

Development Management Planning Application Consultation – Planning Policy comments

To: Development Management
From: Planning Policy
Date: 9th March 2018
Ref: DC/17/2624/HYB

Location: Tripp Batt, The Foundry, Old Bury Road, Stanton, Bury St. Edmunds, Suffolk, IP31 2BT

Proposal: Hybrid Planning Application (i) Full Planning Application for demolition of the existing structures and (ii) Outline Planning Application (Means of Access and Scale to be considered) for up to 9no. dwellings with access and associated infrastructure

The applicant seeks to demolish the existing structures on site under a full application and outline permission for the erection of 9 dwellings including access and associated infrastructure, (with the means of access and scale to be considered).

Recent Planning History

E/77/3172/P - INSTALLATION OF UNDERGROUND PETROL TANK - NOT FOR RESALE – Application Approved

E/80/1754/P - ERECTION OF EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO STORES – Application Approved

E/89/1024/P - Erection of extension to existing building to provide office space over existing showroom – Application Granted

SE/00/2208 - Planning Application - Installation of roller shutters to shop frontage - Application Approved

SE/02/3895/P - Planning Application - (i) Provision of exhaust duct through workshop roof; and (ii) enclosure of open display area as amended by letter and drawing received 24th February 2003 indicating alterations to the flue – Application Approved

The applicant refers to the adjacent site as “the site”. It was previously occupied by Tripp Batt (and is now known as Horseshoe Rise):

SE/00/3145/P: Outline Planning Application - Ten dwellings and vehicular access (following demolition of warehouse) as amended by letter and drawing received 16th October 2000 revising site ownership boundary adjacent to 102 Hepworth Road and further amended by letter and drawing received 16th November 2000 revising position of dwellings on plots 1-3 and 9 & 10, access to plots 9 & 10 and 1.8 metre close boarded fencing on northern boundary - Application granted.

SE/02/1823/P: Submission of Details - Erection of ten dwellings with associated garages and parking spaces and construction of vehicular access (following demolition of former warehouse) - Application granted.

Planning Policy

The following documents make up the local plan for the area:

- St Edmundsbury Core Strategy (Dec 2010)
- Joint Development Management Policies Document (Feb 2015)
- Rural Vision 2031 (Sept 2014)

These documents, together with current national planning policy are material considerations to be taken into account when assessing the above application.

Policies particularly relevant to this proposal are set out below:

NPPF

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 14 sets out the principle objective of the Framework as;

...a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking,...

For decision-taking this means:

- *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
- *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
 - *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
 - *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.*

Paragraphs 17 and 111 of the NPPF state '*Planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value*'.

Paragraph 18 states '*The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future*'.

Paragraph 28 states "*planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity....Plans should... promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities...*"

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that '*to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.*'

The paragraph goes on to state that authorities need to '*identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites, sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.*'

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that '*Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.*'

Paragraph 55 states "*To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.*"

Paragraphs 56 – 68 deal with design. Para 64 states '*Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character of an area and the way it functions*'.

Paragraph 128 states "*In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary....*"

Paragraph 129 goes on to say "*Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.*"

Presumption in favour of Sustainable development - JDMPD (2015) Policy DM1 and Rural Vision 2031 (2014) Policy RV1

"When considering development proposals the council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework....Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

Comment: The application site is within the settlement boundary of Stanton, and is given a presumption in favour of development unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is discussed further below.

The site location

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Stanton, a key service centre. It is towards the north-eastern edge of the designated village local centre, and lies partly within Stanton's Conservation Area. It adjoins Foundry House and cottage that comprise a Grade II listed building.

Housing Land Supply

The latest St Edmundsbury assessment of a five year supply of housing land was published in September 2017. This confirms that the Council is able to demonstrate 5.3 year supply of housing land. The Council's housing land supply policies are up to date and in accordance with the NPPF, and with a 5 year supply of housing, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. Development not in accordance with the development plan should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Core Strategy (2010)

The policies of particular relevance are as follows;

Policy CS2 – Sustainable development, states *"A high quality, sustainable environment will be achieved by designing and incorporating measures appropriate to the nature and scale of development, including:"*

In particular the following criteria are particularly relevant;

"L) making a positive contribution towards the vitality of the area through an appropriate mix of uses. In area of strategic growth this will include employment, community, retail, social, health and recreation, parks, open spaces and allotments."

"N) Making a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, character, townscape and the setting of settlements."

"O) conserving or enhancing the historic environment including archaeological resources."

Policy CS4 – Settlement Hierarchy and Identity, classifies Stanton as a Key Service Centre.

CS5: Affordable Housing states *"Developers will be expected to integrate land for affordable homes within sites where housing is proposed, to ensure that*

affordable housing is provided and comes forward in parallel with market homes, with targets as follows:"

" 1. Where sites are between 0.17 hectares and 0.3 hectares or between 5 and 9 dwellings, 20% shall be affordable."

"2. Where sites are 0.3 hectares and above or 10 dwellings or more are proposed, 30% shall be affordable"

Comment: The site as shown on the planning application form and location plan has an area of approximately 0.4 hectares. Ordinarily, Policy CS5 would be triggered. However, the indicative total combined floor area proposed for the 9 dwellings is 995sqm. Since this is less than 1000sqm outlined in the Ministerial Statement then affordable housing cannot at present be sought. It is suggested that a condition be used so that if the appearance and layout of the development results in development greater than 1000sqm at reserved matters, then an affordable housing obligation could be revisited.

Policy CS13 – Rural Areas states *"The scale of development in Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Infill Villages, as defined in Policy CS1, will reflect the need to maintain the sustainability of local services for the communities they serve, the diversification of the economy and the provision of housing for local needs."*

Joint Development Management Policies document (2015)

The policies particularly relevant to the proposals are as follows:

Policy DM2: Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness states *"Proposals for all development (including changes of use, shopfronts, and the display of advertisements) should, as appropriate"*

The following criteria are of particular relevance;

"a. recognise and address the key features, characteristics, landscape/townscape character, local distinctiveness and special qualities of the area and/or building and, where necessary, prepare a landscape/townscape character appraisal to demonstrate this;

b. maintain or create a sense of place and/or local character, particularly restoring or enhancing localities where strong local characteristics are lacking or have been eroded;

c. preserve or enhance the setting of, or views into and out of, a Conservation Area;

g. taking mitigation measures into account, not affect adversely:

- (i) the distinctive historic character and architectural or archaeological value of the area and/or building;*
- (iv) sites, habitats, species and features of ecological interest*

j. produce designs that respect the character, scale, density and massing of the locality;"

Comment:

- (a), (b) and (j) The proposed 9 dwellings are to be located within a 0.4ha site, creating a density of approximately 23 dwellings per hectare. This*

density is relatively low when compared to the site's surrounding area. It is appreciated that there are historic assets adjacent, but nevertheless, the proposal has not demonstrated an optimal use of land in accordance with para 58 of the NPPF.

- Since the proposal is outline only; appearance, layout and landscape are reserved matters, whilst scale and access are to be considered. Nevertheless there is no rationale for the indicative designs other than commentary to view an illustrative streetscene. The indicative streetscene is not convincing in terms of demonstrating that the proposal may appropriately assimilate into its context, particularly given the proximity of the historic assets. The indicative details fail to demonstrate local distinctiveness, or a design sympathetic to its context. Whilst detailed design is reserved, the indicative information as submitted does not demonstrate compliance with this policy.
- The statement erroneously purports that there is historic planning permission for 10 units on site. In fact the previous application SE/00/3145/P for 10 dwellings relates to the redevelopment of the adjacent site, following the demolition of the existing warehouse, under a previous development plan. This created the development now known as Horseshoe Rise.
- (c) and (g(i)) This is explained further in the comments relating to policies DM15 and DM17.
- (g(iv)) This is explained further in the comments relating to policies DM11 and DM12.

Policy DM11: Protected Species states "*Development which would have an adverse impact on species protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), the Protection of Badgers Act (1992), and listed in the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan, or subsequent legislation, will not be permitted unless there is no alternative and the local planning authority is satisfied that suitable measures have been taken to:*

- a. reduce disturbance to a minimum; and*
- b. i. maintain the population identified on site; or*
 - ii. provide adequate alternative habitats to sustain at least the current levels of population.*

Where appropriate, the local planning authority will use planning conditions and/or planning obligations to achieve appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures and to ensure that any potential harm is kept to a minimum. Development which would have an adverse impact on species protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), the Protection of Badgers Act (1992), and listed in the Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan, or subsequent legislation, will not be permitted unless there is no alternative and the local planning authority is satisfied that suitable measures have been taken to:

- a. reduce disturbance to a minimum; and*
- b. i. maintain the population identified on site; or ii. provide adequate alternative habitats to sustain at least the current levels of population.*

Where appropriate, the local planning authority will use planning conditions and/or planning obligations to achieve appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures and to ensure that any potential harm is kept to a minimum."

Policy DM12 – Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity states *"In addition to, or as part of the requirements of other policies in this DPD, measures should be included, as necessary and where appropriate, in the design for all developments for the protection of biodiversity and the mitigation of any adverse impacts. Additionally, enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development. For example, such enhancement could include watercourse improvements to benefit biodiversity and improve water quality, habitat creation, wildlife links (including as part of green or blue infrastructure) and building design which creates wildlife habitat (e.g. green roofs, bird and/or bat boxes)."*

Comment: A preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been submitted as part of this application by agb environmental. It is noted that the proposal site is within 200m of a Brown long-eared Bat breeding colony. There are also protected and notable birds and hedgehogs in the locality. The submitted report finds negligible evidence of bat roosts in the existing buildings and trees on site. It makes ecological enhancement and mitigation recommendations. The Council's Landscape and Ecology Officer shall advise on the acceptability of the proposal and submitted Report in terms of protected species and other biodiversity impacts.

Policy DM14: Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards, states *"Proposals for all new developments should minimise all emissions and other forms of pollution (including light and noise pollution) and ensure no deterioration to either air or water quality. All applications for development where the existence of, or potential for creation of, pollution is suspected must contain sufficient information to enable the Planning Authority to make a full assessment of potential hazards."*

Comment: A phase 1 geo-environmental study has been submitted as part of the application. The District Council's Environment team have been consulted and has recommended conditions in order to mitigate the risks of land contamination.

Policy DM15 – Listed Buildings, state *"Proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a listed building, or development affecting its setting, will be permitted where they:"*

"a. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the building and/or its setting, alongside an assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on that significance;"

"d. are of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, and design which respects the existing building and its setting;"

"g. respect the setting of the listed building, including inward and outward views;"

DM17 – Conservation Areas, states *“Proposals for development within, adjacent to or visible from a Conservation Area should:”*

The following criteria particularly relevant

“a. preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting, and views into, through, and out of the area;
b. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, alignment and detailed design which respect the area’s character and its setting;
f. use materials and building techniques which complement or harmonise with the character of the area; and
g. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the Conservation Area and/or its setting, alongside an assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on that significance. The proposal should demonstrate how the key characteristics of the character area have been addressed.”

Comment: The site borders Foundry House linked to Foundry Cottage a Grade II listed building, and lies partly within the Stanton Conservation Area. The Heritage section of the Planning Statement justifies the proposed development as representing an improvement upon the existing more utilitarian units on site. The pre-application advice was that the redevelopment of the site offers, “an opportunity to enhance the streetscene in this case....” However, it is not considered that the indicative streetscene demonstrates an enhancement. A full assessment of the proposal’s impacts upon the heritage assets by the Conservation officer is awaited.

Policy DM22 - Residential Design states *“All residential development proposals should maintain or create a sense of place and/or character by:*
a. employing designs that are specific to the scheme, and which respond intelligently and appropriately to a clear brief articulated in a Design and Access Statement;
b. basing design on an analysis of existing buildings, landscape or topography, and fully exploiting the opportunities that these present;
c. utilising the characteristics of the locality to create buildings and spaces that have a strong sense of place and distinctiveness, using an appropriate innovative design approach and incorporating a mix of housing and unit sizes that is appropriate for the location;
d. creating or contributing to a coherent and legible place that is structured and articulated so that it is visually interesting and welcoming;
e. creating and supporting continuity of built form and enclosure of spaces.

Residential development should be laid out to optimise amenity with streets and parking facilitating this primary objective. Therefore, in addition to the criteria above, development should:

f. where appropriate, apply innovative highways and parking measures designed to avoid the visual dominance of these elements in the design and layout of new developments, whilst still meeting highway safety standards;
g. take opportunities for parking to support the street scene;
h. ensure appropriate levels of permeability and accessibility favouring sustainable transport routes and consider the needs of pedestrians and cyclists before car users;

- i. integrate comfortably with surrounding street networks and enable integration into future additional development;*
- j. seek to create a safe and welcoming environment.*

New dwellings should also be of a high architectural quality, meaning that:

- k. they are fit for purpose and function well, providing adequate space, light and privacy;*
- l. they are adaptable in terms of lifetime changes and use;*
- m. they are well built and physically durable;*
- n. they are the product of coherent and appropriate design principles."*

Comment: Whilst the matter of appearance and layout of the proposal are not being considered as part of this application, the indicative details do raise concerns as outlined in the discussion of Policy DM2 above. Furthermore, only market housing is proposed. All 9 dwellings are indicatively shown as detached houses/ bungalows ranging from 2-5 bedrooms.

Policy DM30: Appropriate Employment Uses and Protection of Employment Land and Existing Businesses, states "*Any non-employment use proposed on sites and premises used and/or designated on the policies maps for employment purposes, and that is expected to have an adverse effect on employment generation, will only be permitted where the local planning authority is satisfied that the proposal can demonstrate that it complies with other policies in this and other adopted local plans (particularly Policies DM1 and DM2 in this Plan), and one or more of the following criteria has been met (as appropriate to the site/premises and location):*"

- a. there is a sufficient supply of alternative and suitable employment land available to meet local employment job growth requirements;*
- b. evidence can be provided that genuine attempts have been made to sell/let the site in its current use, and that no suitable and viable alternative employment uses can be found or are likely to be found in the foreseeable future;*
- c. the existing use has created over-riding environmental problems (e.g. noise, odours or traffic) and permitting an alternative use would be a substantial environmental benefit that would outweigh the loss of an employment site;*
- d. an alternative use or mix of uses would assist in urban regeneration and offer greater benefits to the community in meeting local business and employment needs;*
- e. it is for an employment related support facility such as employment training/education, workplace crèche or industrial estate café;*
- f. an alternative use or mix of uses would provide other sustainability benefits that would outweigh the loss of an employment site."*

- a) **Comment:** The applicant has submitted an employment land report to address this policy in particular. The employment land report lists a breakdown of the current uses of the site and the approximate floor space. The table shows the site is used for A1 (retail) B1 (offices), associated B2 (light industrial – the paint shop) and associated B8 (storage) purposes, which means that Policy DM30 is applicable. The submitted planning statement states that the site is under retail/ sui generis use. The retail element is not disputed but the sui generis use class is not agreed. A) It is

recognised that Stanton has a large employment site to the east of settlement, called Shepherd's Grove (Policy RV4(j) in Rural Vision 2031). The submitted report describes an over-supply of employment land within the area, although it should be noted that the application site is located within the centre of Stanton, which is more accessible to local employees. Shepherd's Grove is within cycling distance. On balance, it is considered that there is sufficient employment land to meet local employment growth requirements apart from the site.

- b) There has been a lack of evidence to suggest there has been a reasonable attempt to sell/let the site in its current employment use. The employment land DM30 report para 4.9 (submitted by Hazells on behalf of the applicant) advises to "*allow between six to twelve months in which to attract a tenant.*" The LPA usually expects this length of marketing evidence to demonstrate that there are/ are not "suitable and viable alternative employment uses".

The applicant's property agent, Hazells, has provided an additional email on 16/02/18 that states, "*There are a number of reasons why it was considered that formal marketing of the site would be a moot exercise for the purposes of DM30 (b), particularly given the over-supply of properties and opportunities locally satisfying DM30 (a) and also very much having regard to the nature of the subject premises. The majority of buildings upon the site are at the end of their economic life, with the exception of the rear store. They are not suitable for a reasonable commercial occupier in the current market. In my view there is insufficient market demand and value to make an economic case for spending any money improving the property and it is a risk that is unreasonable for the owner to enter into. It is also doubtful that in its current condition the buildings would command a sufficient EPC rating that would allow a tenancy from April 2018. We could as an alternative offer the property For Sale and in which case we would receive market interest. However, any interest would be predicated on the value of the site for future redevelopment.*"

Having consulted with the Council's Estates' Manager, the changes to the EPC Regs have been known by the property industry for well over 12 months. It is the landlord's liability to ensure that buildings meet the correct rating in order to be leased. Likewise, at pre-application the applicant was made aware of Policy DM30(b) that requires evidence of genuine marketing of a site last used for employment purposes. Given Hazells assertion that some marketing took place last year, (albeit it was not continuous or prolonged), and on the advice of the Estates' Manager, it seems reasonable to request evidence of continuous marketing for sale/letting purposes, for a further period of 6 months. This will enable proper assessment of whether an alternative employment use on site would be viable under the current circumstances.

(c), (d), (e) (f); No evidence has been submitted to meet these criteria. The Planning Statement suggests that the site's redevelopment would have a positive contribution at the edge of the Conservation Area, but this has not been demonstrated by the iterative streetscene.

Policy DM36: Local Centres states *"The local planning authority will seek to maintain a mix of uses in local centres which could include:*

- i. leisure and recreation;*
- ii. health and community facilities;*
- iii. small scale retail development, where it can be demonstrated to meet local need (generally not exceeding 150 sq. metres in net floor area unless a larger area is required to meet a demonstrated local shortfall);*
- and*
- iv. education.*

In local centres the loss or change of use of shops or services (or premises last used for such purposes) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the use is no longer viable or that the change of use will not have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the centre."

Comment: The NPPF defines "town centres" as areas that include local centres. The application site is within the designated local centre of Stanton. The design and access statement para 2.2, explains that part of the site was used for the A1 (retail) use, specifically selling home garden products. Whilst the existing shop predominately sold lawn mowers, the shop also offered a range of country products including clothes and various DIY and gardening products. Policy DM36 generally seeks to resist the loss of A1 uses unless the use is no-longer viable, (which is not evidenced in this instance,) or that the change of use will not have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the centre. The explanatory text details that shops in local centres are safeguarded unless *"there is suitable alternative provision available to meet the local needs of the people in the local area, or that the premises have been realistically, and unsuccessfully marketed for a period of at least 12 months."*

No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that retail uses are no longer viable on the site, although the premises are now vacant. The local centre designation for Stanton was particularly defined to encompass the Tripp Batt site. The site has not been marketed for at least a year. Hazells assert that they did investigate a mixed use of residential and a convenience store on site but, *"none of the major stores were interested in representation within Stanton with its limited population and catchment. We did receive interest from a regional operator but negotiations were not concluded."* It is considered that marketing the site for a further continuous 6 months for employment/ retail uses in line with the advice received in relation to Policy DM30, would be sufficient. An audit of village facilities in 2011 gave Stanton, (designated a key service centre), a good score in comparison with other parishes. Officers have undertaken a new health check of the Stanton local centre in March 2018. This concluded that the village retained a good range of facilities to the present day.

Policy DM46: Parking Standards, states *"The authority will seek to reduce over-reliance on the car and to promote more sustainable forms of transport. All proposals for redevelopment, including changes of use, will be required to provide appropriately designed and sited car and cycle parking, plus make provision for emergency, delivery and service vehicles, in accordance with the adopted standards current at the time of the application."*

In the town centres and other locations with good accessibility to facilities and services, and/or well served by public transport, a reduced level of car parking may be sought in all new development proposals. Proposals for new mixed use sites will be expected to minimise the provision of car parking where achievable, for example by providing shared use parking and/or car pooling as part of a Travel Plan."

Comment: The application site is located within the centre of Stanton in an accessible location. The Highway Authority raise objections to the inadequate visibility splays of the proposed access. There is likely to be sufficient capacity on site to accommodate appropriate parking when a detailed layout is submitted at reserved matters stage.

Conclusions

The following key points can be taken from the above policy and background evidence

- St Edmundsbury have demonstrated a 5.3 year housing land supply and therefore its policies for the supply of housing are considered up-to-date and are a material consideration when determining this application.
- The site is located within the settlement boundary of Stanton. Therefore the application is considered to be given the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in policies DM1 and RV1 unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- The application proposes residential development on a site at a density significantly lower than the surrounding area. Furthermore, indicative designs of the dwellings and streetscene are not convincing in terms of demonstrating that the proposal may appropriately assimilate into its setting, particularly given the proximity of the historic assets. The indicative details fail to demonstrate a design sympathetic to its context contrary to Policies CS2 and DM2 and DM22.
- The proposal would also result in the loss of existing employment land including a retail use, within the local centre of the village, (a key service centre), without sufficient evidence to suggest the site is no longer viable with its current uses, or alternative employment uses. No prolonged marketing of the site has taken place. The applicant has not demonstrated that the introduction of dwellings on the site and loss of retail provision/ commercial uses, would not have a detrimental impact on local centre of Stanton.

The proposal fails to accord with both national and local plan policies, and therefore is not supported.

Stanton Local Centre assessment, March 2018:

Food or general shop	Yes
Post Office	Yes
Post office & General Shop	Yes
Public House	Yes
Meeting place e.g. Village Hall	Yes
Primary School	Yes
Petrol Station	Yes
GP surgery/ Health centre	Yes
Dental surgery	No
Employment Area	Yes
Sports or recreation ground	Yes
Play Area	Yes
Library	No
Bus service	Yes
Train Station	No
Total	12

There is a good range of facilities in the village currently.