has been identified in the employment survey modest adjustments were made to provide for further allocation of employment land under Pre-Inquiry Change 199. (CD99) Pre-Inquiry changes 191,192,194, 195 have provided for neighbourhood centre which could include leisure developments, there is also a recreation and leisure allocation and separate provision for larger community facilities than envisaged at the 1st Deposit stage.

12.25.5 Under Pre Inquiry Change 191 (CD/99) Tesco will remain where it is with the opportunity to expand. I do not consider this materially affects the sustainability of the scheme, whether or not another supermarket sets up in competition in the neighbourhood centre or not. Tesco is within the Chilton development, albeit it on the edge, and those travelling from within the development itself would be travelling short distances to the store and would not need to go out of the area on to the wider local road network.

12.25.6 There has been criticism of the sustainability appraisal for the site. This appraisal was carried out by a panel, only one member of which was from Babergh Council. The work followed the methodology adopted by Suffolk Local Authorities and was based on government advice. The approach was commended by GO-East. I have no reason to suppose such work was superficial or biased.

12.25.7 It has been suggested that alternative sites near Ipswich are better located for Urban Expansion than Sudbury. I accept that there are such sites but they are either not large enough for a comprehensive mixed use scheme, or are required for other purposes. In any

event solving the employment and housing deficiencies at Sudbury identified in Structure Plan Policy and Topic Papers cannot be achieved by developing at Ipswich. Ipswich and Sudbury serve different markets.

12.25.8 Because the Chilton Woods Mixed Use development is a major proposal and an important part of the residential and employment provision for the Plan period involving a new neighbourhood north of Sudbury, the Council has provided detailed evidence to inform the local plan process through the preparation of the Master Plan. Some of this evidence and the resultant objections are more detailed than I would normally expect in support of a Local Plan allocation. I also had detailed evidence about an alternative scheme on behalf of Messrs FJ and A May which I have considered below.

Highways

12.25.9 The main issue on Chilton was that of traffic, particularly now that the western by pass has been rejected by Ministers. These concerns were about the increase in traffic and its impact on the historic part of the town.

12.25.10 Although those living in Chilton Woods will choose where they work, the principle behind the development is to achieve a sustainable relationship between jobs, homes and services by encouraging as much self-containment as possible. There will be a range of employment opportunities locally both within the Chilton Woods development and close by outside it.

12.25.11 Objectors consider that there is no reason why the employment and travel patterns of the Chilton Wood residents will reflect those which have evolved over the years in the town. I agree, but as Chilton Woods is a comprehensive sustainable scheme intending to cater for many of its own needs the increase in housing may well have less impact on vehicular traffic than envisaged by the Mouchel Parkman and Palmer Associates studies and consequently less than envisaged by Mr Savell.

12.25.12 Normally at the Local Plan stage such detailed highway evidence is not available, whereas at this Inquiry two main sources were. Both Mouchel Parkman and Palmer

Associates rely on TIA's. Palmer Associates in particular made it clear in the 2nd Draft TIA that its scope and format bas based on current best practice advice contained in Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessment. I am also satisfied from Mr Palmer's evidence that the assumptions and estimates were based on empirical data, which provided for the most reliable available information on up o date travel patterns in and around Sudbury. The PARAMICS model was the most recent source of date available, based on a wide range of empirical data and in my view a reasonable source of information about travel patterns in the area I consider the County Council as highway authority has pursued its role diligently, by employing Mouchel Parkman to carry out an independent study to validate the work carried out by Palmer Associates on behalf of Ashwell Developments Limited. These two firms of consultants, who chose different "existing zones", against other housing zone distributions, for comparison with Chilton Woods, come to similar conclusions.

12.25.13 I do not consider that the highway consultants have relied on out of date traffic count data as these have been subject to Tempro growth rates, the recognised method of projecting traffic growth. I accept that the TIA's and the TRICS trip rates are also intended to represent the "worst case" scenario in terms of traffic growth, as they have not taken into account a reduction in the use of the car. This modal shift towards non-car use is an integral part of government policy in Planning Policy Guidance No. 13 and in the Chilton Woods development.

12.25.14 Objectors have argued that Stansted Airport as the biggest employer in the region will attract workers living in Chilton Woods. From my past involvement with the Uttlesford Local Plan (which includes Stansted Airport) I consider this to be unlikely on any scale. Evidence in connection with that Inquiry showed that although some workers did travel long distances to the airport, most of them were skilled workers who used the M11 corridor, the majority coming from the south. Also because of the "shift" system for both airport workers and aircrew many did not travel during rush hours. There had also been an over assessment of airport related housing in the past and even with the throughput increasing to

25mmpa no additional housing allocations were required. It had been recommended that Harlow would accommodate further local business that needed to be close to an international airport where there is a ready supply of labour within reasonable distance.

12.25.15 There are also other key centres closer to Sudbury than the airport which have a range of employment opportunities, the nearest being Colchester, with its substantial development at the old Severalls Hospital site and The Garrison, Ipswich and Bury St Edmunds. Commuters to these would not have to travel through the Key Traffic Reduction Area of Sudbury. Colchester also has a range of reasonably priced properties better linked to the airport than Sudbury.

12.25.16 Car travellers flying from Stansted Airport would be likely to pass through the KTRA but although there are flights throughout the day many of the business and holiday flights are early morning, and with the long checking in period, would involve passengers leaving Sudbury well before morning rush hour.

12.25.17 Even if this "worse case" situation comes to pass, which I consider unlikely, I do not believe the Chilton Woods proposal could be rejected on grounds of traffic growth or the impact of additional traffic in or around Sudbury

12.25.18 I note that a more recent detailed assessment of HGV' s using Ballingdon Bridge has been carried out since the 2nd draft TIA. I was surprised at the high level of HGV's identified in that report. I find the later peak hour assessments more realistic except that I consider it misleading to exclude all OGV1 vehicles as this category includes a number of large commercial vehicles.

12.25.19 Concern has been expressed about links to Great Cornard. However, from my visit I found that Great Cornard, which contains about 40% of the population of the town, has its own schools, from primary to upper, its own neighbourhood centre, its own supermarket and supermarket proposal, a dual use sports centre, community centre and library. There are also two industrial estates between Great Cornard and Chilton, the Chilton Industrial Estate and the Churchfield Road site. Even if people from Great Cornard do travel to

Chilton to work or use facilities, a cycle route is proposed together with improved bus services between the two centres. The Chilton employment area will also be well related to Long Melford with its population of about 3400. All of the development at Chilton would be within 400m of a bus route.

12.25.20 Accident statistics were produced for the B1115 at Inquiry but looking at the detail of the 5 serious accidents I do not consider they indicate an inherent safety problem. Although the highway authority takes accident statistics seriously and has put measures in to improve safety, a 40 mph limit was introduced in November 2003, it cannot control abuses caused by drivers travelling at excessive speed, or breaking the speed limit. I do not believe that the provision of an emergency access on to the B1115 in the vicinity of Chilton Priory, with a barrier and key access, would be of significance in highway safety terms.

12.25.21 Although I conclude that the increase in traffic through Sudbury would not justify a rejection of the Chilton Woods development, given the nature of the present unsatisfactory road network, and the effect on the historic environment, which cries out for a by pass or relief road to provide an alternate route for A131 traffic, there is no chance of traffic reduction in the KTRA. Traffic using the A131, including HGV's, will continue to pass through the town via a network of narrow medieval streets in the historic core of the town. There is congestion and environmental degradation. Although I note that there were objections from other local authorities to the by pass, and it was rejected because of adverse environmental impacts, not on traffic grounds, I am not aware of the detailed factors as such evidence is not before me.

12.25.22 However, on the basis of the detailed traffic analysis at this Inquiry, it seems to me that significant environmental improvement in Sudbury can only be achieved by the provision of a western relief road somewhere. Without a by pass it will not be possible to implement related traffic reduction measures of between 70 and 80% and the traffic management and the accessibility schemes are most unlikely to offset the predicted traffic increases over the Plan period.

12.25.23 Nevertheless, although I accept that the situation is unsatisfactory and that the traffic levels, based on national forecasts, are expected to increase to between 13% and 22% by 2011 (CD80F), these figures refer to "in and around Sudbury and Great Cornard" not just the historic core or KTRA. Although consultants may not have taken specific developments into account they will have included projected traffic increases over the Plan period. Some developments in the area are a replacement of established uses, such as the hospital, so the traffic pattern may change but the increases in traffic overall will not be significant.

12.25.24 As the Tesco expansion will be within the Chilton Woods scheme it will no doubt take into account the future customers from the housing to be built within that development. In my view the impact on the core from traffic is primarily because there is no by pass, and that the sustainable Chilton Woods development, of itself, will not add significantly to traffic flows.

12.25.25 The Sudbury and Great Cornard Transport Action Plan (CD80F page 9) found the volume of through traffic to be low, varying from 7% in the morning peak to 11% in the evening peak. It was also found that the vast majority of trips accessing Sudbury and Great Cornard had a purpose for being in the area. As the historic core of Sudbury is also an important commercial area essential traffic will still need to access it regardless of its impact on the mediaeval street pattern and the highway network.

12.25.26 Chilton Woods, of itself, is expected to lead to an increase in traffic through the KTRA by an assessed 8 to 9%. I take the view that this increase will not be "small", and would result in an extension of the rush hour traffic over a longer period. This would be noticeable but I do not consider it would have a discernible *environmental* impact over and above what is already projected and as defined in Rule 1 of the Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic and in IHE Guidelines on Traffic Impact Assessment. There is also the safeguard that a full Transport Assessment would be required by the highway authority at the detailed planning application

stage in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance No. 13.

Woodland.

12.25.27 There is concern that the woodland is to be provided in a phased manner whereas it was stated in the 2nd Alteration of the Plan at paragraph 12.26 "An essential requirement is for the woodland to be planted before development begins". Part of local concern seems to stem from another circumstance where promised planting did not occur. I see no reason why regardless of whether the woodland is planted in one go or phased this should be the case here, as the planting would be subject to an enforceable Section 106 agreement. The Council was only suggesting striking out reference to a Section 106 agreement in Policy CP01g because it was not sure of impending legislation. It is apparent this striking out is no longer necessary and I agree that PIC 197 should not be included in the plan.

.

12.25.28 It seems to me that as the development would take about 10 years to complete that to plant the whole of the woodland prior to the commencement of any development would not be essential to the appearance or setting of the scheme. The period of construction is long enough for phases to be introduced. All that is necessary is to ensure that a dense enough swathe of planting takes place prior to the commencement of the development to ensure an effective screen which can be later be thickened and extended into a wood.

12.25.29 I had understood from past experience in hearing evidence about woodland from various wildlife trusts, that far greater biodiversity will be achieved by having woodland at different stages of development and that there is, therefore, a considerable ecological advantage in not planting all at once. There is also obviously a financial advantage in not planting all at once, particularly on a scheme such as this where there will be other high infrastructure costs. Regardless of this it seems to me that the Council promised planting prior to commencement, presumably because of local pressures, without considering the implications of its promise. This has led to an expectation of a new "one off" woodland, which in my view is unnecessary to achieve the best

result, and would also make it impossible for any part of the new community to be actively involved with its "own" woodland.

12.25.30 Details related to the future maintenance of the woodland are too prescriptive for a Local Plan policy. They are part of the development control process and Trusts or other specialist bodies may be involved at different times. The Council accepts that a proactive approach is necessary and long term planning obligations are required.

Alternative Proposal - Messrs F.J. May and A. May

12.25.31 The Objector's broadly endorse the aims expressed in Section 7 of the Chiltern Woods Masterplan Framework dealing with "sustainability and movement" that:

- New development at Chilton Woods is inextricably linked to the concept of sustainability (paragraph.7.1)
- The need to deliver a form of development that encourages the efficient use of energy and buildings and transport (paragraph.7.2)
- In terms of wider transport issues, one of the main priorities within the Chilton Woods development is to promote the accessibility of local and town facilities by public transport, cycle and foot but at the same time acknowledging the realistic need to accommodate vehicular traffic (paragraph 7.4)
- The location of Chilton presents a real opportunity for it to be well integrated into the existing urban area of Sudbury (paragraph 7.8)

12.25.32 The Objectors have suggested revised wording for Policy CP01, which basically proposes the removal of site specific locations.

12.25.33 Policy CR0 1 envisages 700 dwellings, some 14.9 ha of employment and 8.2ha of playing field area. In addition a neighbourhood centre, community and recreational facilities would be located within the central/eastern residential zone. The main employment area would be to the west. Both the Master Plan and the Palmer Associates Traffic Impact Assessment indicate that the development would be served by a spine road which

would be designed so that heavy goods vehicles would be precluded from its eastern limb where it would serve housing.

12.25.34 In my view there are two basic differences in the Master Plan prepared by and on behalf of the Council and that prepared for the Objectors. The Objector's plan would involve the repositioning of the spine road towards the edge of the site as an outer distributor and exchanging the employment location from the western part of the site to a more central position, and the residential area replacing it. The Objector considers this would be more likely to encourage linked trips.

12.25.35 The Objector's consider that the alternative layout would encourage more trips on foot and involve mainly shorter trips to primary employment uses, the supermarket and the school. Other community and leisure facilities would be further away but these would be used by fewer people. All dwellings on the alternative layout would be within 400mm of a bus stop. The Objector's believe that the adoption of a peripheral distributor with an inter zonal barrier preventing cross traffic movements would act as a disincentive to use the car for very short local trips and remove significant traffic from the core development area. Also that because of the impact on the Stour valley it would be preferable if development on the western part of the Chilton neighbourhood did not incorporate an undue element of high and massive buildings,

12.25.36 With the intensive swathe of community woodland and by moving the industry back on the ridge I do not consider industrial buildings would be obtrusive from the surrounding countryside. From the evidence the vehicular accessibility from Great Cornard to the employment areas on both schemes seems to be about the same. The cycle route on the alternative scheme would be slightly shorter but in my view not significantly so. Also with a cycle route alongside Aubrey Drive and a dedicated link adjacent to the school the employment area would not be isolated. It is likely that people in Long Melford some 4km to the north would also look towards Chilton for work and the Master Plan location would be more advantageous than the alternative. Also the employment location in the Master Plan is well

related to existing housing south of Springlands Way, and the proposed housing area well related to serve Woodhall Business Park and Chilton Industrial Estate. It seems to me that the distribution of existing and proposed employment areas in the Master Plan is such that all housing lies within 800m of employment. Although Tesco would be closer to housing on the alternative scheme I do not consider this to be of particular importance as it is likely that the weekly shop would be by car because of its bulk. Top up shopping could either be at Tesco or the neighbourhood centre.

.

12.25.37 The outer distributor road on the alternative scheme would be likely to encourage trips via Acton and Great Waldingfield, whereas linking Acton Lane to the distributor road as far south as possible would encourage development to use Northern Road and Springlands Way. The spine road as proposed in the Master plan would serve a variety of uses throughout its length and could be designed in such a way that HGVs are accommodated up to the neighbourhood centre with a lower standard of road to the east.

12.25.38 I had understood from other sessions of the Inquiry that wildlife corridors were to be linked to the woodland and the alternative peripheral route would discourage this. The outer route would also physically and visually separate the woodland from the development whereas I consider it should be an integral part of it.

12.25.39 Although the alternative scheme has some merit in terms of walking and cycling distances I do not consider these outweigh the disadvantages which I have referred to above. I cannot identify any material advantage in relocating the employment and residential uses. The Objector considers that the Environmental Impact Study should compare the two schemes. I agree this would be one approach but as I have not identified from the Inquiry material deficiencies in the Council's scheme I do believe such comparison is necessary.

12.25.40 With regard to the wording of Policy CR01 and the revised wording suggested by the Objectors my first thoughts were that the criteria in the Plan referring to locations was too detailed. I have had the opportunity to test the criteria at Inquiry against the alternative

suggested by the Objectors. Accepting that the alternative has some merits, I consider that the Council, the highway authority and the consultants have produced a well thought out Master Plan package for the Chilton Woods development based on sound planning and highway principles. Because off this, and accepting that the policy requires the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment I basically accept the wording of Policy CP0 1 in preference to the more general policy approach favoured by the Objector, with the exception that some minor changes are necessary.

12.25.41 I agree from the evidence at Inquiry that the Local Plan policy should set out the approximate locations and principles of development, but I am still concerned about the inclusion of the Master Plan on the Proposals Map. In my experience Master Plans, like Development Briefs, tend to evolve over time and if changes were found to be necessary after the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment, there would be less flexibility for change if the Master Plan has been adopted as part of the Local Plan. People looking to the Plan for certainty might be concerned about yet further change from an adopted Plan. I consider that the Master Plan should be a supplementary document with the Proposals Map merely defining the allocation site and how access would be provided. The wording of the policy is specific enough to identify approximate areas of development for particular purposes and the Master plan as a supplementary document would refine this.

* * *

Other Matters

12.25.42 Many of the above objections relate to detailed matters which will be dealt with at the planning application stage, or are not matters for a Local Plan policy. Detailed landscaping, drainage systems, effect on residential amenity and impact on individual properties, effect on biodiversity, layout of junctions and signage, how boundaries will be dealt with, smell, light pollution, the routes and design of cycle and pedestrian links are all matters to be considered at the planning application stage. Financial aspects of the development and land ownership are not matters for the Local Plan.

12.25.43 A number of the objections above have also been resolved or partially resolved as a result of discussions on the Master Plan and have been subject to the Pre-Inquiry Changes listed below. Also drafting errors have been corrected.

12.25.44 Inset Maps are at present an acceptable format used by most Council's as an economical and reasonably compact way of producing plans. I accept they are not always convenient to use but the alternative involves a number of very large and bulky maps.

12.25.45 Although the policy is detailed I am satisfied from Inquiry that it is soundly based and clearly indicates to those reading the local plan what would be required.

12.25.46 As there is only likely to be a 10 year period up to 2016 following adoption I do not consider it appropriate to attempt to phase the development over this short time scale.

12.25.47 8.2 hectares are now being provided for recreation and leisure facilities and with 700 dwellings and some 1600 people under the NPFA standard advised in PPG17 this would generate a need for 3.9 hectares of recreation land. Although this is a generous overall provision I agree that it would be helpful to state the minimum requirement in the supporting text as suggested by the objector. If building is required on the Acton Lane school playing fields there appears to be adequate playing field allocation to allow this. However, this can be determined at the planning application stage.

12.25.48 It has been suggested that reference to the Chilton proposal should be made in the Shopping Chapter of the plan. I see no need for this as the Chilton Chapter is specifically related to the Chilton Woods development in its entirety and duplication is not required.

12.25.49 I agree with the Objector that a clearer definition of "bulky" goods would be helpful.

12.25.50 As 5th bullet point relates to paragraph 12.21 and 12.22 - Schools and Playing Fields, education provision on an

education site, reference to private nursery provision in the supporting text would not be appropriate

12.25.51 In the 2nd Deposit Draft Plan CP01a - 4th bullet point the words "will be required" were deleted. In the context of the overall policy these words are not required.

12.25.52 In CP01b 1st bullet point and 3rd bullet point the word "minimise" has been criticised. I do not consider that to add "as far as practical" would be helpful in that if the solution were not practical it would be unlikely to be acceptable. I have considered whether the words "reduce" or "lessen" would be a reasonable option but they might not result in sufficient reduction. I consider the existing wording should remain.

12.25.53 In CP01a 3rd bullet point and CP01b 2nd bullet point I see no reason why a "high" quality of layout, design and landscaping should not be required for both the housing and employment sites. A higher standard is being urged in the ODPM Sustainable Communities Plan.

12.25.54 I have dealt with the proposal for a waste transfer station separately below

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan

a) in accordance with Pre-inquiry Changes 38, 178, 179,183, 184, 186, 188, 190, 191,192, 195, 199

b) by adding after paragraph 12.22 **There is a minimum need for 3.9 hectares of formal recreation provision within the development based on National Playing Field Association standards. 8.2 hectares is proposed in addition to formal children's play areas which would be required within the housing areas"**

c) by providing a clearer definition of bulky goods

d) by deleting the Master Plan from the Proposals Map

12.26 Policy CP01a)

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 187 to Policy CP01a
(First paragraph)
19.0 hectares of net developable land to the north-west and south-east of Acton Lane are proposed for residential development. Access will be provided from a new distributor road linking the roundabout adjacent to the existing Tesco superstore on Springlands Way with ~~the existing spine road (new housing development between Action Lane and Waldingfield Road)~~ **Aubrey Drive**. Proposals are expected to provide:

The Objections

None

12.27 Policy CP01b)

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 188 to Policy CP01b)
14.~~5~~**9** hectares of land to the north of the Woodhall Business Park, ~~on both sides of the distributor road,~~ are allocated for general employment use. Access to this development will be from the new distributor road, and referred to at (a) above. Proposals for development are expected to provide:

- for the layout of the development to be designed to encourage business traffic to access and leave via the new distributor road connection with the Tesco roundabout route, so as to minimise conflict between residential and business traffic;
- **provision for a waste transfer station, household and recycling and refuse depot;**
- a high standard of layout, design and landscaping. This must meet relevant adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to new employment development;
- for the layout of the development to minimise visual and noise intrusion on adjacent land uses;
- substantial structural landscaping to be provided ~~before~~ **in phase with** the development ~~begins~~;
- provision for a workplace nursery, to cater for at least 60 places, should be made **within the Chilton development** which offers an attractive environment at an accessible location; ~~This could be accommodated in or adjacent to the schools campus referred to at (f) below. Developers are~~

~~advised to make early contact with the Local Education Authority~~;

- applications for new employment development will be expected to be accompanied by a "green travel plan", which promotes sustainable modes of transport for staff and visitors;
- adequate advance signing is provided; and
- provision is made for an appropriate stopping facility with an information board at the entrance(s) to the site.

The Objections

13241 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Object to the wording "substantial structural landscaping to be provided in phase with the development". The original wording should be maintained.
13253 Mr & Mrs J Burke
Objects to resiting of waste transfer station. It is unacceptable to us for the obvious reasons of noise, traffic, stench and light pollution. Inappropriate location close to residential housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.27.1 As the development will be phased I consider it practical for the structural landscaping to be similarly phased. See my report on the community woodland at CP01

12.27.2 The pre-inquiry change relocates the waste transfer station, recycling and refuse depot in the main Chilton employment area. The waste transfer would be in a specially designed enclosed building and in accordance with recommendations in the emerging Suffolk Waste Local Plan. One of the recommended locations for such a facility is within an industrial area, (B2) either existing or proposed as at Chilton. In my view it should rightly be planned as an integral part of the development to serve the needs of the community in this area.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

12.28 Policy CP01c)

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 189 to Policy CP01c)

5.3 hectares of land to the north of Waldingfield Road are allocated for ~~general~~ employment use **which will have only a low impact in terms of their traffic generation and on residential amenity.** Access to this development will be by Waldingfield Road. ~~The provision of a waste transfer station, household and recycling and refuse depot is required to be made within the site.~~

The Objections

13242 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Object to any increased access to this development at Waldingfield Road on the grounds that B1115 is a road inadequate for further traffic levels.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.28.1 See my report at CP01 above on the highway implications of the Chilton Woods development

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

---

12.29 Policy CP01d), d)a), e),f)i, f)ii, f)iii

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 190 to Policy CP01d)

d)i) ~~1.7~~ **1.6** hectares of land ~~occupied by~~ **to the east of** the existing Tesco superstore are allocated for bulky goods retail provision, with access from the new distributor road. **Should the anticipated demand for this use not materialise consideration will be given to employment uses on the site.**

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 191 to Policy CP01d)a)

~~**2.9**~~ 1.3 **hectares of land** to the west of the existing Tesco superstore, as shown on the Proposals Map, **are allocated** for retail use to allow **for the potential** ~~**relocation**~~ expansion **of the existing superstore**~~**, together with the provison of**~~

~~community facilities~~**. Proposals for development are expected to provide:**

- **evidence that there is a need for such development and there will be no material adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Sudbury town centre or on the establishment of the proposed Chilton Neighbourhood Centre and its subsequent vitality and viability. Given the inevitable uncertainty in such assessments contributions will be sought for strengthening the town centre and the Chilton development;**
- structural landscaping along the edge of the new distributor road;
- **a new** vehicular access **to the superstore delivery facility is required** from the new distributor road, together with pedestrian and cycle friendly ~~crossing facilities on the new distributor road~~ **access to the site from the Chilton development**;
- a "green travel plan" that seeks to promote sustainable modes of transport for store deliveries, staff and customers; **and**
- **appropriate alterations to the existing roundabout junction with the A134.**

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 192 to Policy CP01e)

~~1.8~~ **8.2** hectares of land, is allocated for **recreation and** leisure facilities. Access will be by the new distributor road referred to at (a) above. Proposals will be expected to provide:

- structural landscaping along the edge of the new distributor road;
- a high standard of layout and design for all buildings~~, including clubhouses and stands;~~
- a co-ordinated approach to the provision of structures, such as floodlights and buildings for storage, ground staff; and
- any floodlighting to accord with Policy EN22;
- **a multi-use games area/"teen zone."**

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 193 to Policy CP01f)i

f)i) 6.4 hectares of land, are allocated for education and associated playing field use, to produce a **nursery,** primary and middle school campus, based on the existing All Saints Middle School.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 194 to Policy CP01f)ii

1.55 hectares of land are proposed for a neighbourhood centre accessed from the distributor road providing between 2,300 and 2,700 square metres of retail floorspace subject to a Retail Impact Assessment and examination of the sequential test demonstrating that there is no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 195 to Policy CP01f)iii

1.55 hectares of land are proposed for community facilities.

The Objections

None

12.30 Policy CP01g)

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 196 to Policy CP01g)

It is a requirement that provision of the woodland will include financial arrangements for its long-term management and for the local community to be involved in its establishment and management. Its provision is a requirement of (a), (b), (c) and (d) above and will be expected to be provided in ~~advance of any of the~~ **phase with these** other development**s.**

Provision of the new distributor road or part of it will be a requirement of the allocations (a), (b), (d), (e) and (f) above.
The new road will be carefully landscaped and include appropriately designed pedestrian and cycle crossing points, to ensure safe movement between the various elements of the development. A section from the Tesco roundabout will be of a suitable standard to provide access to the employment areas **and the neighbourhood centre**, while the remainder will be designed to a standard to serve the residential and community areas. Appropriate traffic management measures will be needed to ensure that commercial traffic uses the ~~higher standard~~ **appropriate** access **provided**.

The Objections

13244 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Original wording should be maintained so that proper financial arrangements are in place for the long term management of the woodland in advance pursuant to legally enforceable agreements.
13248 Chilton Parish Council

Believe it is a serious mistake to remove the plan to secure financial arrangements for the long-term management of the woodlands prior to development of the housing. If the financial management and day-to-day running of the woodland is not organised before housing development begins we could well end up with a situation where no such management exists and the whole of the wooded area will fall into disarray and remain unsupported.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 197 to Policy CP01g)

The District Council will seek a Planning Obligation ~~under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990~~ to provide for:

- highway improvements to the A134 Springlands Way/Northern Road to maintain and improve junction capacity and safety;
- improvements to maintain and facilitate cycling and pedestrian routes between the development and Sudbury town centre, including safe crossing of the A134 **and linking to neighbouring villages;**
- improvements for cycling and pedestrians on Waldingfield Road;
- provision of bus priority measures and associated improvements extending from the development to Sudbury town centre;
- investigation of facilities for potential real-time information provision or hail-and-ride service options within the development;
- contributions for bus service to and within the development;
- ~~contributions to works identified in the approved Local Transport Action Plan where development traffic is proven to have a material adverse impact;~~
- traffic management measures to prevent the use of Acton Lane north ~~or~~ **of** the development as a short cut to outlying areas from the new housing;
- ~~the proportionate level of financial contributions towards education provision and developers contributions to local bus services;~~
- **Belle Vue junction improvements;**
- **Acton Lane Cycle Link (southwest of Springlands Way);**
- affordable and small houses;
- the provision and long-term management of the community woodland;
  the provision and ~~future~~ long-term management of structural landscaping, and public open space and play areas in the development.

The Objections

13245 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Object to deletion of 'under Section 106 of the Town and Counctry Planning Act 1990'. This should be retained.
13256 Mr S J Blackwell
Object to Belle Vue junction improvements and suggests other solutions including completion of the Western Bypass.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.30.1 I have dealt with both the highway and woodland objections at CP01 above

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by not including PIC197 where it deletes reference to Section 106 agreements.

12.31 POLICY CP02

The Objections

7742 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
The land proposed for development of a cemetery is not stated to be shown on the proposals map, therefore objecting because it is unknown which precise area is subject to proposal. Objector would like revision of the proposal map.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.31.1 The site has been clearly identified by the Council but was inadvertently omitted from the 2nd Deposit draft Map. The words "as shown on the proposals Map" were only deleted in this policy and in other policies of the plan because they are unnecessary. Allocations are defined by site, or symbol, on the Proposals Maps.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

12.32 INSET MAP 1

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 198 to Inset Map 1

Existing green hatched area to be shaded green to indicate structural landscaping.
Existing 'footpath' north of employment allocation to become cycle route and be joined to cycle route at south-east of employment allocation.
Site allocated for cemetery (omitted from 2nd DD version in error) to be shaded.

The Objections

13249 Mr & Mrs J Burke
The cycle route/footpaths linking the existing bridleway below Longwall, is not established as public right of way across the field to the west of the scheme, it stops halfway.
13250 Mr & Mrs J Burke
Distributor road is much closer to our house than before with access from a more westerly point. This will create greater noise and light pollution.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.32.1 The Inset Map has been corrected. The precise alignment of the distributor road and its effects will be determined by an Environmental Impact Assessment at the planning application stage.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

12.33 INSET MAP 1C

The Objections

4568 Somerfield Stores Limited/Roger Tym and Partners
Objecting against map inset 1c because although the policy states that 2.9ha of land have been allocated for the relocation of the

superstore and community facilities, the allocated site is not shown on the map.

6897 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Object to the changes made to Inset Map 1 C with regard to the relocation of the main distributor road, changes made to the Tesco roundabout at Springlands Way and the route the proposed road will now take running through the existing Tesco store.

6898 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Object to the changes made to Inset Map 1 C with regard to allocation of the Tesco site for alternative uses.

8222 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
The land proposed for development of a cemetery is not stated to be shown on the proposals map, therefore objecting because it is unknown which precise area is subject to proposal. Objector would like revision of the proposal map.

9130 Messrs F, J & A May/Fenn Wright
Objecting to many of the various amendments made to Map Inset 1c since the First Deposit Draft.

B.D.C Pre-Inquiry Change 199 to Inset Map 1c

Amend inset map 1c for consistency with the Masterplan.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.33.1 The Inset map has been amended in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change. However, see my recommendation at Policy CP01

RECOMMENDATION

See my recommendation at Policy CP01

12.34 POLICY OR TEXT OMISSIONS

The Objections

367 Mrs J M Cole
Suggests that development should take place nearer the A134 towards Long Melford, otherwise if Chilton goes ahead then

development should not go outside the community woodland boundary.

847 Albion Business Service / Whymark & Moulton

Objection to omission of motel site from proposal.

1134 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce

Suggest that improvements to Springlands Way be considered, in the event of the development being undertaken, and on the completion of the bypass.

1412 Tesco Stores Limited / Healey & Baker

Policy CP01 (d) and (e) and paragraphs 12.23 - 5 refer specifically to the provision of new local shops and an extension to the existing Tesco superstore in the Chilton development area. We consider that reference should be made in the Shopping Chapter to such additional retail provision and the possible development of a local centre in this area.

1827 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons

Object to lack of mention of Master Plan in chapter.

2242 Suffolk County Council

Proposal Map: the title of this map should clearly state that it is indicative and subject to the development of a Master Plan. It would be helpful to have a complete key. It is unclear what 'bus only sections' means with regard to the distributor road.

2680 Somerfield Stores Limited / Roger Tym and Partners

Suggests that submitted format of inset maps can cause confusion, and that a comprehensive map be provided.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.34.1 The site near the A134 at Long Melford clearly separates Sudbury and Long Melford and development of the scale required would erode this separate identity and be intrusive in the landscape. It is not as convenient a location for employment or other facilities, nor would it be as well linked by public transport. The agricultural land is of high quality.

12.34.2 The Plan is intended to be read as a whole. Both the Hadleigh and the Chilton Chapters of the Plan are intended to deal specifically with those areas. I see no need to repeat the reference to additional shopping provision in the Shopping Chapter of the plan

12.34.3 See my report on Policy CP01 regarding the Proposals Map and Master Plan

RECOMMENDATION

See Policy CP01

12.35 MISCELLANEOUS

The Objections

1001 Mrs J Antill
Considers gap to Newman's Green is adequate, but wants more positive guarantee that its integrity will be respected. Concerned that there should not be development on the Chilton airfield.
1008 Mr and Mrs G E Moore
Concerned at implication of development through increased traffic on existing Tesco roundabout.
1889 Mr S J Blackwell
Suggests that Suffolk CC as planning authority and landowner are applying double standards to achieve the goal of development at Chilton. Queries the findings of traffic surveys and suggests that they be open to public scrutiny.
2635 Mr J R Michell
Given the size of the proposal, the information provided is basic and there are serious questions about the impact on Sudbury town centre; proper consideration needs to be given to infrastructure provision; there is concern over the traffic implications; the bypass should be built at an early stage; and a need has not been established for new employment land provision.
1838 (Map DD1/06) Suffolk County Council/Donaldsons
Proposals Map has not been agreed, and SCC together with a development partner wishes to work up detail with BDC.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.35.1 As Newmans Green is a settlement surrounded by countryside and subject to countryside policies in the Plan it is not clear to me what other guarantees the Council can offer. The only part of the airfield shown for development in the Chilton Mixed Use development package is the area to the north of Great Waldlingfield Road which is a previously developed area and does not form part of the open airfield.

12.35.2 The traffic implications of the development have been dealt with at Policy CP01. See the additional bullet points at CP01g dealing with traffic matters.

12.35.3 Suffolk County Council as planning authority did not appear at Inquiry. I am satisfied that the County Council as highway authority acted with integrity by producing independent professional evidence which was subject to scrutiny at Inquiry.

12.35.4 For a local plan Inquiry I have had more information than is necessary as much work has been done to obtain agreement to the Master Plan. Details of the scheme and an alternative proposed were considered at Inquiry. See my report at CP01above

12.35.5 The Proposals map has been subject to change. Again see my report at Policy CP01

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

---

Appendix Objections to CP01

118 Mr D F Hamand
Infrastructure not fully thought through. Small extension for school does not look adequate for scale of development. Traffic situation in town is not critical at the moment, but would be if development goes ahead.
120 Mr D F Hamand
Cycle route is planned close to property, concerned it should not be too close. A tree screen would help and create a wildlife corridor, it would also prevent cyclists falling in the ditch.
121 Mrs A Brace
Object to the increase in traffic on B1115 due to more housing. Drivers exceed the speed limit and use the new roundabout like a chicane. There may be increased numbers of lorries if they are

restricted on Valley Road. Housing site in Waldingfield will also put more traffic on the road.

134 Mrs M C Whybrow

Object to residential development on orchards and up to the edge of the airfield as it will spoil a picturesque area and walks in the area. A wooded area between the houses and the airfield would be better.

219 Mr & Mrs D Barwood

Waldingfield Road unable to take more traffic and cannot be crossed safely.
Roundabout on B1115 is in the wrong place.
Speed is so bad people cannot leave their drives.
Paths are dangerous.
Traffic is the problem, buses go to the wrong place at wrong time.
Development package would be better located to the Sudbury side of the Melford bypass. There is plenty of employment land and buildings already.
Keep Chilton as a village and Sudbury as a market town.
There are too few facilities for young people such as cinemas. Will the sewage works cope?

221 Mr & Mrs B M Duce

Extra traffic on Waldingfield Road unacceptable, hard to exit drive and a number of recent accidents. More houses and jobs will make it worse.
Large pond adjacent to property which contains great crested newts and other wildlife in the pond and in the vicinity which will be lost with development.
Will lose footpaths on airfield and view from our house.

241 Mr B H Lean; 310 Mr L A Pittock;384 Mr P M Worton; 386 Mrs A E Worton;502 Mr C S Moss/Acton Parish Council; 552 Mr C Dark;1242 Mrs C Collier;1324 Mr S Bill;1533 Mr D G Frost;1538 Miss S Wells;1549 Mr EA Battman;1560 Mrs V J Wright/Acton Parish Council;1562 Mr R C Wright/Acton Parish Council;1774 Mrs L J Verhaest;1777 Mr A J Vooght 1974 Mrs D M Went;1982 Mr R C Lloyd

Support comments of Acton Parish Council. Access to school only via Acton Lane sounds a good idea.

263 Mr P Clifford

Do not oppose Sudbury growing and consider this the best site, but concerned at impact on roads and infrastructure.
Waldingfield Road narrowand busy, development will lead to more congestion. Northern Road will also be more congested.
Churchfield Road roundabout is badly sited and dangerous.

276 Mr A K Shapley

Infrastructure, particularly roads unsuitable for development on this scale.

Development should be positioned so traffic generated has access to major roads and avoid overloaded minor roads, eg land west of Tesco.
Too great an increase in traffic flow on already congested Waldingfield Road.
New roundabout on B1115 too close to Northern Road/Springlands Way roundabout. Heavy traffic which used to use Valley Road now takes this route. Western Bypass will put more traffic on Northern Road and traffic will tail back across new roundabout. When more of Churchfields Road is developed the situation will get worse. 700 houses and industrial development will make a bad situation worse. The only way to significantly improve traffic flow would be to build a new outer bypass from Tesco roundabout to Newton Road (as 1992 proposal).
If land off Aubrey Drive for community facilities is not extended behind St Mary's Close a corridor of trees should be planted with the cycle way winding through to

279 Revd. D L C Rutherford

Support arguments of Acton Parish Council. Especially concerned about junction of Acton Lane and distributor and dropping off school children.

280 Mr and Mrs R K Toms

Support policy if western bypass and new hospital completed before development begins.

292 Mr G H Potts

Development should not start without western bypass. Plant woodland now to stop further development towards Acton/Newman's Green.
700 houses will strain all services, new car parks and hospital with A&E department.

294 Mrs M Potts

Development should not start without western bypass.
700 houses will need more car parks and a bigger hospital with A&E department.

304 Mr L E Ball (DECEASED)

Roundabout needed at junction of Acton Lane with distributor road.
Prevent Acton Lane and Mills Lane becoming rat runs.
Greenways should not have underpasses, contact Sustrans over design.
Green belt between Chilton and Acton must be planted early and must be barrier to further growth.
Concern at Waldingfield Road/East Street traffic problems and car parks coping with extra traffic.
Must be western bypass before development.

334 Miss H Andrews/Acton Parish Council

Supports comments of Acton Parish Council. Woodland welcomed as a strict development limit and must be properly managed. Traffic management must prevent additional traffic in nearby villages and prevent rat runs. Special attention to design and density to make sure it fits in with an old market town. More surface parking in Sudbury should be considered. Consult Acton PC on details of proposals.

352 Mr K B Atkinson

Sudbury cannot cope with present traffic. Build bypass and deal with existing problems.
Mills Lane and Acton lane will become rat tuns.
Detours for school access will create more congestion and harder to do school run to Acton Primary and All Saints Middle School.
Make Acton Lane access only to school from both ends with drop-off and turning area.
Greenways are ideal, but need lighting and proper crossings for roads without bridges or underpasses.
Planting needed early and would this mean no more development towards Newman's Green?
Why not build adjacent to A134 where less disruption to villages and with direct access to road network.

363 Chilton Parish Council

Consider road infrastructure cannot support development, Waldingfield Road already has safety problems which are not addressed.
Funnels too much traffic via Waldingfield Road and Eastern Bypass down Gallows Hill into narrow and congested area at East Street lights.
Even with western bypass little will be done to deal with local traffic problems and closure of Acton Lane will force traffic to use Tesco roundabout.
Distributor road will divide the new community.
A road scheme to take traffic around Chilton with some alternative route into Sudbury is needed. Subject to rethinking roads the objective of creating sustainable development and a new neighbourhood will give identity and a centre to the community.
Must be a real community and not just a housing estate.
Agrees need for mix of affordable and small dwellings but considers density excessive.
Chilton must remain an independent entity.
Must be sufficient flexibility to tailor a masterplan with a Development Officer to support parish and community liaison.
Consider residential development at Churchfield Road (Bayer) site. create a scenic feature.

365 Mrs J M Cole

Chilton development should not go ahead before the bypass and traffic management should be prioritised.
Chilton growth area should have a 'built-up area boundary' around it to strictly limit development.
Plant woodland before development.
Involve Acton Parish Council in masterplanning.
Design distributor road with consideration for Acton, including a drop-off point for school.
No access from new housing onto Acton Lane and discourage Acton Lane and Mills Lane as rat runs.

392 Mr and Mrs A & D Parmenter

Support comments of Acton Parish Council, particularly provision of woodland. Question whether emergency services could cope.
Support alternative site along A134 Melford Bypass.

398 Mr & Mrs F W Pryke

Development must create a new Chilton neighbourhood with a well planned village centre. It must not be an extension to Springlands.
Concern at increased traffic onto B1115 which is already congested with accidents at dangerous bends towards Waldingfield.

450 Mr P C Richardson

No further expansion beyond plan towards Acton and Newmans Green.
Plant woodland before development.
'Access only' route to Middle School for turning and drop off.
No development access to Acton Lane and prevent HGVs on southern section of distributor road.
Consider improvements to East Street and car parking.
Greenlanes/cycleways to be safe for night use and at main road crossings.

553 Mr R W Morris

Object because of increased traffic on B1115 north east of new roundabout and risk to safety. Some residents have to reverse into their drives.

554 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker

Concentrate employment at west end of area rather than mix in with housing. Ensure adequate separation of development from agricultural land using high standard planting to discourage trespass etc.
Careful phasing needed to prevent blight across the area.
Provide option for a future link road across former Chilton Airfield to relieve congestion and provide better access for vehicles from Lavenham/Stowmarket direction.

585 GO-East

Extension of out of town supermarket without assessment of need or seeking to limit floorspace.

783 GO-East

Policy needs to use wording which increases certainty and clarity. Explanation of use of powers, planning conditions etc should be dealt with in supporting text not policy.

846 Mr and Mrs F May/Fenn Wright
Generally support Chilton package, but consider a motel type development would be suitable at the Tesco roundabout.
902 Mr and Mrs J Marsh
Need assurance that the woodland buffer zone to Newman's Green is provided in advance of development and will be the absolute limit to development.
909 Mrs J Antill
Concerned about light pollution from Chilton development.
938 Mrs S Purser
1579 Mr J H Purser
Using so much agricultural land is wrong, better to use hilly land east of Long Melford Bypass.
No new industrial development without a bypass. Poor access beyond Sudbury and poor take up of land. Without new industrial land much more housing is unsustainable.
If needed more industrial land should be along the Long Melford Bypass.
Downgraded fire facilities not taken into account in proposal.
Adequate plans for dealing with foul and rain water needed.
Inadequate hospital arrangements.
Sudbury Upper School is at its limits. All schools must be expanded.
Better access to town centre needed dealing with East Street and extra car and cycle parking.
Shutting Acton Lane and diverting traffic through Chilton Heights estate unsustainable on road safety and health grounds.
Must prevent Mills Lane becoming a rat run.
Community woodland needs a binding statement on finance, maintenance and access control.
Plans not clear on whether existing playing fields at All Saints Middle School will be reduced in size.
Cycle routes need to be paved, well lit and have security designed into them and to cross roads at grade with light controlled crossings.
Acton Lane junction with spine road should be a roundabout.
Provision needed for safe access to Middle and Upper Schools by bus, car, cycle and foot avoiding long detours due to road closures.
941 R C Partridge & Co. Ltd./Tim Harbord Associates
There is uncertainty over the Chilton development because of the bypass linkage and therefore other land should be allocated.

Concerned at volume of traffic using Acton Lane and Mills Lane. No vehicular access from new development onto Acton Lane. Concerned Mill Lane will become a short cut from the new development to A134 towards Bury St Edmunds.

1006 Mr and Mrs G E Moore
Chilton development being constructed to encourage traffic to the Tesco roundabout will cause chaos as 200 houses are intended west of St Bartholomews Priory to use the same junction. Poor visibility at junction in al directions.
1124 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce
Proposal at Chilton takes no account of effect on historic core and retail centre of Sudbury.
1141 Mr T D Martin
Object to potential loss of habitat for Great Crested Newt at rear of houses backing onto apple orchard owned by Wheldons and the Chilton Grove dwellings.
On B1115 footpaths of inadequate width and restricted road width means dangers from wing mirror overhang. Vehicles travel too fast and poor visibility for drivers emerging from St Mary's Close. Whole of road into town centre needs considering further before development proceeds.
1415 Tesco Stores Limited / Healey & Baker
Object to preclusion of any development until western bypass is firmly committed. This causes uncertainty and may delay or prevent necessary development. It is considered that the transport assessments needed with planning applications will give a thorough analysis of the likely impact of proposed development on highway infrastructure. This can be assessed through the development control process. The Council identifies a shortage of employment sites, but bringing more land forward may be delayed by the bypass requirement.
Broadly supports allocation of land for expansion of Tesco store, objects to criteria in CP01d: prescriptive nature of policy, prescriptive requirement for new distributor road, closure of existing vehicular access and requirement that the store is realigned to face west of site.
1420 Tesco Stores Limited / Healey and Baker
Supports allocation of land west of the Tesco store. But internal layout means it would be more appropriate to expand in an easterly direction. Objects to proposals map not showing opportunity for an easterly extension as well.
1425 A H Philpot and Sons Limited / Bidwells
Chilton package should be deleted as there is too much uncertainty surrounding its deliverability because of the link to the provision of a bypass over which there is clearly uncertainty. Local Plans are

required to give certainty and in this respect the plan is flawed over such a fundamental part of the proposals.
There are no recognised defined boundaries on the north eastern side of the allocation and the development would present a raw edge to the town because of the time taken for the woodland to mature.
The general form of the layout appears ad hoc and dispersed changing the character of this part of Sudbury to its detriment.

1521 Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd/Boyer Planning

Local Plan provides insufficient clarity because of the uncertainty of the bypass and its late predicted start. Development should be restricted to what is compatible with existing highway infrastructure.

1553 Mr A C Sawyer

Involve Acton Parish Council in master plan.
Grossly affects road network around Acton.
Distributor should take into account safety of school children ie drop off point.
No 'T' junction with Acton Lane, prefer mini-roundabout.
Make community area a parking area.
Support cycle ways if clear of trees and bushes to give clear vision for users.
Road priorities need to avoid Acton Lane and Mills Lane becoming rat-runs.
Plant woodland as soon as possible and must mark limit to development towards Acton.
Provide new bypass and extra car parks.

1564 Mr V Herbert

Chilton is dependent on B1115 which is of poor quality and could not safely deal with extra traffic. No proposals for improvement are made. Too much traffic will be funnelled into the narrow and congested part of East Street. This is local traffic which the bypass will not remove. The proposed distributor road does not alleviate the B1115 and will divide the new community. A radical new road scheme is needed taking traffic around Chilton and an alternative route into Sudbury.

1821 Mr and Mrs B R Mugford

Traffic already too heavy and congestion on the northern and southern roads towards Tescos. Ballingdon traffic unacceptable and will drive people and businesses away from Sudbury. Not enough car parks in town to meet present needs.
New housing too dense, not enough green space for gardens.
Roads subjected to speeding and design of new roundabout does nothing to reduce this. Emergency services will not be able to get through town.

Put development to the side of Long Melford bypass which will solve the problem of overcrowding and traffic.

1824 Mr W Sheridan

Acton could become a suburb of Sudbury and lose its village status. Traffic volume using Acton Lane and Mills Lane as a short cut could potentially be lethal. Access to Sudbury from Acton would go through a housing estate.

Traffic generation too great for existing parking and roads in and out of Sudbury.

1849 Suffolk County Council / Donaldsons

CP01 general: At this stage the quoted areas are not adequately justified and need clarifying in the master plan.

No linkage should be made between the bypass and development because:

- assessment of transport implications should be based on the worst case assumption of no bypass and all Chilton developed.
- resultant increase in traffic flows will be small and together with amelioration measures the impact on traffic conditions and amenity in town centre will be small.
- western bypass decision should be taken independently of development.
- linkage could seriously jeopardise the possibility of the development being advanced during the period proposed in the plan.
- linkage could mean development not going ahead if the bypass is not built and the local plan proposals would not be met.

CP01a: Densities and ratio of developable land to total land should not be definitely prescribed at this stage.

- 3rd bullet point should be 'appropriate' standard of layout not 'high' standard.
- 4th bullet point should be 'may' rather than 'will' as flood risk assessment not yet made.
- 5 and 6th bullet points amalgamate as replacement of rights of way may be preferable to their retention.

CP01b: Challenge areas as in CP01a.

- 1st bullet point replace 'minimise' with 'reduce the potential' as minimise implies an onerous and unrealistic obligation.
- 2nd bullet point replace 'high' with 'appropriate'.
- 3rd bullet point unclear what 'development along the northern and eastern edge of the site' refers to and what land is being protected. Replace 'must minimise' with 'should take account of'. The height of buildings should be clarified to include a maximum eaves height of 9.0 metres assuming this relates to the employment land.
- 4th bullet point delete 'substantial' and clarify what this means and refers to.
- 5th bullet point clarify reference to day nursery.

- 8th bullet point contains level of detail not appropriate to a local plan.
CP01d Re-wording proposed to allow flexibility in the location of expansion and is not unduly prescriptive in terms of associated requirements of the extension. Would wish to work up proposals with Tesco and may affect proposals map.
- 1st bullet point inappropriate in this context and should be incorporated into main paragraph CP01d.
- penultimate bullet point refers to green travel plan and should in turn refer to master planning process.
CP01e: Challenge areas as in CP01a.
- 2nd, 3rd, 4th bullet points delete as this level of design should be in master plan/development brief.
CP01f: Challenge areas as in CP01a.
CP01g: Challenge areas as in CP01a.
- detail on width of woodland strip and management inappropriate.
1st paragraph page 221, last sentence needs clarifying.
2nd paragraph page 221, amend to provide appropriate flexibility to tie in with ultimate phasing of development.
3rd paragraph page 221, should refer to bus priority rather than bus only sections.
4th paragraph page 221,reference to green links needs clarifying as it does not relate to any previously defined infrastructure element of the proposals. Such details should only be in master plan.
-1st bullet point should read 'implementation of any appropriate transport improvements, to ameliorate the impact on traffic flows in and around Sudbury town centre, including:'.
- remove all sub-bullet points as they are not justified at this stage.
-2nd bullet point is also a design point which should be included in the text above the Sec 106 requirements of CP01g.
- 3rd bullet point is ambiguous and challenge what basis this requirement depends upon in terms of policy or other justification.
-4th and 5th bullet points specific proposals are needed for this requirement to be valid.
Final bullet point not required as covered in other points.
- Suggest replacement of all bullet points detailing Planning Obligations with '- amelioration against adverse transport impacts; - design to be undertaken on County/District design standards; - developer contributions will be sought where appropriate'.

1863 Mr S J Blackwell

Concerned at the effects of more development at Chilton on sub-standard and virtually unimprovable B1115 in Sudbury. Bottleneck in East Street and overloaded lights at B1115/A131 junction almost impossible to improve. Parked cars and visibility problems create further difficulties. Lack of footpath in lower part of Waldingfield Road, again residents parking causes problems. Expansion at

Chilton cannot be the right way forward with these and other highway constraints.

1874 Mr S J Blackwell

Gallows Hill B115 is relatively steep. Traffic from roundabout on to it with an unobstructed slope and view spaces out travel at 30 to 40 mph or more despite 30 limit. Landsdown Road has poor visibility to get out in face of this and Park Road it is becoming a constant problem, especially to turn right. Clearly it is going to get worse and worse.

1975 Acton Parish Council

Involve Acton Parish Council in preparation of master plan.
Junction of Acton Lane and distributor road should be safe and easy to use, particularly for parents taking children to school.
'T' junction where Acton Lane meets distributor road not acceptable.
Need for safe drop off/collection point on distributor for children who can then walk to school.
Could a parking area be included on the community land or keep Acton Lane open for school access only?
Extending length of school bus journey may disrupt viability.
Welcome cycle and walking links, but must be in open areas not lined with trees and bushes for safety reasons.
Where greenway routes cross roads, underpasses are unacceptable.
Openings onto the distributor road need to discourage traffic from using Acton Lane and Mill Lane.
No vehicular access from new housing onto Acton Lane.
Welcome woodland buffer, but plant first and maintain properly.
Proper arrangements for management needed in master plan.
Built-up area must not breach woodland buffer.
Support securing bypass before development.
More town centre car parks needed and traffic management.
Particularly concerned about Waldingfield Road and East Street.

1978 Mr D L Johnson

If development is necessary no further advancement towards Newmans Green and Acton.
How do children get to school, where can they be left or collected?
What form will cycle track take and when will it be available?
What happens to the present new junction in Acton Lane above the Middle School?

1984 Mr & Mrs T R Bloomfield

Greenway links are good, but a break at New Farm must be bridged.
Links must be open in aspect for security reasons and crossings of distributor road to be safe. Build security in at the start.
Access for parents taking children to school needs to be thought through with improved pavements and footpaths available.

Need to avoid Acton Lane becoming a route from the distributor road via Acton and Bull Lane to A134.

1990 Mr I O Hill
Problem of congestion at junction of distributor road with Waldingfield Road and Eastern bypass.
System needed to discourage traffic turning from distributor road and using Acton Lane and Mills Lane.
Plant woodland at start of development.

2036 Mr N A Bennett
Chilton development will bring a lot of traffic into the town centre if there is no western bypass, traffic management alone will not help.

2054 Sport England (East)
Should specify the exact minimum requirement for formal recreation provision in line with NPFA standards. Only a general reference at the present time. Object to sports ground off Acton Lane being lost unless one of exceptions to Sport England's policies is met. Overall provision for formal recreation facilities on this site should be over and above existing levels and not merely compensate their loss.

2111 ICI Corporate Real Estate / Andrew Martin Associates
There are serious concerns about the deliverability and timetabling of this proposal. 700 houses could not be completed by 2011 leaving a major shortfall in housing provision. Commitment to western bypass is not sufficient prior to development starting, the bypass should be started or even finished. The housing should be phased to the release of the employment land.
Consider housing would be better near Long Melford bypass.

2241 Suffolk County Council
Amend to provide information on key elements only, too prescriptive and unnecessary detail. Items for development brief or Master Plan should be deleted.
Reference should be made to the Local Transport Action Plan and the Local Plan Chapter 9: Transport. Because of the demands created by 700 houses there should be a developer contribution to an expanded library for Sudbury.

2615 Mrs A E Chapman
Affects access from Acton for many purposes in Sudbury. The junction between the distributor road and Acton Lane should be safe and easy to use enabling drop off/collection for school children with a safe, visible and clean footway to school.
Does the Lane have to be closed or could it be kept open for school runs or the bus?
If the Lane is closed will this be too disruptive to school bus routes?

Greenway cycle and walking links are supported, but must be safe and not enclosed. Treesand shrubs should be set back and where they cross distributor road should nit be an underpass.
Plant woodland buffer prior to development and use of native broad leafed varieties. The buffer should not be encroached upon.

2637 Mr J R Michell

Already had huge numbers of extra houses, enough is enough.
Impacts on doctors and hospital waiting time.
Too many cars in lanes will result in accidents.

2639 Mrs K M Frost / Acton Parish Council

The Chilton package should not allow extra traffic on Acton Lane.
Waldingfield Road and East Street cannot cope with extra traffic.
Secure bypass before any development. More car parks and better traffic management needed. Acton must remain separate form Chilton and woodland should have been planted years ago and be properly looked after.

2676 Mr G G Calver

Concur with views of Acton Parish Council and in addition:
concern for the safety of children walking through a low cost housing estate
planned woodland should be planted before development and not subsequently breached
bypass must be in place before building starts
take into account parking problems in Sudbury.
Emphasises that greenway paths should be continuous and not disjointed.

2679 Mr and Mrs W J Gabbey

Concerned that the bus only sections of the distributor road will mean other traffic travelling all over the countryside and side roads when they should have a proper, safe and direct transport system.

2682 Somerfield Stores Limited / Roger Tym and Partners

Object to retail allocation. If not deleted, evidence of need is required and of sequential approach as required by PPG6.

2853 Mr J Nichol

Roads already inadequate. More houses will lead to more congestion. It must remain a medieval market town and not become like Milton Keynes.

2854 Mr A P Stifani

Road system inadequate now. More houses will mean more congestion. Need new hospital and an adequate road system.

2855 Mr C W Bareham

Roads are bad enough now without building more houses.

2856 Mr J Griffiths

Traffic congestion in Sudbury is unbearable now without the introduction of thousands more cars on the road. The road system is terrible and more development will kill the town.

2857 Mr M Hicks
Adequate hospital and casualty unit is more important than new houses. Road system cannot take more traffic and will cause congestion and environmental problems such as pollution. Fire service inadequate.

2858 Mr N Andrews
Only have to drive through Sudbury to realise this proposal is ridiculous.

3192 Sport England (East)
Sport England still has concerns regarding the provision of leisure facilities and education/playing field use in relation to this development, and in both cases the amount of land allocated has been reduced in comparison to the original Deposit Draft.

3193 Sport England (East)
Sport England are still concerned that community needs for formal recreation (i.e pitches for outdoor sport) will not be adequately met by the current proposals.

3777 Mr R W Morris
Objection to the resiting of Sudbury area domestic waste and recycling facility to Acton/Waldingfield.

3935 Mr M P Booth
Object to removal of following paragraph:
'No part of this development will be permitted to take place until there is a firm commitment to the Sudbury Western Bypass and related measures in the form of :
Planning, Funding, Firm commitment from SCC, Confirmation following public inquiry decision'

4002 Mr N A Bennett;4333 Mr P R Walker;4334 Mrs M C Walker;4336 Ms D Keeble;4337 Mrs E M Dryden;
4577 Mr C J Hunt
Removal of link to Sudbury Western Bypass.

4003 Mr N A Bennett
Has opened up Sudbury to an increase in volume of traffic, especially HGV. Already too much traffic within area, particularly town centre.

4010 Sudbury Town Council
BDC failed to make any link between this proposed new development and the increased traffic it will cause. Whilst Sudbury Town Council accepts that the link between the commencement of this development and the Western Bypass has been broken, it feels strongly that extra traffic generated by the development be acknowledged by BDC and that the issue cannot solely be resolved by traffic management schemes.

4028 Sudbury Town Council
Sudbury Town Council feels that provision for an additional domestic refuse site, similar to the Sandy Lane facility, should be included in the Chilton Development.

4029 Sudbury Town Council
Page 321 of the Plan refers to a refuse depot, which therefore may be purely for commercial use, with no public access. The Town Council wishes to clarify this ambiguity, and feels that clear reference should be made to public access.

4555 Mr M J A Scott
No more housing development in Sudbury and Cornard until the western By-pass has been built. The road structure in Sudbury and Cornard will not with stand the amount of housing that is in the Local Plan. There are no major roads for 16 miles going north, south or west, if the Western bypass is ever built people still have to get through Halstead.

4566 Somerfield Stores Limited/Roger Tym and Partners
Objection to food store site "out of town" due to it's huge impact on the town centre.

4567 Somerfield Stores Limited/Roger Tym and Partners
Relocation of Tesco, the existing site is sequentially preferable.

4847 Mrs M E Shapley;5506 Mr A K Shapley
Objecting against the waste transfer development due to it being located by a grain store, housing and will encourage more vermin to the area.

4851 Mrs M E Shapley
Objector would like the cycle links to be tree-screened.

5037 Acton Parish Council
Change of words in sentence to 'traffic management measures to prevent the use of Acton Lane north of' (not or)

5039 Acton Parish Council
It is noted that provision has been added for improvements to cycling and pedestrian routes between the development and Sudbury Town Centre, including safe crossing of the A134, and improvements for cycling and pedestrians on Waldingfield Road but it is also noted that there has been a deletion of reference to 'providing safe and appropriate crossings for pedestrians and cyclists across the new distributor road'. The parish Council questions why it is more important to provide safe cycle and pedestrians routes for people travelling from the new development to Sudbury town centre than it is to provide safe cycle and pedestrian routes for people travelling from Newmans Green and Acton to the schools referred to in the Chilton Master Plan and to Sudbury. People do cycle and walk from Acton to Sudbury and more would do so if the route were made safer. It is requested that the deleted words be reinstated.

5041 Acton Parish Council
CP01(g): It is of concern to the parish council that 'essential requirement' has been reduced to '..will be expected to be provided..' It is requested that the words 'expected to be' are removed.

5042 Acton Parish Council
It is noted that the word 'the local' have been added to community. Clarification is sought as to what is meant by 'local'. Is it the residents of Sudbury or the residents of Newmans Green, of whom there are only 52? Or will it be the residents of the new developments whose homes will not be built until after the woodland has been provided? It is a matter of concern for the residents of Newmans Green and Acton that the woodland belt is properly planned and managed. It is thought highly unlikely that there will be much interest from residents in the parish in becoming involved with a community woodland on the edge of Sudbury. If local means Newmans Green and/or Acton, then it is requested that the words 'the local' be removed.

5294 GO-East
We have noticed that in a number of instances the revised wording of policies does not always read correctly, for example, CP01, now starts "of Sudbury will be required".

5296 GO-East
The Plan appears to identify out of centre development in the absence of any evidence that a sequential approach to the site selection has been followed and that alternative sequentially preferable sites are not available to meet the need.

5297 GO-East
There may be an over allocation for comparison goods - the Plan advises that a site of one hectare is required, however, the Plan allocates 1.7ha currently occupied by Tesco.

5298 GO-East
There is no indication of the type of goods this allocation is intended to meet.

5299 GO-East
We have concerns in relation to the new allocation of 2.9ha at Chilton for the relocation of Tesco. We note that the retail assessment identifies a quantitative need for additional convenience goods floorspace. However, there is no indication that sequentially preferable sites are not available to meet the identified need. Neither is it clear whether this allocation is intended to meet the convenience need or whether it will incorporate an element of comparison goods.

5375 Suffolk County Council
CP01(c): Policy makes reference to a proposed waste transfer station within the development. Whilst it could be argued that the

allocation of such a facility should be made via the Waste Local Plan, there are substantial merits in including this in the Plan in this instance to successfully integrate the transfer station with surrounding development. The County Supports policy CP01 but the term 'household and recycling and refuse depot' is unclear and should be clarified.

5376 Suffolk County Council

CP01d: The County Council will be seeking further information on the proposed scale and distribution of and justification for, the community and retail uses in the Chilton area. This is therefore a holding objection which will be amplified as soon as possible.

5449 Mr B L Lazenby

Policy CP01 the revised plan has broken away from the original 1st deposit draft by decoupling the houses etc away from the promised western bypass, which according to the local press will not now go ahead as Braintree and Essex have objected to same.

5462 Mr M R Miller

The proposed new development at Chilton should not be permitted without the simultaneous approval and funding of the Sudbury Western Bypass. In its absence there will be an unacceptable increase in the traffic load for Sudbury.

5501 Mr A K Shapley

Objecting to substantial increase in traffic which will occur around the new Churchfield roundabout and along the B1115.

5505 Mr A K Shapley

Need to provide greenways for cycle routes and pathways.

5507 Mr A K Shapley

Waste transfer site could be located in Long Melford, though not next to housing.

5510 Mr A K Shapley

Shortest route to a re-located Tesco store for most of the local population in Sudbury will interrupt with local housing.

5902 Mr J D Burke;5906 Mrs L K Burke

Objecting to the impact that the commercial development will have on property through noise, traffic and light pollution.

5904 Mr J D Burke;5908 Mrs L K Burke

Objecting against the traffic on the proposed road: poor access and area will be ruined by influx of traffic.

5905 Mr J D Burke;5909 Mrs L K Burke

Objecting to the footpath on the western boundary of the site; its purpose is unclear and it appears to stop in the middle of a field. Oppose linking of commercial development with existing rights of way.

6772 Mr V Herbert

CP01g: It does not seem that the potential traffic problems that formed the core of the previous objection (1st Deposit Draft) have

been seriously addressed with the alterations. Indeed the 'improvements to the Waldingfield Road' have actually been deleted from the first draft.

6795 Chilton Parish Council

Objecting to CP01(g) as the last bullet point has been deleted and should not have been.

6890 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker

Object to the amendments made with specific regards to the changes to criterion d) and changes to Criteria d)a). Tesco object to the relocation of their site for redevelopment for alternative uses with access taken from the new distributor road as detailed in criterion d). Request that this criterion be reviewed and rewritten to follow the principles as published in the First Deposit Draft.

7237 Mr C W Arthey

Objects to removal of link to Sudbury Western bypass. Proposed development will generate significant increased traffic flows which cannot be accommodaed without the western bypass.

7584 Mr & Mrs M J Bryant;7595 Mrs V R Hall;7602 Mr & Mrs R D Brown;7731 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;7916 Mr V Herbert
8235 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart

Objecting to provision of waste transfer station and location of the waste transfer station.

7585 Mr & Mrs M J Bryant;7596 Mrs V R Hall;7603 Mr & Mrs R D Brown;7613 Mrs E A Tatum;7732 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart

Objecting to the smells, vermin and insects that will result from the waste transfer station.

7586 Mr & Mrs M J Bryant

Objection to the proposed development because of the increase in traffic it will cause.

7588 Mr & Mrs M J Bryant

Objecting to the resultant environmental damage as it is in breach of policies CN06 and CN07.

7590 Mr & Mrs M J Bryant

CP01a) Objecting to the net developable area. Objector would like the previous restriction of 19.0 hectares to be reinstated.

7591 Mr & Mrs M J Bryant

Objector wants a link to the Western Bypass to be made before any developments take place.

7597 Mrs V R Hall;7604 Mr & Mrs R D Brown;7733 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8237 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart;8842 Mr S Cheese

Objecting that the waste transfer site will increase traffic on unsuitable roads.

7600 Mr & Mrs R D Brown;7610 Mrs P R Lane

Objection because no landscaping has been proposed; objector fears the area will become unsightly.

7605 Mr & Mrs R D Brown
Waste transfer site will increase noise pollution to area.
7606 Mrs P R Lane
Objecting to the proposed waste transfer site.
7607 Mrs P R Lane
Waste transfer system will lead to an increase in traffic, and the B1115 is not large enough to accommodate this change.
7608 Mrs P R Lane
Locating the waste transfer depot by housing is a health hazard.
7609 Mrs P R Lane
Objection to the increased allocation of housing.
7611 Mrs P R Lane
The B1115 is not capable to the amount of traffic at current, extra housing will only increase this problem.
7612 Mrs E A Tatum
Object to the Waste Transfer Station at Chilton. Objector's property is not far away from the proposed site.
7614 Mrs E A Tatum
Object to the increase in traffic on Waldingfield Road as a result of the Waste Transfer site.
7615 Mrs E A Tatum
Object to the houses which are to be built in Chilton Priory as well as on the land near the objector's property which will come right up to her garden.
7616 Mrs E A Tatum
Object to the increase in traffic on the B1115 which is already very busy.
7725 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8257 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
The previous restriction on the amount of net developable area to 19.0ha should be reinstated.
7726 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Objector would like the reinstatement that no part of this development will be permitted to take place until there is a firm commitment to the Sudbury Western Bypass and related traffic and highway measures.
7734 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8238 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
Objecting to the noise and environmental damage from an increase in movements of heavy goods vehicles created by the waste transfer station.
7738 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8232 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
Object on traffic and environmental grounds to the potential relocation of the Tesco Superstore.
7740 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Reinstate the provisions requiring evidence that there is a need for such development, and no adverse impact will occur on the vitality and viability of Sudbury Town Centre.

7744 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8229 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
Object to the reduced allocation of land to leisure facilities. The original provision of 2.4 hectares of land should be reinstated.
7748 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart;8225 Mr & Mrs A East/Mrs V Hart
The community woodland development should be provided under a Section 106 agreement.
7749 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
Objecting to the weak wording of section g) of the policy.
7750 Mr & Mrs G R R Hart
The current wording is too weak. The word "needed" should be replaced with the word "required."
7988 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker
Land allocated for housing on the western side of Acton Lane to the north of the distributor road is shown as abutting Acton Lane without the benefit of any structural landscaping along this section.
7989 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker
The overall area may represent an over development of this site all of which is effectively severed from the school and other community facilities which lie to the south of the proposed distributor road whereas the land to the eastern side of Acton Lane appears to be underdeveloped in relation to this.
7991 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker
The creation of the two employment areas on either side of the distributor road to the north of Woodhall Business Park will create a "industrial estate" feeling to this section of the development and to the users of the distributor road.
If some of the business units erected are associated with low grade manufacturing or engineering rather than high tech industries, the feeling of a run down industrial estate may soon become apparent and there may also be associated security and vandalism problems in what will become something of a deserted commercial wasteland at night.
7992 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker
Although it is fully accepted that the balance of employment and residential areas needs to be established, if industrial development is allowed on either side of this section of the distributor road this will reduce the quality of the local landscape significantly.
This deleterious effect may be added to by the stationing of waste skips, commercial vehicles and the like and there will in fact be no residential or other types of development between the Tesco roundabout and the second proposed intersection on either side of the distributor road.
7993 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker
To improve the general environment of the area and to alleviate the 'industrial feel' to the western end of the distributor road and surrounding area, it is suggested that the employment area on the

northern side of the distributor road is relocated and incorporated into the extreme eastern employment area on Chilton airfield.

7994 Mr R T Edgeley/Strutt & Parker

The employment area on the northern side of the distributor road should be zoned for mixed residential and retail use which might include an alternative site for the Tesco supermarket and the creation of neighbourhood and community facilities to give identity and centre to the overall Chilton development.

8203 Mr A C Deville

The principal objection relates to the realignment of the proposed distributor road in the vicinity of the Tesco roundabout on Springlands Way. This appears to have been done at the instance of a commercial occupier, namely Tesco, together with SCC as landowner, in order to further Tesco's own commercial ambitions with regard to relocation of its existing premises, and the maximisation of SCC's own landholding. Whilst this is understandable commercially it is anathema to good planning: it does not amount to a material planning consideration and has led to an unsatisfactory planning proposal. In the alternative as will be seen from representations to be received it may be that Tesco do not seek relocation or any such commercial ambition; in such case the analysis must find the maximisation of the SCC Landholding as immaterial planning influence underlying the changes in the policy relating to the Chiton Mixed Use development. Objector reiterate such commercial ambition is an anathema to good planning.

8204 Mr A C Deville

Development associated with unfortunate planning consequences: The unnecessary and therefore unsustainable duplication of the Tesco Superstore when the existing site is both more sustainable and capable of appropriate extension.

8205 Mr A C Deville

Development associated with unfortunate planning consequences: the unnecessary loss of the existing modern large building and associated facilities when the existing building could easily be preserved (and re-used) by the alignment of the Distributor Road previously advocated in the First Deposit Draft.

8206 Mr A C Deville

Development associated with unfortunate planning consequences: in the absence of worked up proposals both for the road and any future retail scheme, it is not possible to conclude that Second Deposit alignment provides sufficient land for a viable and attractive scheme.

8207 Mr A C Deville

Development associated with unfortunate planning consequences: Both existing and future retail needs at this location should be assessed before the road alignment is altered. Moreover, it would

be prudent to consider the provision and accessibility of future longer term needs before introducing the current artificial constraints of alignment and provision.

8208 Mr A C Deville

The new location of the superstore should be assessed in traffic, sustainability and accessibility terms before the proposals are accepted. A neighbourhood local shopping centre is more appropriate at the new proposed location that is specifically and properly earmarked for local community facilities. A new enlarged superstore is not appropriate to serve such a location and its wider appeal would introduce unnecessary unwarranted and potentially harmful traffic movements to the new residential neighbourhood. The existing superstore serves a very wide catchment and is more appropriately sited on the major Northern Road/ Springlands Way strategic route; The proposal for bulky goods should be considered afres in terms of longer term needs and accessibility. Constraining the road alignment at this stage is deeply unsatisfactory. If bulky goods provision is justified, this is a good strategic accessible location whose longer term potential should be optimised. The First Deposit alignment would provide a better and more flexible solution.

8234 Mr & Mrs A East / Mrs V Hart

Objection against the removal of the provisions requiring evidence that there is a need for such development. Objector would like the reinstatement of the provisions requiring evidence.

8236 Mr & Mrs A East / Mrs V Hart

Objecting to the potential smells and vermin of a waste transfer station, particularly because there are adjoining residential dwellings.

8258 Mr & Mrs A East / Mrs V Hart

We seek the reinstatement into the CP01 policy that no part of this development will be permitted to take place until there is a firm commitment to the Sudbury Western Bypass and related traffic and highway measures.

8839 Mr S Cheese

Objects as the waste station and industrial area will cause noise, smell and light pollution.

8840 Mr S Cheese

Object to impact of waste transfer station and industrial area on their enjoyment of a quiet life.

8841 Mr S Cheese

Objects as the introduction of a waste transfer site may decrease value of property which will no longer be in the countryside.

8958 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

Object to the newly inserted text regarding a "phasing programme" and to new paragraphs 3.24b-3.24e, which specifically refer to a phasing programme for the development at Chilton.

8964 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

In sub-section c) amend the second sentence to read "A site for the provision of a waste transfer station, household and recycling and refuse depot will be sought within the site."

8965 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

In sub-section d) delete the first sentence in a). Insert "approximately 2.9 hectares of land are allocated for the provision of a neighbourhood centre including community facilities."

8969 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

In the second paragraph under g) delete the phrase "while the remainder will be designed to a lesser standard." Insert "and."

8970 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

In the fifth paragraph under g) delete "among other things" and insert "and may include contributions towards."

8972 Ashwell Developments Limited / FPD Savills Conditional Withdrawal

In the fifth bullet point from the end of the policy, the phrase "traffic management measures to prevent the use of Acton Lane north or the development as a short cut to outlying areas from new housing" has an unclear meaning.

9009 Mr R Bagness

The Waste Transfer Station, sited next to a busy Grain Store is quite horrific and if we ever get a Hospital as proposed, the site will be very close to the Waste Station.

9129 Messrs F, J & A May / Fenn Wright

Objecting against the amendments made to CP01 since the First Deposit Draft.

9131 Messrs F, J & A May / Fenn Wright

The proposed allocations of 19 hectares and 14.5 hectares are insufficient to meet the needs of Sudbury and the district.

9132 Messrs F, J & A May / Fenn Wright

It does not appear that there are logical planning reasons for the relocation of both Tesco's site, the employment land and residential allocation.

9133 Messrs F, J & A May / Fenn Wright

The allocation of 30.2 hectares of woodland with an average width of 50 metres, seems excessive.

9174 Bovis Homes Limited

Objecting to Policy CP01.

9175 Bovis Homes Limited
Inappropriate to impose phasing on the site as it may delay the provision of public open space, affordable housing and other community facilities.

9179 Bovis Homes Limited
Object to the requirement to provide a waste transfer depot, it should be a contributory measure, and not a requirement.

12033 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce & Industry
The failure of the Council to make the provision of a western relief road prior to commencement of the Chilton Mixed Use Package is a serious omission from the Local Plan. It will have detrimental consequences for the business economy in general by virtue of increased congestion in the centre of the town. It will also result in detriment to the residential environment on the route of the A131 and threaten the well being of the fabric of buildings and structures, which from the historic core and are an integral part of the uniqueness of Sudbury.

12220 Mr S J Blackwell
Query over whether the short stretch of road in Essex can be permitted for a bypass. The bypass is essential to improving the lives of a large number of residents in Sudbury and the situation must be rebutted and corrected.

12275 Tesco Stores Ltd/Cushman & Wakefield Healey & Baker
Criterion d)a) Tesco object to the proposed allocation of 2.9 hectares of land for the potential relocation of their existing food store, in a location less convenient for the existing customer base and less accessible.