

10. CHAPTER 10 – SUDBURY TOWN CENTRE

10.1 POLICY SD01a PRINCIPAL SHOPPING AREA

The Objections

5659 Suffolk Preservation Society

The society feels that the policy needs to incorporate flexibility to ensure uses retained in the many listed buildings in the town centre/ principal shopping area. This may in some cases mean granting planning permission for a change of use which is a non-shopping one.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.1.1 The Retail Capacity Study for Babergh identified primary, secondary and tertiary areas and from my visits I consider these areas have been reasonably defined. In secondary frontages mixed uses are already accepted. Listed Buildings are already adapted to shopping uses and if there is a particular problem with a Listed Building the three criteria in the bullet points of the policy allow for exceptions to be made.
- 10.1.2 This objection relates to both the town centre and the principal shopping area. Within Market Hill and part of North Street, which is the primary shopping area I see no reason to dilute the policy by accepting non-shopping uses.
- 10.1.3 Since the Plan was prepared PPS6 has been introduced. However, I do not consider the changes to have a material impact on what has been written, although minor phrasing revisions may be necessary to better reflect the later document.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

10.2 POLICY SD02 BUSINESS AND SERVICE USES

The Objections

763 GO-East Conditional Withdrawal

Objection to policy wording. Duplication and lack of clarity. Policies which repeat the provisions of other policies are not necessary. Cross references to other policies in the plan are not necessary.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD02 Pre-Inquiry Change 146

Amend SD02 as follows: ~~'In the Mixed Use Areas of Sudbury, applications for new development or a change of use will be judged against the following criteria:~~

~~The scale of the proposal, which must be compatible with the surroundings;~~

~~The effect on residential amenity;~~

~~The effect on the Conservation Area or listed building;~~

~~Access, traffic generation and modes of transport other than the car; and~~

~~The need to retain or create open spaces which make an important contribution to the environment.~~

~~Uses in Class B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 – as amended – will not be permitted.'~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.2.1 This has been clarified by a pre-inquiry change as the provisions duplicated other policies of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 146

10.3 PARAGRAPH 10.22a – c BUS/RAIL INTERCHANGE

The Objections

5368-5369;12274 Suffolk County Council

If the Sudbury bus station is relocated, sufficient space must be provided for the stabling of buses between journeys. In addition, the Sudbury and Great Cornard Local Transport Action Plan may recommend a bus gate between Bures Road and the Bus Rail Interchange. This would enable buses from the south, (buses competing with rail over the Colchester corridor and buses from Great Cornard) to reach the station with relative ease. The County Council is concerned that providing a bus/rail interchange is no guarantee of buses serving such a facility for instance at Colchester the 753 (Bury-Colchester) bus passes the entrance to the station but does not make the small diversion necessary to serve the station. Running via such a bus gate would enable works at Belle Vue roundabout de-prioritise traffic from Bures Road, therefore encouraging operators to run via the bus/rail interchange by providing priority for buses from the station to the town centre.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.22b Pre-Inquiry Change 147

Development on the site will include improved access from Station Road, a roundabout and a bus shelters where passengers can be dropped off a catch the train and vice versa. **The possibility of a bus gate between Bures Road and the interchange, to enable buses from the south to serve the station with relative ease, will be considered in the LTAP.** Development of this kind is in accordance with central government planning guidance PPG13. It will reduce the demand for car parking provision, encourage people to use public transport and reduce reliance on the private car.

The Objections

None

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.22c Pre-Inquiry Change 148

The District Council **will pursue funding options in partnership with Suffolk County Council to increase the likelihood of the proposal being implemented.** ~~has put in a bid to implement the bus-rail interchange proposal under Suffolk County Council's Local Transport Action Plan within the Plan period.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.3.1 Without repeating too much detail the pre-inquiry changes have incorporated revised wording to reasonably meet the concerns of the objector.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Changes 147 and 148.

10.4 POLICY SD04a BUS/RAIL INTERCHANGE

The Objections

5657 Suffolk Preservation Society

The society agrees with the overall objective of this policy but would suggest that reference be made not to a bus - rail interchange but to a multi-mode transport interchange.

5658 Suffolk Preservation Society

The society is also concerned that the policy does not deal with the possible visual impact of such a proposal which could be significant and adverse.

7214 The Sudbury Society

Objection against the visual impact of the proposed "improved access" and "roundabout" on this area. Concerned about possible destruction of attractive tree lined avenue that lead to the station to allow access buses.

7215 The Sudbury Society

Policy relates poorly with SD05 and the needs of the public. If the Bus station is relocated the proposed site it will only be 100 metres from the proposed Bus/ Rail interchange.

8829 Network Rail

It would be useful if the policy also had some flexibility to allow other uses to be developed in appropriate circumstances.

8830 Network Rail

It is not yet possible to ascertain how much space will be required for the interchange, and there may be potential for perhaps the inclusion of residential, retail and/or car parking. This will create a density of development suitable for its location in line with Government Policy, and provide an evening activity around the station, making the area safer.

8831 Network Rail

Railway car parking needs to be provided to encourage people to travel by train. The Council needs to recognise that commuting is now an important part in people's lives, thus safe and adequate car parking must be ensured at rail stations to encourage further use of public transport.

8832 Network Rail

Long-term parking is required at rail stations to accommodate private cars, especially for those who can not rely on other means of public transport due to where they live or the hour of travel.

8833 Network Rail

It is requested that the policy notes the importance of long term car parking in addition to the interchange, or if the interchange were not to come forward for whatever reason, allows these uses on the entire site.

8834 Network Rail

The final phrase "will include" should be changed to "is proposed to include," so that the interchange can adapt over the plan period as required.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD04a Pre-Inquiry Change 149

'The land adjacent to the railway station, Sudbury, is proposed for a bus-rail interchange. Development will include improved access to the site, bus shelters and a roundabout.'

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.4.1 I note that reference is made to a Bus/Rail Interchange in the Local Transport Action Plan and for consistency the same wording should be used in this policy.
- 10.4.2 The environmental and amenity impact will be assessed at the planning application stage. Other policies already cover such matters and do not need to be repeated here.
- 10.4.3 This is a bus/rail interchange policy. Other development in the area would be assessed against relevant policies in the plan.

- 10.4.4 The principle behind this policy is to encourage an integrated public transport system. Additional car parking over and above that in Policy SD09 would further promote the use of the private car contrary to government policy and make a public transport system less sustainable.
- 10.4.5 The Council has two alternative sites for a bus station each to be considered in relation to an integrated public transport system for the town.
- 10.4.6 As the matters listed in the policy appear to be fundamental to the scheme there is no reason to assume they will not be provided. Bus shelters, which are normally an item of street furniture hardly deserve a mention, but no one has objected to their inclusion.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

10.5 POLICY SD05 LAND AROUND THE BUS STATION AND BOREHAMGATE PRECINCT

The Objections

41 Mrs L O Glenn

Support - if more use of buses are encouraged improve the bus station by providing adequate shelter.

1250 Mrs M K Newman

Sudbury is fortunate to have a bus station located near shops. A decent waiting room for travellers should be provided in the redundant builders yard to encouraged more people to Sudbury. An improved bus station should be mentioned.

5662 Suffolk Preservation Society

The society does not understand the addition to the policy relating to the extension of the library. Is this a specific proposal by SCC to provide an extended and improved library service?

5830 Sudbury Town Council

Sudbury Town Council is perplexed by the reference to an extension of the library as it does not adjoin this site.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD05 Pre-Inquiry Change 150

Amend second bullet point of policy to read: "**when redeveloping the surrounding area to allow for** the extension of the library".

The Objections

13228 McCarthy & Stone (Dev) Ltd/The Planning Bureau Limited

It is an unreasonable expectation to harness on a developer or development consortium who would effectively be required to set aside part of an identified mixed-use site for the extension of the library.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.5.1 The policy leaves the option open of improving the existing bus station or relocating it in the centre. Without a detailed scheme to assess I do not consider the policy could be more specific. I have commented on the detailed facilities which may be required at paragraph 10.4.6 above.
- 10.5.2 If there is a specific need during the Plan period for an extension to a public facility such as a library I see no reason why this should not be clearly stated in the Plan to ensure that the opportunity is not lost or disregarded on redevelopment. The proposed pre-inquiry change clarifies that the reference to the library relates to the *surrounding area*. Residential development which forms an integral part of a mixed use scheme is acceptable.
- 10.5.3 There is nothing in the policy which indicates that a sequential approach would not be acceptable once a development brief has been prepared.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 150

10.6 POLICY SD06 LAND TO THE REAR OF MARKET HILL AND GAOL LANE

The Objections

822 GO-East Conditional Withdrawal

Overly-detailed plans are likely to lead to an increase in objections. Policies which repeat the provisions of other policies and cross-references to other policies in the plan are not necessary. Furthermore, policies should only relate to the development and use of land and should not include the reason for the policy.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD06 Pre-Inquiry Change 151

'In the area between Gaol Lane and North Street, south of North Street car park and to the rear of shops on the north side of Market Hill, Sudbury, small-scale proposals for **new shop units or extensions and** alterations at the rear of existing shop units will be permitted. Adequate provision **should be** ~~being~~ made for rear servicing and the improvement of rear servicing to existing shops in the area.

- ~~• no adverse impact on listed buildings or the Conservation area;~~
- ~~• provision of appropriate levels of car parking;~~
- ~~• improvements to the appearance of the area.~~

~~Proposals involving new shop units on a limited scale will be acceptable subject to the same provisos as mentioned above, and those set out in policy SP06.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.6.1 All the excess detail which duplicated other policies of the plan was removed following a previous objection which was conditionally withdrawn. The remaining criteria give sufficient guidance in respect of these small scale extensions.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 151

10.7 PARAGRAPH 10.30 LAND AT THE JUNCTION OF NORTH STREET AND GAINSBOROUGH ROAD

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.30 Pre-Inquiry Change 152

'At the junction of North Street and Gainsborough Road, Sudbury, is an area of secondary shops and a wood yard. **Also situated on the site is the New Hall building which is a Victorian factory building that is included in the Sudbury Local List.** The site is prominent from the northern approach to the town centre. Whilst the site may be too far from the Principal Shopping Area to be attractive for integrated development with the Principal Shopping Area, commercial use would be permitted. Alternatively, the site could be developed for housing, preferably in 'block' form e.g. sheltered housing or flats. **Redevelopment of the site should however be sensitive to the history of the New Hall building on the site.'**

The Objections

13170 The Sudbury Society

Object to phrase "Redevelopment of the site should however be sensitive to the history of the New Hall Building the site". The New Hall should be retained for employment use and excluded from the Local Plan map showing the area scheduled for possible redevelopment at the junction of North Street and Gainsborough Road.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.7.1 From my visit I do not consider it would be appropriate to exclude the hall from this junction site. How it is treated would be a matter for the planning application stage having regard to other policies of the Plan to protect locally listed buildings and encourage appropriate uses within them. (CN16 and CN17). However, I consider the hall to be an integrated part of any such scheme and a comprehensive approach is required.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 152

10.8 PARAGRAPH 10.34b AREAS FOR PARKING AND TRANSPORT –
Car Parking Provision

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.34b Pre-Inquiry Change 153

"...the District council will provide a site for the relocation of the bus station, if it cannot be accommodated in the mixed use scheme proposed in Policy SD05. **Enough space should be provided on this site for stabling of buses between journeys.** Before both these developments..."

The Objections

None

10.9 POLICY SD10 AREAS FOR PARKING AND TRANSPORT – Car Parking Provision

The Objections

768 GO-East

Objection to policy wording. Overly-detailed, lengthy plans are likely to lead to an increased number of objections, delay the adoption of the plan and result in more departures. Policies which repeat the provisions of other policies, for example the use of phrases such as "development will be permitted provided it does not conflict with other policies of the Plan" are unnecessary. Cross-references to other policies in the plan are not necessary. For the purposes of S54(a) of the Principle Act, if a policy is material to the decision it applies. Nor is it necessary to include phrases as "as shown on the proposals map". The requirement to show proposals on a map is covered by legislation.

5371 Suffolk County Council

If the Sudbury bus station is relocated, sufficient space must be provided for the stabling of buses between journeys.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.9.1 In accordance with objections raised much of the detailed description has been relegated to the supporting text at paragraph 10.34b. With these changes I find the policy provides reasonable guidance for an alternative site for a bus station, if required.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 153

10.10 POLICY SD11 – INDUSTRIAL AREAS

The Objections

6877 John Lewis Partnership/Turley Associates

The policy as currently formulated fails to provide the flexibility included within the First Deposit Plan and is inconsistent with the land use policy areas currently proposed. Objector would like the wording to be reverted to the SD11 wording in the First Deposit.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.10.1 This policy would control both commercial and industrial expansion in or adjacent to the town centre. The Employment Chapter deals with the need to retain premises in employment use. I find the criteria listed in the policy provide useful guidance by describing those matters which would be taken into account prior to granting planning permission for expansion. Paragraph 10.36 of the supporting text gives background to the policy.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

10.11 PARAGRAPH 10.43 RESIDENTIAL AREAS

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.43 Pre-Inquiry Change 154

~~'Development will either place on a cleared or partly cleared site~~
consist of primarily the conversion of those buildings, which are of
~~in the form of conversion of those buildings with~~
architectural merit. This is a critical site in a key location in the conservation area and ~~whether it is redeveloped in whole or in part with conversion of buildings,~~ securing a high quality **development** is paramount. **This aspect will be covered in a development brief.**

The Objections

13171 The Sudbury Society

This alteration appears to give more protection to the central core of buildings on the site, however suggest replacement wording " the conversion of those buildings of architectural and/or significant local historical value".

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.11.1 See my report on Policy SD13 below

RECOMMENDATION

See Policy SD13 below

10.12 POLICY SD13 RESIDENTIAL AREAS

The Objections

4024 Sudbury Town Council

Having already accepted (p85 HS09) that many of the existing buildings are worthy of retention Babergh need to have the courage of its convictions and insist that the most significant buildings are retained for conversion (converting the three storey core into apartments would also enable far more housing units on the site than the projected 50). SD13 should therefore read 'the core of significant buildings will be retained for conversion. Other development and changes to the site etc.

4026 Sudbury Town Council

Sudbury Town Council recommends retention of the Pathology Laboratory among the existing buildings.

5651 Suffolk Preservation Society

The society feels that the amended wording does not secure with any certainty the future of the historic buildings on this site. The current wording could be interpreted to allow the existing buildings on the site to be demolished and for redevelopment proposals to be designed taking account of the sensitive nature of the site and its history.

5652 Suffolk Preservation Society

The wording of the policy does not incorporate the contents of the supporting text in paragraphs 10.41a - 10.43 and in some instances seem to contradict them. Given that Walnuttree Hospital now appears in the Sudbury Local List of historic buildings and is

therefore given protection by policy CN16 and CN17 the society feels that all the buildings and structures on the site of architectural or historic interest must be retained and incorporated into any redevelopment proposals.

5653 Suffolk Preservation Society

Given the scale of development and sensitivity of this site the society feels that a development brief be prepared and adopted to guide the implementation of this policy.

7193 The Sudbury Society

Babergh should insist that the most significant buildings on the site are retained for conversion.

7194 The Sudbury Society

Converting the current buildings will result in more housing possibilities.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.12.1 I consider that the supporting text and in particular 10.41a and revised 10.43 recognise the importance of the site and its buildings. In my view without an assessment of the individual buildings it would not be appropriate to insist that all buildings are retained. Other policies in the Plan also protect locally listed buildings (CN16 and CN17). From my visit I consider it likely that some of the buildings will be worthy of retention and this has been recognised in the rewording of paragraph 10.43 above.
- 10.12.2 The requirement for a development brief has been introduced by pre-inquiry change 154 .

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan at paragraph 10.43 in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 154.

10.13 PARAGRAPH 10.45a – 10.46 ROADS AND TRAFFIC – Traffic Circulation and Management

The Objections

8825-8826 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Retailers have requested the provision of a raised junction at the Friars Street/Station Road junction. This is to slow traffic and make it easier for pedestrians to cross the road. This is preferred to the alternative of installing a pedestrian crossing (therefore delete pedestrian crossing).

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraphs 10.45a and 10.46 Pre-Inquiry Change 155

The District Council will urge the County Council to carry out necessary road and traffic management improvements in Sudbury, to deal with anticipated traffic growth. Details of the schemes to be carried out will be set out in the Local Transport Action Plan for Sudbury and Cornard.

~~Improvements to the Belle Vue junctions;~~

~~Improvements to the Girling Street/ East Street junction;~~

~~Pedestrian and cyclist improvements between Ballingdon Street and Market Hill, and throughout the town centre;~~

~~In the longer term, and linked to the provision of the Western Bypass, the reorganisation of traffic flow to divert through traffic out of Market Hill;~~

~~introduction of pedestrian crossing facilities On Cross Street and Friars Street;~~

~~Traffic mitigation schemes throughout the traffic management zone.~~

~~Other work, not identified above, may also be necessary as a result of the development of the Local Transport Action Plan.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.13.1 Those matters listed above are too detailed for the Local Plan and have been recommended for deletion. They would be included in the Local Transport Action Plan. Paragraph 10.46 of the supporting text is no longer necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 155 by amending paragraph 10.45a and deleting paragraph 10.46

10.14 PARAGRAPH 10.52 PEDESTRAIN AND CYCLE MOVEMENT

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.52 Pre-Inquiry Change 156

The implementation of such schemes, their nature and priorities will depend on practical considerations. In consultation with Suffolk County Council and interested parties, the District Council will investigate and, where feasible, introduce traffic-free streets of schemes giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists in the town centre. **Details of the schemes will be set out in the Local Transport Action Plan for Sudbury and Great Cornard.**

The Objections

None

10.15 PARAGRAPH 10.53 PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE MOVEMENT

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.53 Pre-Inquiry Change 157

The effects of such schemes will be greatly enhanced if the Western Bypass and related measures are completed and remove considerable volumes of traffic from the town centre one-way system. ~~Improvements to the Belle Vue junction may offer the opportunity for additional schemes in areas such as King Street and East Street.~~

The Objections

None

10.16 PARAGRAPH 10.53a PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE MOVEMENT

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.53a Pre-Inquiry Change 158

Notwithstanding the uncertainty over whether the Western Bypass will be built and the detail of the schemes that will be contained within the LTAP there are a number of traffic

management measures that will contribute to the vitality and viability of the town through townscape improvements. The District Council will continue to promote these schemes which are listed below:

- **Traffic calming, traffic management measures and an improvement scheme for the North Side of Market Hill, Sudbury;**
- **Traffic calming and traffic management measures for Old Market Place and East Street;**
- **Traffic calming for Gainsborough Street and King Street; and**
- **Traffic calming and footway improvements for Burkitts Lane and Weavers Lane."**

The Objections

None

10.17 POLICY SD17 PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE MOVEMENT

The Objections

828 GO-East

Policies should relate only to the development and use of land. Other matters should be relegated to the supporting text, supplementary planning guidance, planning briefs etc. Policies should only include those matters which will be taken into account in land use decisions.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD17 Pre-Inquiry Change 170

~~In considering development proposals in Sudbury town centre, pedestrians will receive priority over vehicles.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.17.1 This objection from GO-East has been met by the proposed change. This policy did not relate to development or use of land.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting policy in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 170

10.18 PARAGRAPH 10.54 – 10.57 THE NORTH SIDE OF MARKET HILL

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.54 Pre-Inquiry Change 159

~~The following areas of the town require consideration as to how greater priority over the car can be accorded to pedestrians. These proposals are expected to be introduced in phases over a number of years, following extensive consultation.~~

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.55 Pre-Inquiry Change 160

~~Their implementation does not necessarily imply complete closure with 'wall to wall' paving, at least not in the first instance. Often the simple closure of a street to traffic, even for part of the day or week, has immediate and noticeable benefit for the environment.~~

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.56 Pre-Inquiry Change 161

~~All detailed options for implementation will be thoroughly investigated and consultation carried out before any decision are taken.~~

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.57 Pre-Inquiry Change 162

~~The Market Hill is the most important open space in the town. Its attraction is marred by the presence of so many cars and the poor quality of its surfacing. Market days give the area vitality and colour. On other days it is used for car parking, usually short-stay in nature.~~

The Objections

None

10.19 POLICY SD18 THE NORTH SIDE OF MARKET HILL

The Objections

829 GO-East

Policies should relate only to the development and use of land. Other matters should be relegated to the supporting text, supplementary planning guidance, planning briefs etc. Policies should only include those matters which will be taken into account in land use decisions. Policy is a statement of intent and should be deleted.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD18 Pre-Inquiry Change 171

~~The District Council, in consultation with Suffolk County Council and interested parties, propose to introduce traffic calming and traffic management measures into the north side of Market Hill, Sudbury. These will be followed by an improvement scheme that will include:
Visual improvements to the area;
Recognition of demand for some limited parking; and;
An extension of footway based activities.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.19.1 These matters are too detailed for a Local Plan policy and should be covered by the Local Transport plan as yet to be determined. This policy is proposed for deletion and I agree that it is not necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the policy in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 171

10.20 PARAGRAPH 10.58 OLD MARKET PLACE AND EAST STREET

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58 Pre-Inquiry Change 163

~~The north side of King Street and the Post Office in East Street are isolated from the remainder of the Principal Shopping Area. This is primarily because of the volume of traffic which pedestrians have to encounter crossing the road. Introducing traffic calming and traffic management measures would integrate this area into the shopping centre and offer the opportunity for improvements, including small-scale developments, of the area between East Street, King Street and Girling Street. It would also create a large traffic-free open space on the Old Market Place and Town Hall.~~

The Objections

None

10.21 PARAGRAPH 10.58a OLD MARKET PLACE AND EAST STREET

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58a Pre-Inquiry Change 164

~~If justified by reducing traffic as a result of other highway improvements, consideration will be given for the same improvements from Old Market Place and East Street, Sudbury, as far as Girling Street.~~

The Objections

None

10.22 PARAGRAPH 10.58b GAINSBOROUGH STREET AND KING STREET

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58b Pre-Inquiry Change 165

~~These two street have considerable pedestrian and vehicle movements primarily because they give access to the Market Hill area. Traffic calming and traffic management schemes will contribute to and improve the historical character of the area.~~

The Objections

None

10.23 B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD18a Pre-Inquiry Change 172

~~Traffic calming is proposed for Gainsborough Street and King Street, Sudbury.~~

The Objections

None

10.24 PARAGRAPH 10.58c BUS PRIORITY MEASURES ON EAST STREET AND KING STREET

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58c Pre-Inquiry Change 166

~~The introduction of bus priority measures and a bus lane in East Street and King Street will improve access for buses into the town centre. The speed and circulation of traffic will be managed and ultimately contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre.~~

The Objections

None

10.25 PARAGRAPH 10.58d – 10.58f BURKITTS LANE AND WEAVERS LANE

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58d Pre-Inquiry Change 167

~~Burkitts and Weavers Lanes are two narrow lanes off Gainsborough Street. Burkitts Lane has considerable pedestrian movements across it at the Gainsborough Street junction and conflict often occurs with vehicles. Vehicles also damage the buildings on one side.~~

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58e Pre-Inquiry Change 168

~~At Weavers Lane the conflict between vehicles and pedestrians is less severe but the slowing of vehicles to turn into it from the one-way system is still a traffic hazard.~~

B.D.C is proposing a change to Paragraph 10.58f Pre-Inquiry Change 169

~~The District Council proposes traffic calming at Burkitts and Weavers Lanes at their junctions with Gainsborough Street. This would mean that the principal access to the area would be via The Croft. Implementation of traffic calming in these two streets will be complemented by the completed improvements at The Croft. The development will include a paving scheme, which will improve the area for pedestrian use.~~

The Objections

None

10.26 POLICY SD18b BUS PRIORITY MEASURES ON EAST STREET AND KING STREET

The Objections

5646 Suffolk Preservation Society

The society is concerned that this policy is limited to the north side of Market Hill Sudbury.

8820 Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce & Industry

The proposed closure of through traffic to East Street has the secondary proposal of introducing a bus lane. In both instances there will remain vehicles using streets in which pedestrians otherwise 'free to roam' will be less wary of vehicles and this will increase the risk of incident. Neither North Street or the northern side of Market Hill are main through routes, the through traffic travels along Girling Street and the southern side of Market Hill. The traffic using these areas does or can be made to travel more slowly. Since the refurbishment of North Street the retailers report that there have been no vehicle/pedestrian incidents of note consequent of the current surfacing and paving arrangements provided to North Street. There is no complaint about the quality of the atmosphere, which might be harmed by the access traffic in North Street.

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD18b Pre-Inquiry
Change 173**

~~Bus priority measures and a bus lane are proposed in East Street
and King Street.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.26.1 This level of detail is a matter for the Local Transport Plan which I understand has yet to be determined. This policy is proposed for deletion and I agree that it is not necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the Policy in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 173.

10.27 POLICY SD18c BURKITTS LANE AND WEAVERS LANE

The Objections

6812 Gainsborough's House Society

It is very difficult to see how vehicular access could be maintained and an adequate pavement be provided as there is a narrow pavement and only the last 27m are one way travel.

6813 Gainsborough's House Society

Where the Weavers Cottages exit onto Weavers Lane, there is only a present pavement width of 0.75m and a road width of 2.7m.

6814 Gainsborough's House Society

For pedestrians exiting or entering Weavers Cottages, particularly those with disabilities, there will be a potential hazard.

**B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy SD18c Pre-Inquiry
Change 174**

~~Traffic calming is proposed at the entrance to Burkitts and Weavers Lanes, Sudbury and will include extension of footways at the~~

~~entrance of these two lanes and their junctions with Gainsborough Street.~~

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.27.1 This level of detail is a matter for the Local Transport Action Plan. However, I note that the southern end of Weavers Lane has been closed to traffic and paved over, providing level access to Gainsborough's House. This policy has been recommended for deletion and I agree that it is not required.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the Plan by deleting the policy in accordance with Pre Inquiry Change 174

10.28 PARAGRAPH 10.63 SADBURY HOSPITAL

The Objections

5439 Suffolk West NHS Primary Care Trust

There is currently a planning application under consideration for the development of the new health complex in Sudbury at the Churchfield site. The PCT is concerned that the Plan may leave the location of the new health facilities in doubt. Wonder therefore whether by the time the Plan is approved it would be possible to alter this wording to reflect the outcome of the application.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.28.1 I believe that the supporting text at paragraph 10.63 makes the Council's position clear. If there is more certainty prior to adoption the Council could revise the wording accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection at this time

10.29 POLICY SD24 SUDBURY HOSPITAL

The Objections

773 GO-East

Objection to policy wording. Overly-detailed, lengthy plans are likely to lead to an increased number of objections, delay the adoption of the plan and result in more departures. Policies which repeat the provisions of other policies, for example the use of phrases such as "development will be permitted provided it does not conflict with other policies of the Plan" are unnecessary. Cross-references to other policies in the plan are not necessary. For the purposes of S54(a) of the Principle Act, if a policy is material to the decision it applies. Nor is it necessary to include phrases as "as shown on the proposals map". The requirement to show proposals on a map is covered by legislation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.29.1 This policy has been simplified to meet the objections. I consider the criteria now listed are adequate to guide development.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection

10.30 POLICY SD25 RESIDENTS PARKING, BALLINGDON STREET, SUDBURY

The Objections

12 Mr N G Parkin

Objection is made to carpark at rear of properties. It is unclear for who the carpark will serve; natural open space consisting of woodland and wet grounds would be destroyed; properties will lose privacy and security; light pollution will result. The area of the meadow near the entrance from Middleton Road would be more ideal for a car park.

77 Miss L J Kidman

Object to location of proposed car park in that it invades privacy, result in loss of conservation area and will result in pollution.

133 Mrs J E Jones

Object to proposal to build houses and a car park behind properties in Ballingdon Street. Development will result in traffic and access problems and will contribute to loss of wild life and open space.

497 Ms C Fox

Do realise that the people of Ballingdon St have a problem with car parking but consider the effect on local area.

2603 Mr P Selwood

This is one of Sudbury's finest natural beauty areas. Funds would be better directed at public transport rather than the reliance of the car.

2604 Mrs H M Selwood

Object to proposal since development will take place on conservation area, contribute to increased pollution, wild life will be harmed and increase risk of flooding.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.30.1 This policy was deleted at the 2nd Deposit draft stage. The objections have been met by the deletion.

RECOMMENDATION

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

10.31 INS1b SUDBURY TOWN CENTRE LAND USE POLICY AREAS

The Objections

3021 Miss J I Fulford

Proposal plan 1B covering Sudbury Town Centre continues to show the designation of the Atkins Fulford Site, Edgeworth Road as industrial and subject to Policy SD11. As amended in Policy HS09 - brownfield sites; this has now been granted planning consent for housing. No doubt the plan has simply not been updated but should be amended in line with the written statement.

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy Inset Map 1b Pre-Inquiry Change 175

The extension of Sudbury Town Centre boundary and change allocation for land East of Edgeworth Road together with Waitrose supermarket into Mixed Use Area. Add north pointing arrow.

The Objections

None

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.31.1 These revisions have been included by pre-inquiry change.

RECOMMENDATION

Modify the plan in accordance with Pre-Inquiry Change 175

10.32 INS1 SUDBURY, GREAT CORNARD AND CHILTON

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy Inset Map 1 Pre-Inquiry Change 176

Amend area shown as being covered by inset map 1a to be the same as that covered by the inset map.

The Objections

None

10.33 INS 1A SUDBURY TOWN CENTRE

B.D.C is proposing a change to Policy Inset Map 1a Pre-Inquiry Change 177

Amend notation on Walnuttree Hospital site to read "HS09A(a)"

The Objections

None

10.34 POLICY OR TEXT OMISSIONS

The Objections

426 Mr A M Cox

The previous local plan recommended the closure of Weavers Lane, at its southern end, in Sudbury. The revised local plan change this policy to keep Weaver's Lane open. This is a mistake since the southern end of Weaver's Lane is dangerous.

561 Mrs L A Gilfillan

A better alternative to the proposed car park on Kone Vale would be to turn the temporary residents parking site outside St Matthews Hostel into a permanent residents car park thereby relieving the current parking problem.

1886 Mr S J Blackwell

Sudbury is very poorly provided for amenity buildings, public halls etc. Present limited size halls are unsatisfactory in many ways. Sites in Town Centre to meet growth of population needs, seem all to be allocated for more brownfield housing development to make the situation worse.

1887 Mr S J Blackwell

Sudbury is also very poorly off for publicly owned open space and sporting areas for its present and growing population.

2581 Mr P A Brandt

It is particularly requested that the part of Weavers Lane nearest to Gainsborough Street should be pedestrianised. This would greatly assist access by pedestrians to the Cottages now owned by Gainsborough's House and Gainsborough's House Print workshop.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.34.1 As far as I am aware the car park in use at present at St Matthews Hostel is an integral part of that development and also forms part of the recreation ground. Although it might be convenient for local residents to park there it would not be available for the purpose.
- 10.34.2 I am aware from the detailed evidence at Inquiry than community facilities are to be provided in the new Chilton development, but I have no evidence from the Council that there is a deficiency of public buildings in the town centre which would require action through a specific Local Plan policy. There is a shortage of open space provision. This has been recognised in the Tourism and Recreation Chapter of the Plan.
- 10.34.3 Details of road closures and pedestrianisation schemes would have to be assessed in the Local Transport Action Plan. The supporting text describes the problems in the Weavers Lane area. I note that the southern end of

Weavers Lane has now been closed to traffic and paved over, providing level access to Gainsborough's House.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to these objections

10.35 MISCELLANEOUS

The Objections

42 Mrs L O Glenn

Public transport do not allow evening visits to cinema. The exhaust pollution would be much less if Sudbury had a cinema.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.35.1 There are two factors here neither of which can be adequately covered in a Local Plan. The first is the public transport timetable over which the District Council has no direct influence. The second, the provision of a cinema in Sudbury which would reduce some evening travel out of the town by car. The viability of such provision as part of the mixed use scheme in Sudbury would be a factor to be assessed by the developer.

RECOMMENDATION

Make no modification to the Plan in response to this objection
