

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING REFERRALS COMMITTEE - 18 November 2015

---

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO</b>	1
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	3112/15
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Outline application for residential development of up to 175 dwellings with access, landscape, open space and associated infrastructure. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	Land between Gipping Road and Church Road, Stowupland
<b>SITE AREA (Ha)</b>	10.9
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Gladman Developments Ltd
<b>RECEIVED</b>	August 27, 2015
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	November 27, 2015

---

#### **REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reasons :

(1) it is a "Major" application for:-

- a residential land allocation for 15 or over dwellings

(2) the Head of Economy considers the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the extent and planning substance of comments received from third parties.]

#### **PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE**

1. This application follows the refusal of a previous, similar proposal now at appeal and described more fully in the introduction and background to 'Assessment' below. Advice has consistently been given that the development of this site is considered unacceptable.

#### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. The application concerns an irregular, elongated parcel of land between Church Road and Gipping Road on the eastern side of Stowupland. The site is outside the settlement boundary for that village as defined in the adopted Mid Suffolk Core Strategy (2008) (MSCS) and, whilst it falls within the area covered by the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013 (SAAP)), is not an 'allocated site' in that document.

The site extends to 10.9 Ha. in total and has frontages of approximately 190m.

to Church Road and 170m. to Gipping Road. A further 90-100m. of the northern boundary to Gipping Road runs behind the existing residential properties fronting that road.

Beyond Church Road and Gipping Road is generally open countryside. However, Columbine Hall, a grade 2\* listed building and its associated outbuildings stand some 400m. to the north of Gipping Road.

To the east, the site abuts open countryside apart from a small portion in the south-eastern corner which is adjacent to a group of properties fronting Church Road and which contains several listed buildings.

To the west the northern part of the site adjoins residential development., the central portion of the site abuts the primary school fields which are designated Visually Important Open Space, and the southern edge is adjacent to residential properties and close to the Grade 2 listed church.

The southern part of the site has a gently undulating character. The land then rises slightly and levels out towards the north-west.

### HISTORY

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

4002/14	Outline application for residential development of up to 190 dwellings with access, landscape, open space and associated infrastructure.	Refused 19/03/2015. Currently at appeal.
---------	--	--

### PROPOSAL

4. Proposed is a residential development of up to 175 dwellings with access, landscape, open space and associated infrastructure. The application is in outline, with all matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.

An illustrative Development Framework plan has been submitted with the application. In general terms this shows:-

- Main vehicular access off Church Road
- Emergency vehicular access off Gipping Road
- An indicative 'main street'
- Four discrete residential areas of various sizes (total 6.97 Ha.)
- An area of amenity open space with play area and 'biodiversity enhancements' extending to 3.63Ha. approximately in the centre of the site
- A 'native species woodland belt' adjacent to Gipping Road and along the eastern boundary
- Potential new footpath links

From the information supplied the site would have a nett residential density of 25 dwellings per Ha.

**POLICY**

**5. Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

**CONSULTATIONS**

**6. Stowupland Parish Council** consider the proposal to be too much additional housing for the village and object for the following reasons (summarised):-

- Adverse impact on landscape around Stowupland. Urbanisation will change character of the area, in particular setting of village and enjoyment of footpaths etc.
- Development will lead to significant additional traffic on the A1120, increasing congestion and exacerbating problems at junction with B1115. Applicant's Transport Assessment (TA) is out of date and does not take account of local schools reorganisation or committed developments at Mill Lane and Cedars Park on the east of Stowmarket.
- Stowupland currently a well balanced community. Scale of additional development will put pressure on facilities and services.
- Application proposes growth not identified in the SAAP.
- Proposal is the 'very antithesis of localism'. Preliminary work on Neighbourhood Plan suggests development of this scale.

**Stowmarket Town Council** recommend refusal as the development would have a seriously detrimental effect on education, health provision, open space and recreational provision, library services, sewerage and drainage and the local road network.

**SCC Highways** note that the source of their objection to the previous application, the vehicular access onto Gipping Road, has been removed from this proposal. They consider that the proposed access onto Church Road serving the whole site is acceptable, with emergency access only onto Gipping Road.

However, they consider that the submitted TA is inadequate in that it does not take account of the effects of two committed local developments; the extension to Stowupland School (2611/14) and the business park at Mill Lane (0371/15). In addition there is the proposed development at Ashes Farm and further extensions to Cedars Park which will affect roads in the vicinity of the development.

They therefore conclude that if the proposal is to be approved, it is likely to require mitigation measures, but cannot say at this stage what those would be.

They require the following improvements to the public highway to be funded by the developer and secured via S106 Agreement:-

- Provided any necessary mitigation at the junction of the A1120/B1115, supported by evidence, to show that the residual effects of the development will not be severe, taking into account other committed developments.
- A suitable route for pedestrians linking the site to the Post Office in Rendall Lane
- Widening of the footway along the site frontage to Church Road to 2m.

In addition, the Highway Authority require the following financial contributions relating to public rights of way (PROW) and the Travel Plan to be secured via S106 Agreement:-

- PROW improvements - £40,107.50
- Bus stop improvements - £12,00.00
- Travel Plan Monitoring and Support Fee - £5000.00
- Travel Plan Implementation and Target Bond - £152,300.00

**SCC Landscape Officer** objects to the proposal for the following reasons (summarised):-

- Existing settlement has low visual impact on and is well integrated into the landscape. Proposal will significantly change that and effectively join Stowupland to the outlying housing clusters.
- Limited separation provided by the central area of open space is compromised by the 'Indicative Main Street'.
- Effect of areas designated as Visually Important Open Space in achieving the transition between the current settlement edge and the countryside will be lost if development allowed.
- Proposals for landscape buffer to east of site will take some 30 years to reach semi-maturity and an element of good screening.
- Wide impact from night time light glow.
- In overall terms consider that the landscape and visual impacts have been underestimated - perhaps as a result of an optimistic expectation of the new planting proposals.

The Landscape Officer does, however, acknowledge that:-

- The retention of the hedgerow fronting Glipping Road with only an emergency access point, moving the development edge away from that road and limiting the northerly properties to 1.5 storey ('chalet' style) will lessen

the impact on the localised landscape in this area.

- The existing and proposed planting belt to the edge of the properties in Trinity Walk will limit the impact on these properties,

...but overall recommends refusal for reasons similar to that applicable to the previous application.

**SCC Archaeology** have no objection subject to the standard two-stage condition

**SCC Infrastructure Officer** requires financial contributions as follows:-

- Education facilities £1,212,230.00
- Pre-school/early years £103,547.00
- Library facilities £37,800.00
- waste management £8,925.00

**SCC Flood and Water Management Team** object to the proposal. They consider that the submitted Flood Risk Assessment is unacceptable in that it does not describe the existing drainage system or correctly identify flood risk or adequate mitigation measures compliant with national policies or standards. . They list a significant series of shortcomings.

**SCC Rights of Way Officer** has no objection.

**Historic England** have concerns over the effect of the development on the setting of the Grade 2\* Columbine Hall. They suggest that the area of open space to the south of the site is moved and added to that at the Gipping Road edge to further mitigate the effect on the 2\* building.

**Highways England** have no objection.

**Natural England** have no objection. They have not commented on protected species and refer the Council to their standing advice on same.

**Suffolk Wildlife Trust** consider that the breaching of th hedgerows fronting and within the site will have some adverse impact on biodiversity, including foraging bats. They also note that the increase in external lighting is likely to have an adverse impact on nocturnal wildlife including bats.

They require any permission granted to have conditions requiring significant ecological enhancements, including those contained in the applicant's submitted Ecological Appraisal, and the specification of external lighting to be strictly controlled.

**MSDC Strategic Housing** require 35% of the dwellings (61 no. units) to be provided as affordable. They also suggest that the open market apartments and smaller market units be designed and developed to Lifetime Homes standards.

**NHS England** have no objection. The Stowhealth practice has capacity to deal with the residents generated and no mitigation is therefore required.

The following consultees had not responded at the time of preparing this report. Any comments received will therefore either be included in Member's late papers or reported verbally to Committee.

- MSDC Heritage
- Suffolk Police Force
- MSDC Environmental Health - Land contamination
- MSDC Planning Policy
- MSDC Environmental Health - Sustainability issues
- Suffolk Preservation Society

### LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. Letters of representation can be summarised as follows:

- It would result in a massive traffic impact and there is already a lot of traffic on the main road.
- There is not enough space for further children in the schools.
- There is not enough capacity for extra people at the doctors surgeries.
- The development would not fit in with the feel of the village.
- The site is proposed where there are predominately older properties, this development would not fit in.
- It is not considered that this number of houses is needed.
- Extra homes will exacerbate the pedestrian safety for school children and those trying to cross the main road.
- Traffic using the A1120 due to the change in the school structure has created more traffic using this road where the new development is proposed to be accessed from.
- The owners/residents along the A1120 will be subjected to even more noise pollution, congestion and difficulty in gaining access and exit to own property.
- It will impact upon family life and the entire village residents lifestyle as Stowupland will change from a small village into a small town.
- There have already been new housing developments, including sheltered housing schemes. The village has already accommodated more residents and associated traffic.
- Rendalls Lane is already being used as a short cut to avoid congestion on the A1120. This development will exacerbate this.
- Concerned that the development adjoins meadow has special connections and history with the village (grassy meadow/whoopers meadow/allotment meadow). This may be lost and become insignificant in the development, resulting in the loss of part of the village's history.
- Local services are already over stretched, schools, doctors.
- The application would result in the loss of our local countryside surrounding the village and our open views.
- The development will increase the village by 20%. No small village should have to deal with such a size of development.
- It would result in the loss of wildlife habitat.
- Take pride in our countryside and we wish to remain a village and a close knit community. The village is not ready for a development of this size.
- The development is unsustainable.
- Concerned over sewerage and drainage generated by this development.
- Open space, sport and recreational facilities for those occupiers of the proposed development.

- The development is contrary to the policies within the Mid Suffolk Local Plan, Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focussed Review as development outside the settlement boundary and does not comply with any of the exception criteria set out within Paragraph 55 of the NPPF.
- Development of such a large area will result in the loss of residential amenity for those living close to it and a loss of visual amenity particularly to walkers, riders runners and those who use the public footpath network that passes the site.
- The site is typical High Suffolk countryside as evidenced by the Landscape and Visual Appraisal submitted with the application. This assessment has failed to assess the development in the wider context.
- The fact that the site does not have a national or local designation does not mean that it is not of value to the immediate and wider area.
- The urbanisation, including street lighting and roads will be out of keeping with the settlement pattern. A housing estate will look totally out of place in this location.
- The wider landscape includes listed buildings.
- The Parish Council is producing a neighbourhood plan and approval of this development would deprive the community of deciding for itself how much growth is needed and where it should go.
- Much has been made of the Five Year Housing Land Supply but appeals have been dismissed where the Inspector found the development was not sustainable.
- The development would result in light pollution.
- There are inconsistencies and inaccuracies within the application.
- There is already a large housing development at Cedars Park.
- The golden thread of the NPPF is sustainable development and this development because of its size and impact upon the local community and infrastructure is not.
- The requirement for flood water catchment in the form of balancing ponds indicates the site is unsuitable for residential development.
- These balancing ponds cannot be considered as amenity space or a replacement for lost habitat.
- The Stowmarket Area Action Plan provides for growth in the area but does not propose allocations in its villages as they are close to Stowmarket which is the most sustainable location in relation to local employment and growth.
- Stowupland would become the suburbia of Stowmarket.
- There are not enough jobs in the locality now. This development would increase this problem.
- The site has been poorly chosen.
- There are no cycle links and poor bus services at this location.
- Concern over the emergency access.
- The change in the development to have a single access point on Church Road will mean the need for a larger access with greater visibility splays which would create an enormous scar on the edge of the village.
- The travel plan, which is only a framework, is inadequate at this stage.
- The heavy plant traffic with the construction of the development going through the village is dangerous and vibrations could affect the stability of properties, old and new.
- Would cause nighttime illumination.
- It is affecting properties values and the selling of those on the market.
- Dangers with the junction of A1120/B1115.
- Brownfield sites should be used before greenfield sites.

## **ASSESSMENT**

### **8. *Introduction and Background:***

This application follows the refusal of a similar application for up to 190 dwellings including 40 affordable units on this site in March this year. That application is now at appeal with a public inquiry scheduled for April 2016.

Five reasons for refusal were included on that decision notice, covering the following issues (these are summarised for this report - a copy of the decision notice is included in the committee papers):-

- The proposed access onto Gipping Road was considered unacceptable as the constrained nature of that road, lack of pedestrian footways and poor visibility at the junction with Rendall Lane rendered it inadequate to accommodate the projected increase in traffic volume.
- The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the quality and local distinctiveness of the landscape around Stowupland, which includes areas designated Visually Important Open Space in the adopted Local Plan.
- The loss/fragmentation of hedgerows would have a detrimental impact on the biodiversity value of the site.
- The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the setting of Columbine Hall, a Grade 2\* listed building some 400m. to the north of the site, and the Grade 2 listed cottages and church adjacent to Church Road.
- The proposal failed to make provision for the proportion of affordable housing and the financial contributions required by locally adopted policies and supplementary documents (i.e. no completed Section 106 Agreement was returned).

It will be noted from the above that, notwithstanding the fact that the site has not been 'allocated' site in the Stowmarket Area Action Plan and is therefore 'countryside', non-compliance with adopted policy was not included as a specific reason for refusal. That is because at the time of considering the application, the Council did not have a deliverable five year supply of housing land.

In such circumstances the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) deems that policies for the supply of housing should be considered 'out of date'. The application was however considered to be otherwise contrary to the policies and guidance in the adopted Development Plan framework. Accordingly it was assessed both against the principles of 'sustainable development' - the 'golden thread' that underpins the NPPF - and the policies and guidance in the adopted Development Plan framework which are consistent with that document.

### ***The Current Application:***

As members will be aware, the Council still has a shortfall in the five-year deliverable supply of housing land. This current application therefore falls to be considered against that same background.



Following on from this, it is then perhaps logical to first consider how the new application compares with the previous in terms of the issues which formed the basis of that refusal, and then to consider any additional matters raised.

#### **Highway Capacity and Safety:**

It is noted that the Highway Authority welcome the removal of the proposed vehicular access onto Gipping Road, which essentially overcomes their principal objection to the previous application.

They include in their consultation response specific improvements to footway provision. These can be carried out on highway land under S278 Agreements but will need to be secured via a S106 Agreement.

They remain concerned however that the submitted Transport Assessment does not take account of the approved extensions to Stowupland High School and the committed development at Mill Lane (both of which have been approved since consideration of the previous application on this site) and proposed developments at Ashes farm and further extensions to Cedars Park - all of which, along with this development if allowed, will put pressure on the layout and capacity of the junction of the A1120 and B1115 at the western end of Stowupland.

Without the up-to-date information it is not possible to establish the mitigation measures which may be required. It is therefore recommended that a reason for refusal is included based on the application as submitted failing to demonstrate that the development would not have a severe impact with particular referencing to the junction of the A1120 and B1115.

The policy framework considered to be particularly relevant to this issue is:- Paras. 32 and 35 of the NPPF, Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012), Policies 4.1 and 8.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Policy T10 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)

#### **Landscape Impact:**

It is acknowledged that the adverse impact on the landscape is reduced in the immediate vicinity of the Gipping Road frontage. However, this is a very localised impact, and the wider concerns over the wider setting of Stowupland, the quality and function of the areas designated visually Important Open Space, and the enjoyment of the local footpath network remain.

It is therefore concluded that this revised scheme again has a significantly detrimental impact on the visual quality and experience of the landscape around Stowupland, contrary to the aims and requirements of the NPPF and locally adopted policies and guidance, and that this application should be refused for that reason.

The policy framework considered to be particularly relevant to this issue is:- Paras. 61, 76 and 109 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy (2008), Policy FC1.1 of the Focussed Review of that Document, Policy 4.2 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Policy RT12 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

**Biodiversity:**

It is clear from Suffolk Wildlife Trust's consultation response that the concerns over the impact on biodiversity and the ecology of the area expressed in connection with the previous application remain with this proposal. A recommendation for refusal based on these concerns is therefore included.

The policy framework considered to be particularly relevant to this issue is:- Paras. 109 and 118 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Policy FC1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review and saved Policy CL8 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

**Impact on the Setting of Listed Buildings:**

Historic England remain concerned the proposal will have an adverse impact on the setting of Columbine Hall.

Mid Suffolk's Heritage Team acknowledge that this revised application lessens the impact on Columbine Hall but conclude that the adverse effects are not entirely removed. They also remain concerned over the impact of the development on the Grade 2 buildings close to Church Road.

Historic England's suggestion that the open space in the south of the site should be included with the area to adjacent to Gipping Way to further ease the impact on the 2\* building is to a large extent counter-productive, as that area to the south to some extent mitigates the effect on the Grade 2 listed buildings close to Church Road.

In overall terms however, the only change to the setting of the Grade 2 buildings close to the south of the site proposed by this application is the inclusion of a diagonal corridor of open space in the lower centre of the site which retains a very localised view of the Grade 2 listed church. It is therefore concluded that the objection concerning the impact on the setting of listed buildings close to the site should substantially remain.

The policy framework considered to be particularly relevant to this issue is:- Paras. 131, 132 and 134 of the NPPF. Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Policy 9.5 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan, Policy FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review and saved Policy HB1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).

**Provision of Affordable Housing and Other financial Benefits Required by Adopted Policy and Guidance:**

The Planning Statement submitted with the application suggests the developers are prepared to enter a planning obligation with regard to the provision of :-

- Open space- both on site and a commuted sum for off- site.
- Education facilities
- Improvements to Public Rights of Way (maximum £20,000)

- A habitat management plan
- A planting plan
- Bus service and infrastructure improvements
- Travel Plan monitoring (maximum £5,000).
- Affordable housing (not less than 35% of the total number of units)
- Legal costs

However, apart from the amounts/details shown in parenthesis (which are well short of the required amounts) and the affordable housing offer, no specific figures are included. Furthermore, the applicants have declined to enter any discussion/negotiation on these contributions.

At the time of preparing this report no completed S106 Agreement had been entered into. Accordingly, at this stage the issue forms a further reason for refusal.

The policy framework considered to be particularly relevant to this issue is:- The NPPF, saved Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy FC1.1 of the Focussed Review, Policy 11.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Altered Policy H4 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan First Alteration.

**Other Matters:**

As will be clear from the consultation response above, SCC Land Drainage Team consider that the submitted information fails to identify flood risk and adequately inform the proposed development with regard to mitigation measures and sustainable drainage.

This matter forms a further reason for refusal.

The policy framework considered to be particularly relevant to this issue is:- Para. 107 of the NPPF and Para, ID7 of the associated Practice Guidance, Policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Focussed Review (2012) and Policy 4.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013).

No other substantive planning issues are raised by the current application

**Conclusion/Overall Planning Balance:**

It is accepted that the Council has a shortfall in the five year deliverable supply of housing land.

However, it is considered that, for the reasons set out below, this proposal does not comprise 'sustainable development' as required by the NPPF and the framework of adopted local policy and guidance which are consistent with that document.

The development is contrary to the development plan read as a whole. Any benefit to be derived from the grant of planning permission is therefore considered to be significantly outweighed by this lack of sustainability and conflict with the development plan, and it is therefore concluded that the application should be refused.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**That Outline Planning Permission be Refused for the following reasons:-**

**1. The proposal, by reason of its scale and form, would have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area including an area designated Visually Important Open Space in the adopted Development Plan, and would not conserve or enhance local distinctiveness or safeguard the appreciation of that landscape for users of the Public Right of Way network in the area. As such the proposal conflicts with the aims of paras. 61, 76 and 109 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of the adopted Core Strategy (2008), Policy FC1.1 of the Focussed Review of that Document, Policy 4.2 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Policy RT12 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).**

**2. The application as submitted fails to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety, with particular reference to the junction of the A1120 and B1115 at the eastern edge of Stowupland, contrary to the aims of para. 35 of the NPPF, Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focussed Review (2012), Policies 4.1 and 8.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Policy T10 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998)**

**3 The proposed development would have detrimental impact on biodiversity due to the loss of hedgerows of high ecological importance contrary to Paras. 109 and 118 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Policy FC1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review and saved Policy CL8 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).**

**4. The proposed development by virtue of its scale and form would have a detrimental impact on the setting of heritage assets, including the cluster of Grade II listed buildings on Church Road and the Grade II\* listed Columbine Hall. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Paras. 131, 132 and 134 of the NPPF. Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy, Policy 9.5 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan, Policy FC1.1 of the Core Strategy Focused Review and saved Policy HB1 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan (1998).**

**5. The proposal fails to make adequate provision/contributions (and/or agreement to provide) for community and other facilities/services for the occupants of the dwellings. The applicants have not entered in to the necessary legal agreement, which is required to ensure the following Community Infrastructure Requirements/Facilities are provided:**

**- The provision of 35% of the dwellings as onside Affordable Housing,**

- Financial contributions towards Primary School & Secondary School Places, Pre-school Places, Libraries and Waste.
  - Financial contributions towards Highway Improvements and a Traffic Regulation Order in order to address highway and pedestrian safety concerns and improvements to the Public Right of Way network.
  - The provision of Play Space and Sports Space and Social Infrastructure
  - A Management Plan to deal with the provision, maintenance and transfer of open space and play space equipment,
- The Proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, saved Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policy FC1.1 of the Focussed Review, Policy 11.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013) and saved Altered Policy H4 of the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan First Alteration.

6. The application as submitted fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause localised flooding through the identification of flood risk or adequate mitigation measures compliant with national or local standards. Furthermore it does not clearly describe the existing drainage system or fully describe sustainable drainage solutions for the development. As such the proposal conflicts with the aims of Para. 107 of the NPPF and Para. ID7 of the associated Practice Guidance, Policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy, Policies FC1 and FC1.1 of the Focussed Review (2012) and Policy 4.1 of the Stowmarket Area Action Plan (2013).

Philip Isbell  
Corporate Manager - Development Management

Ian Ward  
Senior Planning Officer

## **APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

### **1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review**

- Cor1** - CS1 Settlement Hierarchy
- Cor2** - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages
- Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment
- Cor9** - CS9 Density and Mix
- CS SAAP** - Stowmarket Area Action Plan
- CSFR-FC1** - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- CSFR-FC1.1** - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- CSFR-FC2** - PROVISION AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING
- CSFR-FC3** - SUPPLY OF EMPLOYMENT LAND

### **2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan**

- SB3 - RETAINING VISUALLY IMPORTANT OPEN SPACES**
- CL8 - PROTECTING WILDLIFE HABITATS**
- CL6 - TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**
- GP1 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT**
- RT12 - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS**
- H13 - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**
- H14 - A RANGE OF HOUSE TYPES TO MEET DIFFERENT ACCOMMODATION NEEDS**

**3. Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

- C01/03 - Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives**
- NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework**

**APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of representation have been received from a total of **251** interested parties.

The following people **objected** to the application

[Redacted list of names]

rket



[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[Redacted text block]

The following people **commented** on the application:

[REDACTED]