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Further Comments for Planning Application DC/19/2481/OUT

Dear Council,

We wish to lodge our continuing objection to this planning application, for the reasons stated below.

**Comment Details**

Type: Neighbour

Stance: Objection to the Planning Application.

Reasons: Planning Policy, Layout and Design, Highways, Community Infrastructure.

These further comments are made on the revisions submitted by Boyer, Planning Consultants acting on behalf of the applicant Bloor Homes.

Our previous comments objecting to the application were submitted individually by us, Kenneth and Carla Carlisle, and raised the following issues. These remain central to our objections:

1. That the proposed development would lie outside the Stanton Settlement Boundary and as a consequence should not be approved. The National Planning Policy guidance relating to the presumption to approve in certain circumstances should not apply, given that West Suffolk District Council has identified a pipeline of residential development sites in excess of 5 years.
2. That whilst the application is in outline, the indicative layout and design is incompatible with the village of Stanton.
3. Connectivity to the centre of the Village and it amenities is poor and encourages the use of cars
4. There would be an adverse impact on highway safety, especially on the A143 as a result of the additional traffic from this development entering an already over-crowded road.
5. Existing community infrastructure, such as Schools and Doctors’ surgeries are already stretched without the capacity to accommodate the additional demand generated by the development.

In response to Consultees’ comments, Boyer, the applicant’s planning consultants, submitted a rebuttal on the issues that had been raised on the 14th April, which was followed on the 31st July by the submission of revised drawings and reports in support of the outline application.

Based on these revised documents, we wish to add to our previous comments and reconfirm our objection to the outline planning application submitted by Bloor Homes.

**Five Year Land Supply**

It is contended by the applicant that West Suffolk has not identified a deliverable 5 year pipeline of development sites for residential development and as a consequence breaches the guidance set out in Para 73 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework).

An acknowledgement of this by West Suffolk District Council could have significant implications for district wide planning policy. If correct, this should be addressed by way of prioritising and identifying additional sites in a district wide context rather than a “he who shouts loudest” approach on individual sites.

In any event, we believe this site fails to meet the criteria set out in the NPPF test relating to sustainable development and, as a consequence, planning permission should be refused.

The applicants contend that the inclusion of this site in the West Suffolk SHELAA (Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment) supports the case for the grant of planning permission. We would make the point that the inclusion of a site within a local authority’s SHELAA does not determine that the site should as a consequence be allocated for development.

**Layout and Design**

The proposed reduction in the number of dwellings from 250 to 244 is not in truth material. The proposal to reduce storey heights at the eastern end of the site is not really a major improvement given that the application is in outline.

The other changes made do not alter our view that the proposals are incompatible with the local style and character of the existing village.

**Highways and Connectivity to the Village**

We have not had sight of the comments on the application by Suffolk Highways. We remain of the view that the proposed new junction with Bury Road will result in a reduction in

highway safety on the very busy A143.

In an attempt to improve pedestrian and cycleway links to the village centre the applicants are proposing a new cycleway/footpath across the Stanton Recreation Ground. It would appear that there is no agreement yet in place with the Parish Council in respect of the grant of the licence that will be needed to construct and subsequently maintain this. In such circumstances we believe it is wrong to include this in the application until there is certainty that an agreement will be reached with the Parish Council.

We remain of the view that the location of the site out of the main village will limit pedestrian and cycle use because of travel distances and so will encourage the use of cars.

**Community Infrastructure**

The capacity of existing community infrastructure is already stretched. There are also other developments sites in Stanton which are coming forward, and these also must be considered. All these will add to the pressure and must be taken into account by way of a wider village infrastructure delivery plan. The application makes no provision for this and relies on CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) contributions. Due to the funding arrangements across the District Council area there is no certainty that the funds needed would be provided and, as a consequence, it is possible that this development will be the straw that breaks the camel’s back.

We hope that you will give careful consideration to these points, because this development would have serious implications for the local community.

Yours sincerely,

Kenneth Carlisle

Carla Carlisle