

# Site Allocations Local Plan - Further Issues and Options (Regulation 18 Stage)

## Public Participation Report

1. Background to this consultation

1.1-1.6

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

### ***1. Background to this consultation***

#### *1.1-1.6*

22793 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	While some of the sites in the Plan identify heritage assets as potential constraints, this is not consistently done for all sites and all heritage assets. There is also limited information in the document on how sites might be developed, making it difficult for us to assess their full impact.	Response noted	Advice taken, and heritage assets noted on a site-by-site basis.
--	---------	--	----------------	--

Please note that our comments on specific sites have been informed by desk-based analysis rather than site visits in most cases. Conservation and archaeology staff within the borough and county councils should be consulted on matters relating to archaeology, landscape/townscape and the historic environment generally.

---

22828 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	Copy of our Site Allocation advice note attached	Response noted	Advice taken, and heritage assets noted on a site-by-site basis.
--	---------	--	----------------	--

---

22549 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Support	Hard work easy to understand	Response noted	Noted
----------------------------------	---------	------------------------------	----------------	-------

---

#### *1.7-1.8*

22987 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan based on out of date data for services and facilities in Lakenheath. The details for why this is the case are given below.  <i>Updated</i>	Response noted	IDP will be updated through the plan preparation process.
--	--------	---	----------------	---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>1.9-1.11</i>				
22593 - Kentford Parish Council (Mr Malcolm Baker) [12577]	Comment	reference to the Interim Sustainability Assessment, it says about Kentford - "it is a small settlement with very limited community infrastructure." " There is little to no merit to the option of significant additional growth over and above that already completed/committed since 2011"	Response noted	The Council agrees that Kentford has accommodated a relatively high level of growth in recent years, and is only proposing to allocate sites that already have planning permission (K/10 and K/16).
22988 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	Paragraph 1.10 The Sustainability Appraisal rating of noise as a Red level "3" constraint is inappropriate and underplays the true degree of noise constraint. LPC recommends the constraint is revised to Red "4".	Response noted	Flightpaths may change as a result of the announcement to close RAF Mildenhall and restructure activities at RAF Lakenheath over the next 5 - 7 years. The Council will continue to work with USAFE and provide the most up-to-date information as it becomes available.
<i>Update</i>				
<i>1.19</i>				
23826 - Heath Rosselli [12721]	Comment	W16 West Brambles, The Street, Worlington see attached	Response noted	This site is not included as Worlington is not a primary village, and the site is outside the settlement boundary (as reviewed and proposed for amendment in the SALP Preferred Options consultation draft).
22693 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Comment	RAF Mildenhall could support thousands of houses and will be closed by 2019 at the latest.	Response noted	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the government will be selling off RAF Mildenhall for housing once the United States Air Force vacates the base in 2022. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Core Strategy Single Issue Review. Should this position change during the plan period, the Council will immediately commence a review of the Local Plan.
23833 - Mr & Mrs Richard and Claire Tilbrook [12523]	Comment	BARTON MILLS SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY AMENDMENT  SEE ATTACHED	.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23827 - Robert Murry Brown [12722]	Comment	W17 land between Newmarket Road and Gold Links Road, Worlington  see attached	Response noted	Site not included as Worlington not a primary village
<i>1.20-1.22</i>				
22694 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Comment	It must be demonstrated that the housing allocations contained in the consultation document could be altered substantially based on the responses, otherwise no effective consultation has actually taken place.	Response noted	All responses have been taken into account along with the views of consultee and stakeholders, and the outcome of studies.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>2. National and local policy context</b>				
<b>2.1-2.3</b>				
22550 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Support	polices national/local help the future	Response noted	Noted
<b>2.4-2.11</b>				
23091 - CgMs (Miss Rachel Mottram) [12617]	Comment	Proposed extension to the Icklingham settlement boundary	Response noted	The settlement boundaries for the Secondary Villages have been reviewed and no revisions are proposed for Elveden, Gazelely, Holywell Row, Icklingham, Moulton, and Tuddenham.
23411 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Comment	We support the categorisation of Beck Row as a Primary Village.	Response noted	No action required
22998 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	Paragraph 2.10 There is a limited number of employment sites in Lakenheath. The only employment site with planning permission is a Tesco site that is not proceeding. <i>Create employment opportunities.</i>	Response noted	Proposed new, and existing employment land is the subject of Policies EM1 and EM2
22991 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	LPC objects to the classification of Lakenheath as a Key Service Centre (KSC) and submits that it is inappropriate to deliver housing to Lakenheath as a KSC as the level of services and facilities within Lakenheath do not meet the KSC criteria. <i>Removal of KSC classification.</i>	Response noted	It is beyond the scope of the SALP to amend the settlement hierarchy.
22695 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	The Council must fully discuss in this section WHY Core Strategy 7 has needed to be completely re-examined, and explain why so little change has been made to the allocation that were quashed by the High Court. <i>The Council must fully discuss in this section WHY Core Strategy 7 has needed to be completely re-examined, and explain why so little change has been made to the allocation that were quashed by the High Court.</i>	Response noted	The Council believes this point has been

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
2.12-2.15 22997 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>Paragraph 2.14 The Lakenheath allocations (L13, L35, L26, L22, L36, L19, L25 and L27) should be deferred for the reasons explained below, relating to uncertainty of RAF/USAF operations. This is a major constraint and the degree of uncertainty makes any allocation within the Lakenheath unsound until the certainty is resolved.</p> <p><i>The Lakenheath allocations (L13, L35, L26, L22, L36, L19, L25 and L27) should be deferred for the reasons explained below, relating to uncertainty of RAF/USAF operations.</i></p>	<p>Response noted. The LPA is working with the MOD and sub region to plan for the impacts of the USAF leaving Mildenhall and further intensification of Lakenheath Base.</p>	<p>There are planning applications with resolutions to grant planning permission on sites L/13, L/35, L/26, and L/36. These sites are the subject of proposed Policies L1 and L2.</p> <p>Sites L/19, L/22, L/25, and L/27 are omission sites.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

2.16-2.21

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23274 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	<p>The Site Allocations Local Plan should ensure that future developments are in appropriate locations where pollution, flood risk and other adverse effects on the local environmental or amenity value are minimised.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk</b>            We have used the current Flood Zone outlines and the draft outputs from the Eastern Rivers Project to assess the flood zones for each site. However, there are a few sites which are in flood risk areas which have not been identified in the plan. We have listed all sites within Flood Zone 2/3 in Appendix 1.            The Anglian Flood Risk Management Plan is due to be published in December 2015 alongside the Anglian RBMP. The Site Allocations Plan should take into account the objectives and measures from both Plans. These will provide relevant information relating to polices and plans which could be used and taken into account for future planning.            The Plan should aim to deliver the following flood risk outcomes:            * ensure that no inappropriate development is located in areas at high risk of flooding            * contribute to reducing flood risk for existing communities            * identify the risk of flooding from all sources</p> <p><b>Water</b>            The water section is satisfactory from a water quality/wastewater and water supply perspective. The Plan should aim to deliver the following water quality outcomes:  <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of surface and ground waters and wetlands continues to improve for the benefit of people, the economy and wildlife.  <input type="checkbox"/> Protection and enhancement of the environment and promotion of multifunctional benefits such as climate change adaptation, delivery of RBMP objectives, flood risk management, including SuDS, and water quality  <input type="checkbox"/> The Plan should identify sufficient infrastructure to support the delivery of Local Plan economic and housing targets.</p> <p><b>Groundwater and Contaminated Land</b>            We support the re-use of brownfield land. However, the Council and developers should ensure that</p>	Response noted	The council has continued to engage with all stakeholders including the Environment Agency in preparing the next version of the local plan documents.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>brownfield sites are suitable or made suitable for the intended use.</p> <p>Paragraph 111 of the NPPF recognises the importance of dealing with previously developed sites. For potentially contaminated sites, the Plan should require developers to submit a Preliminary Risk Assessment together with a planning application. Any development should be undertaken with due consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ the potential land contamination issues, which should be adequately addressed in the interest of controlled waters protection;</li> <li>□ the potential impact of the proposed development on groundwater/surface water quality through the mobilisation of any potential contaminants that may be present in the soil/groundwater associated with the previous land use, and</li> <li>□ the release or discharge of any potential contaminants associated with operation of the development, including the disposal of any potentially contaminated surface water run-off, with suitable mitigation measures employed to eliminate or minimise the potential impacts.</li> </ul> <p>In that regard, for issues associated with development that may have a potential impact on groundwater, such as the discharge of liquid effluents into the ground, land contamination, etc, developers should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Refer to our "Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3)" documents: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297347/LIT_7660_9a3742.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297347/LIT_7660_9a3742.pdf</a></li> <li>□ Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination", when dealing with land affected by contamination: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/managing-land-contamination">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/managing-land-contamination</a></li> </ul>		



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23629 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>This document is a technical response to Forest Heath District Council's consultation on Issues and Options for a future Site Allocations document. The response covers technical matters regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Archaeology</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Education</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Landscape</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Minerals and Waste</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Public Rights of Way</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Surface Water Management</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Transport</li> </ul> <p>The focus of the Transport section is the management of the highway network rather than transport strategy, which has been considered in appendix 2 (scale and distribution of housing growth). Notwithstanding this point, there is a need for sites to reflect improvements to local pedestrian and cycle facilities such as along the main road through Lakenheath and within Red Lodge.</p> <p>The response is based on an assumed dwelling capacity in Forest Heath District Council's published document and covers technical matters relevant to County Council service responsibilities and policy objectives for individual sites.</p> <p>The response does not follow the District Council's consultation questions, but seeks to identify issues relevant to the delivery of the sites identified.</p> <p>It is not possible, at this stage, to understand all issues relevant to the development of these sites. This level of evidence is not available, and is often unknown until the planning application stage. The County Council would be pleased to discuss these sites further with the District Council as it identifies its preferred options.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed this selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>The council will continue to work with SCC in the preparation and progression of the SALP</p> <p>Constraints and opportunities, and development issues are identified for each settlement, and specific constraints and issues are highlighted in policies where appropriate</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23085 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Mrs Bethany Philbedge) [12105]	Comment	2.19 A distinction should be made between geological/archaeological and the historic built environment where the statutory test is set out at S66(1) of the 1990 PLBCA Act which requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This is a much wider test which assesses the harm to the significance of heritage assets rather than physical damage.	Response noted	These elements are assessed separately when sites are researched.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23502 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Comment	<p>Designated sites</p> <p>We welcome the approach set out in the site allocations local plan further issues and options document, which in our view gives sufficient consideration to the effects of development on European, nationally and locally designated sites. It is clear that the majority of sites that are situated within the buffers are deferred and furthermore that a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment screening is carried out for sites within the buffers. We are confident that protecting the designated sites in the vicinity is a key consideration for your authority when formulating site allocations with the district.</p> <p>We appreciate that the proximity of the 400m, 1500m and stone curlew nest attempts buffers, in particular in relation to Brandon, Mildenhall, Lakenheath, Red Lodge and Kentford, mean that on occasion it is not possible to defer all applications within the buffers. Therefore in instances where your authority is able to demonstrate early that a site is not likely to have an effect on the interest features or the integrity of Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), such as where the site is within a current settlement, for example, we consider it appropriate to include those sites within the allocations. When viewing the deferred applications it is clear that the risk levels associated with these applications vary considerably, for example between B/13 and B/14, and therefore it may be possible to provide an earlier HRA screening for those comparatively lower risk sites in order to screen them in to the site allocations (if sites are considered sustainable and have no other issues).</p> <p>However we consider that the status of sites that are currently affected by the stone curlew nest attempts buffer may need reviewing. This is due to the fact that the nest attempts buffer, which is based on the analysis of 1km grid cells that have supported at least 5 nesting attempts between 1995-2006, is formulated from data that is becoming out of date. We would therefore recommend that your authority seeks to update the data and analyse whether the nest attempts buffer needs to be amended. We would advise your authority to work with Breckland Council to establish a joint approach to formulating the buffer (or alternative strategy if appropriate). We would be</p>	Response noted	No action required to general comments.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>happy to provide further advice on this.</p> <p>Note that we have provided comments on the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment screening for the site allocations in a separate response.</p> <p><b>Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Green Infrastructure (GI) should be an integral part of the creation of sustainable communities and the site allocation process can provide a useful starting point to consider GI provision. In some settlements it is clear that there is a lack of green infrastructure to support local residents. Natural England recommends that appropriate green infrastructure is put in place (including natural greenspace, walking, cycle routes and dog walking facilities) that will provide sufficient green infrastructure to divert pressures away from Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) and sensitive sites of special scientific interest (SSSIs) in the district. The inclusion of sufficient green infrastructure is also important in terms of the health and wellbeing of local residents.</p> <p>It is clear in the approach set out in the document that your authority also seeks to avoid site allocations in close proximity to locally designated wildlife sites. However there is no mention of retaining connectivity between the various designated sites and important wildlife areas/areas of habitat within the district. In line with the NPPF (paragraphs 113, 117, 118) your authority should delete such allocations or ensure that sufficient mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation is available to ensure development will not have an adverse effect on locally designated wildlife sites, including areas of Ancient Woodland. It is also important to consider whether brownfield sites may be of high environmental value.</p> <p><b>Soil</b></p> <p>Although it is clear that the initial assessment of the sites included consideration of the grade of agricultural land on site, it would be helpful if the approach to protecting soils is set out at the beginning of the document. Your authority should consider the quality of soil resource affected by development, taking into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>preference to that of a higher quality (NPPF, paragraph 112). Soil quality varies from place to place. The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. It helps underpin the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>The plan would benefit from inclusion of the following:</p> <p><b>Landscape</b>  Site allocations should address the need to protect and enhance landscapes, including local landscape character, natural and historic landscapes, to protect their natural beauty and amenity, wildlife and cultural heritage. Reference should be made to the Borough's Landscape Character Assessment. Development should be informed by Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments where appropriate.</p> <p>We also recommend reference to the European Landscape Convention.</p> <p><b>Public rights of way</b>  Site allocations should protect and enhance designated rights of way such as PRow, bridleways and National Trails. Development should seek to protect and enhance designated paths as far as possible, with reference to the local ROWIP, in order to comply with paragraph 75 of the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Developments Specifications</b>  When considering development specifications, it is important to consider whether the allocation enhances biodiversity. We would expect applications to include the enhancement of existing features such as hedges, wetlands, woods, watercourse and any geological features as well as new habitat creation measures and other features to support biodiversity such as green roofs and walls, and bird and bat boxes.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23796 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Finally, the following helps identify context for archaeological remains across the District, and could be referred to in the site allocations document to highlight the need for archaeological assessment. This is equally relevant to the Single Issue Review document.</p> <p>Brandon - There are multi-period archaeological remains all along the Little Ouse valley. Brandon is a historic settlement. Scheduled monuments include the Anglo-Saxon monastic site at Staunch Meadow and a prehistoric barrow.</p> <p>Mildenhall - There are multi-period archaeological remains all along the Lark Valley, particularly around Mildenhall where the river meets the fens. Mildenhall is a historic settlement with likely prehistoric origins. To the east, there are extensive multi-period remains relating to exploitation of the heath land, including warrens.</p> <p>Newmarket - In the environs of Newmarket, there are multi-period archaeological remains, particularly along the river valley sides.</p> <p>Lakenheath - Lakenheath is surrounded by multi-period archaeological sites, particularly relating to activity on the fen edge. Maidscross Hill is an important lower Palaeolithic site.</p> <p>Red Lodge - There are multi-period archaeological remains in the environs of Red Lodge, particularly relating to activity along the River Kennett and exploitation of chalk and heath. There are scheduled prehistoric barrows.</p> <p>Beck Row - There are multi-period archaeological remains in the environs of Beck Row, particularly relating to activity on the fen edge.</p> <p>Exning - There are multi-period archaeological remains in the environs of Exning, relating to river valley sides, notably Iron Age, Roman and Anglo-Saxon sites.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>A review of the suite of approved sites indicates that they appear to be capable of being made acceptable in landscape terms, subject to detailed conditions. The Landscapes Types of the District, in particular the</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>The council will continue to work with SCC in the preparation and the progression of the SALP.</p> <p>Constraints and opportunities, and development issues are identified for each settlement, and specific constraints and issues are highlighted in the Policies where appropriate.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Estate Sandlands and Estate Chalklands with their plantations and belts of trees, are generally amenable to locally appropriate mitigation planting. This integrates the new urban edge into the countryside limiting widespread visual effects and significant impacts on the character of the wider landscape. Further assessment may be required for sites for which development may affect the historical characteristics of the landscape.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to use a development brief and/or master planning approach for these sites, such as that used in St Edmundsbury, in order to facilitate growth while safeguarding the character of the landscape and public visual amenity.</p> <p>It is notable that many of the sites fall within the Brecks National Character Area (NCA) identified by the District Council's policy DM13 as a sensitive landscape. Given the locations of the sites in Brecks and the ability of this landscape to absorb development, subject to appropriate and robust landscape mitigation, it should be possible to facilitate growth while safeguarding the special qualities of the Brecks and their unique sense of place.</p> <p><b>MINERALS AND WASTE</b></p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ B/19 includes the Lignacite works, which is an important concrete block manufacturer, and some of the surrounding land has planning permission for sand and gravel extraction.</li> <li>□ M/10 is adjacent to Forest Heath's waste vehicle depot and would need to be considered for the relationship with that existing use.</li> <li>□ RL/09, RL/18 and RL/19 are very close to a waste transfer station (access within Suffolk, main site within Cambridgeshire). The relationship to that existing use would need to be considered.</li> <li>□ RL/15 A large part of the site is within Worlington Quarry, which has planning permission for sand and gravel extraction and infilling with inert waste.</li> </ul> <p><b>PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</b></p>		

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

The County Council would be pleased to discuss the implications of the site allocations in respect of the following matters:

- Impacts on the Rights of Way network, specifically increased usage as a result of development and routes which may require protection, improvement or diversion as a result of development.
- Opportunities for improving access to the Rights of Way network for the existing population, in pursuit of improved health outcomes and enjoyment of the natural environment. For example, allocating sites which enable new routes to be established or existing routes to be improved or linked up.
- Ways in which the Public Rights of Way network can support the avoidance of recreational disturbance of protected species, by encouraging walkers to access less sensitive locations.

This approach will also support the District in meeting the requirements of paragraph 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Forest Heath Core Strategy requirements around health and tourism, and the objective in the Suffolk Health and Wellbeing Strategy to improve access to a healthy environment. Any site which is allocated by this document will need to be assessed at the planning application stage, in terms of its relationship with the Public Rights of Way network, opportunities for maximising healthy and sustainable travel, and ensuring that residents can access the countryside in a manner consistent with the protection of designated habitats and species.

The following is an indication of the routes and areas which should be the subject of further discussion, as the Plan progresses to preferred options.

Brandon:

- Routes to Santon Downham and Brandon Country Park
- Routes to Lakenheath Station and the RSPB reserve at Lakenheath Fen.
- Routes along the Little Ouse and, within Norfolk, towards Thetford.

Mildenhall:

52

- Improvements to the Lark Valley Path and connecting routes, providing access to West Row.
- Need to consider walking and cycling routes to and



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>from sites M/30 and M/43, perhaps including surfacing improvements.</p> <p>- Within the sites to the North-East of Mildenhall, there is a large existing bridleway network to be preserved and enhanced through improvements to existing routes and additional access through sites.</p> <p>Newmarket:</p> <p>- The County Council will continue to work through the Newmarket Vision structure to consider opportunities to improve walking and cycling routes in Newmarket, such as the Yellow Brick Road route from Studlands through to the Town Centre.</p> <p>Lakenheath:</p> <p>- A new route could be sought from Eriswell Hall, north to Lakenheath and continuing to the B1112, on to Lakenheath Station and the RSPB reserve.</p> <p>Red Lodge:</p> <p>- It is notable that there are currently no links into site R/L15. This development would need to provide sustainable routes into the centre of Red Lodge.</p> <p>- Opportunities to provide routes to Mildenhall should also be explored.</p> <p><b>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>SEE TABLE ON PAGES 53-59 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p>		
23546 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	2.17-2.18 see response to Question B1	Response noted - however, thorough investigations, including with Natural England, have led to the conclusion that environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations	Limited growth is proposed for Brandon because of the significant environmental constraints

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22996 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	Natural England, in their letter to FHDC Planning of 4 June, has concerns that increased urbanisation in future in this area will lead to damage to the qualifying species and integrity of the International sites in the vicinity, particularly Breckland SPA and Breckland SAC.  <i>Designate more green space to protect bio diversity.</i>	Response noted. The need for POS will be taken into account when determining density.	It is proposed that growth in the northern part of the village included in Policy L2 will include provision of areas of public open space and the enhancement and promotion of walking routes.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

### ***3. The settlements and site options***

#### ***3.1-3.2***

22551 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Support	most support their own chapters and only complain about daft areas included	Response noted	Noted
----------------------------------	---------	---	----------------	-------

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature*

*Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

3.3-3.5

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23272 - Suffolk Constabulary (Mrs Heather Highton) [12541]	Comment	<p>Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (revised) places an obligation on local and other names authorities to consider the crime, disorder, environmental issues affecting the local area and substance misuse of all their activities and to do all they reasonably can to prevent them.....</p> <p>When designing developments that the balance between permeability and accessibility is always a delicate one. We (policing) want less permeability as it creates entry and escape routes for those who may want to commit a crime. For planners it is about the green agenda, being able to get people from A to B, preferably not in their cars.</p> <p>We cannot demand reductions in permeability without having evidence that this is the only option. What we can do is look at the design of walkways, lighting, surveillance and the security of surrounding properties to ensure that any permeability is as safe as it can be and that the offender will stand out in a well-designed community. There is no blanket approach, site specifics apply, based on the crime rate and local context.</p> <p>We would also strongly recommend that all properties with gardens should be provided with 1.5 m high close board fencing with 300m trellis top with the first panel section being constructed of a 1.8 m Privacy Panel. Developments are being built with inappropriate fencing thus allowing ease of access between neighbouring dwellings. This has cause areas of concern for security of personal property as well as safety of vulnerable people.</p> <p>Secured by Design aims to achieve a good overall standard of Security for buildings and the immediate environment. It attempts to deter criminal and anti-social behaviour within developments by introducing appropriate design features that enable Natural Surveillance and create a sense of ownership and responsibility for every part of the development.</p> <p>These features include secure vehicle parking, adequate lighting of common areas, control of access to individual and common areas, defensible space</p>	Response noted	This is a matter for masterplans design briefs, and detailed planning applications - these elements are also included in policies on design in the Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>and a landscaping and lighting scheme which when combined, enhances Natural Surveillance and safety.</p> <p>Experience shows that incorporating security measures during a New Build or Refurbishment reduces crime, fear of crime and disorder. The aim of the Police Service is to assist in the Design process to achieve a safe and secure environment for Residents and Visitors without creating a 'Fortress environment'.</p> <p>New Homes 2014 guide is available from <a href="http://www.securedbydesign.com">www.securedbydesign.com</a> which explains all the crime reduction elements of the scheme.</p>		
23547 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	3.4 see response to Question B1	Response noted - however, thorough investigations, including with Natural England, have led to the conclusion that environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations	Limited growth is proposed for Brandon because of the significant environmental constraints
22995 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>The criteria relied on to assess sites includes sites where there is a resolution to approve but the decision notice is not issued (page 12). Given the possibility of judicial review in relation to three sites in Lakenheath, if the decision notices are issued, this is not an appropriate criteria for assessing deliverability.</p> <p><i>A change to the an unfair reliance on the lack of housing land supply at the time of resolution rather than the merits of the site in terms of the objective sustainability criteria that should be used to assess suitability/sustainability and deliverability.</i></p>	<p>Response noted.</p> <p>The applications in question were assessed against the development plan and NPPF. The lack of a five year housing land supply was not the only factor in granting a resolution to approve.</p>	<p>In the absence of an up-to-date Local Plan decisions are taken based on the NPPF and associated guidance, and on the views and comments of statutory consultees. All sites, whether the subject of planning applications, and/or resolutions to grant permission, or with no planning history are assessed for suitability using one set of criteria, and all are subject to sustainability appraisal. The most sustainable locations and least constrained sites are proposed for allocation.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>4. Towns</b>				
<b>4.1.1-4.1.2</b>				
23551 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	See Response to Question 2 of SIR Issues and Options (repeated above at QB1).	Response noted - however, thorough investigations, including with Natural England, have led to the conclusion that environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations	Limited growth is proposed for Brandon because of the significant environmental constraints
22794 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	The constraints and opportunities paragraph for Brandon refers to the conservation area and listed buildings, but should also mention archaeology including the scheduled Saxon site at Chequer Meadow.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in preparation of the 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Response noted. Suffolk County Council Archaeological Services will be consulted on preferred sites.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Planning constraints map</i>				
22609 - Mrs Rosamund Lodge [12584]	Comment	<p>I think is an error on page 13 - Brandon you state there are THREE doctor surgery but to my knowledge there are only TWO.</p> <p>Overall I agree with the environmental constraints that cover the whole of Brandon but would stress this very strongly for the area of B17 and B12B. I must admit as being confused by some of the inner town areas being constrained by them as there are already housing surrounding some plots.</p> <p>Other areas outside of Brandon I do not feel I am justified to comment on as I do not know them well enough.</p> <p>I do not know where to put this comment about Brandon as it is partly about the infrastructure, but hope that you can find the correct place for it. I feel Brandon needs support to revive it's town centre and that will only happen if there us good employment within the Town. There is a large proportion of industrial units that are empty and so it seems industry is not the answer.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the constraints mentioned in the alp above, should not the District Council be promoting Brandon as a visitor area along with better publicity to promote the environmental aspects with Thetford Forest High Lodge, Brandon Park, RSPB Lakenheath Fen reserve, Suffolk Wildlife Trust at Lackford Lakes, BTO at Thetford, along with Grimes Graves, the Anglo Saxon village at West Stow, Bury St Edmunds all being local visitor attractions. We have some very rare species here in the immediate area of Brandon and we should be shouting about it. There could be promotion of the wonderful eating places in Brandon along with the local hotel accommodation and the wonderful walks within the forest around us. Brandon has so many possibilities that I feel we are missing a trick to bring it alive again.</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Inaccuracies will be noted and amended in the next draft of the documents.</p>	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22691 - Mr Hugh Lodge [11964]	Comment	I think is an error on page 13 of the document where for Brandon you state there are THREE doctor surgery but to my knowledge there are only TWO. Overall I agree with the environmental constraints that cover the whole of Brandon but would stress this very strongly for the area of B17 and B12B. I feel Brandon needs support to revive it's town centre and that will only happen if there us good employment within the Town. There is a large proportion of industrial units that are empty and so it seems industry is not the answer.	Response noted  Inaccuracies will be noted and amended in the next draft of the documents.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22540 - Jane Tipper [12298]	Comment	The colours chosen for the bird constraints are too similar to make out the boundaries. It would be helpful if better contrasting colours were chosen. e.g. red,black	Response noted	Noted
<i>4.1.3-4.1.7</i>				
23552 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	4.1.4 See Response to Question 2 of SIR Issues and Options (repeated above at QB1).	Response noted - however, thorough investigations, including with Natural England, have led to the conclusion that environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations	Limited growth is proposed for Brandon because of the significant environmental constraints
22698 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	DC/15/1072/OUT should be approved as soon as possible to provide houses where they are needed in our district.  <i>DC/15/1072/OUT should be approved as soon as possible to provide houses where they are needed in our district.</i>	Response noted	This is a complex planning application on land in two district council areas and two counties. The applicant has requested an extension of time to deal with requests for further information.
<i>Question B1</i>				
23356 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	Yes - Brandon has many facilities that could support large scale development.	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22552 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Comment	Yes. Brandon has grown 50% over the past 50-60 years without much infrastructure grown.	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23580 - Rural Parish Alliance (Mr Bill Rampling) [12706]	Comment	<p>We are very surprised to see that development at Brandon has become so restricted since the approval of the Core Strategy in 2010. We note development in this location has been reduced to only 55 dwellings. We do not believe this is sustainable development for Brandon or the district.</p> <p>We note the availability of brownfield sites in and around Brandon, which seem to have been discounted as potential opportunities to support development.</p> <p>We support a sequential approach to development and building on available brownfield sites. This opportunity seems to have been rejected in this consultation document when considering development</p>	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
23267 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Comment	yes - Brandon has many facilities and needs large scale development	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
23286 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	We consider that it is likely that additional growth in Brandon will be heavily constrained by the need to protect the integrity of the sites of European nature conservation importance which surround the town. No new development should be allocated in the town until it has been demonstrated that it will not result in a likely significant effect on these sites, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects.	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22999 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	<p>Since the approval of CS7 in 2010, Brandon was expected to deliver 760 homes; it is now proposed that the total housing figure for this market town should be 55 dwellings.</p> <p>Consultation for the preparation of the Core Strategy 2010 concluded that Brandon could accommodate 240 houses on brownfield sites. This number has now been slashed to 55, which is simply an unsustainable number of houses to support the growing economy at Brandon. The low levels of growth at Brandon will limit the regeneration of the town.</p>	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23352 - Five Villages Preservation Trust (Dr Allan Marchington) [5854]	Comment	<p>The level of development proposed at Brandon is an unsustainable amount. 55 houses will not allow for the necessary regeneration of the town. Employment opportunities exist in Brandon and FHDC have committed a large sum of money to assist in the expansion of Omar homes.</p> <p>A sequential approach to development should be encouraged, placing the majority of development in and around the 3 main market towns. Brownfield sites are available in the town which could be made available for a greater level of growth.</p> <p>A 1% increase in this location where infrastructure exists to support growth is not a sustainable option.</p>	Response noted - environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
23528 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Comment	<p>Brandon is a market town with considerable infrastructure as such we do not understand why the allocation of housing has been slashed from 1,260 in the previous document to a mere 55 in this one. The District Council has recently made a significant financial investment in employment within the town, yet housing numbers do not reflect this.</p> <p>The town would benefit from a relief road and it seems the major constraint is the Special Protection Area (SPA). We do not believe that the SPA in Brandon should have more importance than those of Lakenheath and Red Lodge.</p>	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23600 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	<p>Brandon is designated as one of the three market towns in the district. The Core Strategy identifies that the highest proportion of new development should be directed to the districts 3 market towns.</p> <p>Sequential development, development located in and around the market towns, is supported through national planning policy and by Herringswell Parish Council. It is a core principle feature of sustainable development given the range of existing services and facilities to be found in the market towns.</p> <p>The allocation for housing in this consultation document, has slashed development from 1260 houses in the previous document, to a mere 55 in this one.</p> <p>We respect the many constraints surrounding development across the whole of the district, but we are surprised it has impacted to the degree it has at Brandon when the constraints were in evidence during the consultation for the finalized, but subsequently quashed, CS in 2010.</p> <p>We believe there are a number of brownfield sites available in Brandon and following the huge financial investment made by FHDC in Omar homes, we would encourage mitigation to be sought in order to bring forward additional housing development at Brandon as it clearly has thriving employment opportunities.</p>	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23522 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Comment	<p>Additional growth should take place in Brandon. Brandon is one of Forest Heath District Council's (FHDC) more sustainable locations, having been designated as one of only three market towns in the Core Strategy Policy CS1 with a full range of services and facilities as evidenced in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (2015) and the Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Appraisal (IECA) (2009). Proposals to grow and support these facilities are evidenced in the planning documents submitted with the application on land to the west of Brandon in particular the Design and Access Statement, Chapter 6 Socio-Economics and Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport of the ES and the Planning Statement. The highest proportion of new development and growth is expected to be directed to market towns reflecting and building on the existing range of services and facilities, and their good public transport links to other towns and villages. However, existing infrastructure in some cases is beyond or nearing capacity and therefore any new development in Brandon should provide the necessary infrastructure improvements to ensure infrastructure is provided to meet needs and result in a sustainable pattern of development.</p>	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23548 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>Policy CS1 defines Brandon as a Town; it is in the top tier of the settlement hierarchy along with Newmarket and Mildenhall. The most sustainable distribution of development as a first option is to direct development to the Towns, where there is a good availability of employment and services. The housing distribution options propose medium growth at Mildenhall and high levels of growth at Newmarket without relying on sites in the SPA CZ; Brandon is the only Town identified for low growth of 50-55 dwellings as there are no sites outside of the CZ. This distribution option is not a sustainable form of development; it will limit opportunities for regeneration of the town and encourage over-reliance on commuting to access the employment and services in Brandon.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes consider that insufficient evidence has been gathered by FHDC to discount development in the SPA Constraint Zones at this early stage. FHDC should facilitate discussions between site promoters and Natural England to enable HRA to be undertaken to identify whether the constraints at Brandon can be overcome, thereby identifying reasonable alternative options for the distribution of housing that is in accordance with both Policy CS1 and Policy CS12.</p>	Response noted, however, environmental designations seriously constrain site allocations.	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22626 - P Brunning [12600]	Comment	<p>people will have to go through village to go to work very narrow areas better infrastructure needed new link road to A1065 or reopening of Lords Walk</p>	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22534 - Jane Tipper [12298]	Comment	No. The environmental constraints are too great.	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22543 - Mr Steve Tozer [12538]	Comment	<p>Yes extra housing is required for local residents within the Brandon and surrounding villages but the B/14 scheme is not suitable as the size of the area takes away areas of green land from leisure access from local people and the impact of traffic to and from the scheme would have a negative impact on the flow of vehicular traffic in this area.</p>	Response noted	<p>Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.</p> <p>Site B/14 is not a preferred option.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23526 - Norfolk County Council (Ms Laura Waters) [11365]	Comment	Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan supporting the SIR of Core Strategy Policy CS7 and Site Allocations Local Plan: Points 4.6 and 4.29 of the draft plan, Norfolk County Council are working closely with adjoining authorities on the highways and education infrastructure associated with the proposed development at Brandon. For information please find attached Norfolk County Councils response to the 1,650 dwellings application which was put together with Suffolk County Council.	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22697 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	I object to the time it is taking to consider this - if 1,200 houses can be allocated without 'consideration' to Midenhall - why not Brandon?  <i>The people of Brandon should be allocated at least another 1,270 houses immediately under the Core Strategy.</i>	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
22603 - Mrs Alison Barnes [12581]	Object	No. I think Brandon has reached its capacity with regards to its size. You can't keep expanding towns and villages and swallowing up the countryside. There are so many important species which we are fortunate enough to share our lives with, here in Brandon. Any significant growth to this town will have negative effects on the wildlife. For once, can't nature take precedence over houses?!  <i>Future development in Brandon should be minimal, to protect the towns heritage but most importantly, the rich and diverse wildlife which surrounds it.</i>	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.
23094 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Object	Brandon is a particularly sensitive area because of its surrounding SACs and SPAs. All development would threaten this environment in ways which have yet to be adequately mitigated. The only development which should be allowed should be small scale projects totally within the current Settlement Boundary.  <i>Reject all proposals which are outside the Settlement Boundary and some of those which are on the boundary.</i>	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.1.8-4.1.12</i>				
22696 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	Brandon has the potential to build at least 1,270 houses in the district immediately (and likely many more), yet only 50-55 new houses are allocated, repeating the mistake of the allocation that was thrown out in the High Court. This is a disgrace. The people of Brandon are being horribly let down by this.	Response noted	Growth in Brandon is significantly constrained by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* European site designations for stone curlew, woodlark and nightjar. (SPA)</li> <li>* airbase noise constraints</li> <li>* the conservation area and listed buildings and their settings</li> <li>* land within Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the north of the settlement.</li> <li>* a site of special scientific interest (SSSI)</li> <li>* Brandon is surrounded by an extensive area of forest, Brandon Country Park and High Lodge Forest Centre.</li> </ul>
<i>Increase Brandon's immediate housing allocation to at least 1,270 new houses, or more.</i>				
<i>B/01 Land off Fengate Drove</i>				
23381 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/01 Situated in Norfolk	Response noted. The majority of this site is within Brandon's settlement boundary, and the whole of BR/01 is within Forest Heath	Proposed site allocation Policy B1 site a). Application for 64 affordable dwellings (38 of which are in FHDC) DC/14/2219/FUL approved subject to S106



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23654 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any new permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. This site straddles a large ditch along the line of the county boundary between Suffolk and Norfolk (BRD 189). Targeted excavation is required to record any further information from the large ditch of archaeological interest, prior to development.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Site B/01 is a proposed site allocation in Policy B1 (site a). Application for 64 affordable dwellings (38 of which are in FHDC) DC/14/2219/FUL approved subject to S106

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/02 Land to the rear of the High Street</i>				
23382 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/02 Restricted access not good for development	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued.	Omission site * Fragmented ownership. * Access/servicing for retail premises. * Site below 0.5ha.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23655 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p><b>ARCHAEOLOGY</b></p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. This site spans a number of historic tenements in the medieval core of Brandon. There is high potential for archaeological remains relating to the development of the town, and these could be relatively complex. Development will involve considerable groundworks that have the potential to damage or destroy archaeological remains. Field evaluation would need to be undertaken as a first stage. Given the potential complexity of archaeological remains, evaluation at an early stage is highly recommended so that archaeological costs and timescales can be factored in.</p> <p><b>EDUCATION</b></p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p><b>TRANSPORT</b></p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Parking for existing units to be redesigned to meet current guidelines.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Fragmented ownership.</li> <li>* Access/servicing for retail premises.</li> <li>* Site below 0.5ha.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22795 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	The development of this site is likely to have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area. These impacts could be positive in terms of addressing untidy plots, but also negative in terms of potential harm to the conservation area. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site * Fragmented ownership. * Access/servicing for retail premises. * Site below 0.5ha.
<hr/>				
<i>B/04 Land to the rear London Road, St Peters Place and Park View</i>				
23383 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/04 Already fully developed	Response noted - this site is clearly in multiple ownership, a criterion that will weigh against it when assessed further.	Omission site * Fragmented ownership. * Garden land
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23656 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is close to the medieval church of Brandon, in the vicinity of finds of Roman date (County Historic Environment Record BRD 049, BRD 107).</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Relocation of lighting column and location of access needs to be carefully thought through. The site is between two busy junctions.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Fragmented ownership.</p> <p>* Garden land</p>
<hr/>				
<i>B/05 Land to the rear of 99-107 Thetford Road and Webbs Row</i>				
23384 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/05 Restricted access to site for redevelopment	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Site confirmed as not available.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23657 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site lies in a topographically favourable location for early activity, overlooking the Little Ouse valley.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Omission site Site confirmed as not available.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/06 Land off School Lane</i>				
23385 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/06 Restricted access to site for redevelopment	Response noted  Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site  * Part of site is identified as important open space within the conservation area; * Remainder is private garden. * Site as a whole has mature vegetation and development has the potential to be harmful particularly in relation to the conservation area
22796 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	The development of this site is likely to have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site  * Part of site is identified as important open space within the conservation area; * Remainder is private garden. * Site as a whole has mature vegetation and development has the potential to be harmful particularly in relation to the conservation area

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23658 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Part of site is identified as important open space within the conservation area;</p> <p>* Remainder is private garden.</p> <p>* Site as a whole has mature vegetation and development has the potential to be harmful particularly in relation to the conservation area</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Requires access upgrades from shared space to estate road.</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>B/09 Land at Station Way</i>				
23386 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/09 Already used for industrial purposes	B/09 is shown with a proposed use as employment in the SALP Issues & Options consultation	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Existing employment site</p> <p>* Majority of site in flood zone 2</p>
22797 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site adjoins Brandon Conservation Area (not mentioned in the description) and could offer the opportunity to enhance the approach into the conservation area along the High Street. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s). Existing industrial site 50% floodzone.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Existing employment site</p> <p>* Majority of site in flood zone 2</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23659 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection to development but depending on the nature of proposed groundworks, a condition relating to archaeological work may be appropriate. This site lies in a topographically favourable location for early activity, on the northern edge of the floodplain of the Little Ouse. Previous Land-use is likely to have reduced archaeological potential. Desk-based assessment would be the first stage of work, with palaeoenvironmental assessment of deep deposits where appropriate.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Existing employment site</p> <p>* Majority of site in flood zone 2</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Access would need to be through Station Way not the private pub access.</p>		

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*B/10 Land south-west of Station Way*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23660 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p><b>ARCHAEOLOGY</b></p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. This site lies in a topographically favourable location for early occupation, on the south facing valley side of the Little Ouse and close to the early crossing point of the river (BRD 014). It spans the interface between the valley edge and valley bottom. There is potential for good preservation of organic and palaeoenvironmental remains in deposits closer to the river, and archaeological evidence for activity on the relatively higher ground.</p> <p><b>EDUCATION</b></p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p><b>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p><b>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA. The number of dwellings proposed is relatively small however LSE cannot be screened out.</p> <p>* Majority of site in flood zone 2, and small part in flood zone 1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Separate access from employment required but with adequate cycle links.</p>				
23387 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/10 Site would be suitable for houses	Response noted. 50% of the site is in flood zone and the site isn't screened from the SPA to the west.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA. The number of dwellings proposed is relatively small however LSE cannot be screened out.</p> <p>* Majority of site in flood zone 2, and small part in flood zone 1.</p>
22798 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	Development could have an impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of open space, while the impact on the listed building is not clear in terms of site access etc. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA. The number of dwellings proposed is relatively small however LSE cannot be screened out.</p> <p>* Majority of site in flood zone 2, and small part in flood zone 1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/11 Land north of Gas House Drove</i>				
22799 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	The site adjoins Brandon Conservation Area on the north-west side, and comprises open space and meadow land. To the west on the High Street is the Grade II* listed Oak House, although the car park and warehouse separate the building from the site. Development could have an impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	Omission site  * SPA * Majority of the site is in flood zone 3
23388 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/11 Restricted access for vehicles	Response noted  Highways to be consulted if site pursued. Majority of the site is in flood zone 3 and not screened	Omission site  * SPA * Majority of the site is in flood zone 3

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23633 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Brandon 11 - this is in an area of high archaeological potential, and also encroaches into river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic Brandon.</p> <p>B/11 This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Desk-based assessment and palaeoenvironmental assessment would be appropriate in the first instance. This site lies within the flood plain of the Little Ouse, adjacent to the medieval settlement of Brandon and close to an early crossing point of the river. There is potential for well-preserved environmental evidence and structures associated with the river and water management.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA * Majority of the site is in flood zone 3</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Gas House Drove not suitable for access and would need upgrading.</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>B/12 Land off Manor Road</i>				
22538 - Jane Tipper [12298]	Comment	B12/17 should not be allocated due to identified constraints, listed buildings, planning history, biodiversity, access, open space amenity. See detailed report.	Response noted	
23389 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/12 Site would be suitable for houses	Response noted. Site a) allocated for cemetery F/2012/0449/COU	Omission site * SPA * The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23662 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. 12a has been evaluated and any new consents in that area will require a condition to secure archaeological excavation.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22800 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Object	<p>We are concerned about the development of these sites, and have commented on the larger urban extension site at pre-application and application stages. Our response to the current application concludes that the proposal fails to comply with the NPPF in terms of impacts on heritage assets, including the hall and church. We are therefore likely to have significant reservations about allocating these sites. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.</p> <p><i>Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.</i></p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Site a) allocated for cemetery F/2012/0449/COU</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p>
23104 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Object	<p>B12/b is not suitable for any development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outside the Settlement Boundary and a greenfield site.</li> <li>2. is in buffer zones for stone curlew, nightjar and woodlark.</li> <li>3. has great impact on the curtilage of Brandon Hall - grade 2* listed building.</li> <li>4. Current infrastructure is inadequate and not much promise of an upgrade or replacement is offered in the plans.</li> </ol> <p>Application contains factual errors.</p> <p><i>The planning committee should refuse this application.</i></p>	<p>Response noted.</p> <p>Site a) allocated for cemetery F/2012/0449/COU</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p>
<i>B/13 Omar Homes</i>				
23390 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/13 Site would be suitable for houses	Response noted. In employment use.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* Site is in employment use.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23663 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Potentially suitable if visibility and access design can meet adopted standards.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* Site is in employment use.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/14 Land off Green Road</i>	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Earthworks may survive in the woods.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Two accesses required as well as formal crossing over green.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* High ecological importance</li> <li>* Development of this site would represent a significant loss of important brecks landscape features.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23391 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/14 Site would be suitable for houses	Response noted - site not screened from SPA	Omission site  * SPA * High ecological importance * Development of this site would represent a significant loss of important brecks landscape features.
22610 - Mr & Mrs Gordon Livermore [12553]	Comment	<p>Already we find Green Road quite busy since cars use it to connect Bury Road and Thetford Road.</p> <p>Brandon will need new schools, doctors, health centre, entists, post offices, shops, leisure facilities and very importantly Banks (we have just one at present).</p> <p>Before we are asked to comment on where the housing is proposed, should we not be shown all details regarding infastructure proposals.</p> <p>Obviously increased housing is necessary but has anyone noted the ageing population of Brandon and made provision for affordable and private assisted living.</p> <p>what about employment for all the new people the housing will generate?</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	Omission site  * SPA * High ecological importance * Development of this site would represent a significant loss of important brecks landscape features.
22542 - Mr Steve Tozer [12538]	Object	The development is too large and the impact on local traffic, services, employment prospects do not allow for such a large scheme to go ahead.	Response noted	Omission site  * SPA * High ecological importance * Development of this site would represent a significant loss of important brecks landscape features.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/15 Riverside Lodge off High Street</i>				
22801 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site lies within Brandon Conservation Area with listed buildings to the north and west (none of this is mentioned in the description). The site is described as brownfield, but appears to be largely undeveloped with mature vegetation. Given its location within the conservation area, further assessment is needed in terms of the site and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area. Any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* Partly in flood zone 1</li> <li>* Garden site within the conservation area and the brick wall fronting the site is a feature of this part of the conservation area (and is curtilage listed).</li> <li>* Development has the potential to impact on the character of the conservation area and the amenity of the river crossing.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23665 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. This site lies within the medieval settlement core and close to the historic river crossing. There is high potential for encountering Medieval, and possibly earlier, occupation deposits at this location. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* Partly in flood zone 1</li> <li>* Garden site within the conservation area and the brick wall fronting the site is a feature of this part of the conservation area (and is curtilage listed).</li> <li>* Development has the potential to impact on the character of the conservation area and the amenity of the river crossing.</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Walls and trees may impede the area needed for visibility.</p>		
23392 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/15 Site would be suitable for houses	Response noted - Majority of site in flood zone 2, and not screened.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* Partly in flood zone 1</li> <li>* Garden site within the conservation area and the brick wall fronting the site is a feature of this part of the conservation area (and is curtilage listed).</li> <li>* Development has the potential to impact on the character of the conservation area and the amenity of the river crossing.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/16 21 Market Hill</i>				
23666 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site lies in an area of archaeological potential, within the historic core of Brandon.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Walls impede the area needed for visibility along Bury Road.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Site too small to allocate * Within settlement boundary and SPA screened so could come forward as windfall.</p>
23393 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/16 Restricted access for vehicles	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Site too small to allocate * Within settlement boundary and SPA screened so could come forward as windfall.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22802 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site lies within Brandon Conservation Area (not mentioned in the description) and could offer the opportunity to enhance the significance of the conservation as it appears to be limited merit in its current form. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site * Site too small to allocate * Within settlement boundary and SPA screened so could come forward as windfall.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*B/17 Land to West of Brandon*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23634 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p><b>ARCHAEOLOGY</b></p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Brandon 17 - as already flagged in the development process, this is in an area of high archaeological potential, and also encroaches into river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic Brandon. Historic England have commented on impacts on designated assets.</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, on the edge of the river valley. Desk-based assessment for previous application has reviewed the potential for multi-period archaeological remains. There is potential for earthworks to survive in wooded areas. Impacts on Brandon Hall, the Church and river valley should be assessed. Historic England have made comments on the previous application.</p> <p><b>EDUCATION</b></p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p><b>TRANSPORT</b></p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>		
22541 - Jane Tipper [12298]	Comment	B12/17 should not be allocated due to identified constraints, listed buildings, planning history, biodiversity, access, open space amenity. See detailed report.	<p>Responses noted.</p> <p>Planning application DC/15/1072/OUT for 1270 dwellings (in FHDC, and extends into Breckland D C) currently under consideration.</p> <p>Consider potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>
23394 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/17 Not suitable without relief road	<p>Responses noted.</p> <p>Planning application DC/15/1072/OUT for 1270 dwellings (in FHDC, and extends into Breckland D C) currently under consideration.</p> <p>Consider potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23098 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Object	<p>B17 not suitable for development. 1. outside current Settlement Boundary and greenfield site. 2. completely or partially within buffer zones for stone curlew, nightjar and woodlark - all threatened species. 3. it surrounds the grade 2* listed Brandon Hall and has great impact on its curtilage. This not acknowledged in the SA FHDC Site Allocation Local Plan. 4. far from urban centre. 5. Current infrastructure would be inadequate - the sewage plant cannot cope now and frequently floods. 6. 'relief road' is not fit for purpose and only provides access for the proposed housing. 7. Application contains factual errors.</p> <p><i>This site is not suitable for development and the current application should be refused.</i></p>	<p>Responses noted.</p> <p>Planning application DC/15/1072/OUT for 1270 dwellings (in FHDC, and extends into Breckland D C) currently under consideration.</p> <p>Consider potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>
23088 - Suffolk Preservation Society (Mrs Bethany Philbedge) [12105]	Object	<p>The Society has objected to the application on this site for 1650 houses. See attachment.</p> <p><i>See attachment</i></p>	<p>Responses noted.</p> <p>Planning application DC/15/1072/OUT for 1270 dwellings (in FHDC, and extends into Breckland D C) currently under consideration.</p> <p>Consider potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22803 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Object	<p>As with Site B/12, there are considerable heritage issues including those relating to the conservation area and listed church and hall . There are wider heritage issues too, including impact on archaeology. Our response to the current application concludes that the proposal fails to comply with the NPPF in terms of impacts on heritage assets, including the hall, church and archaeology. We are therefore likely to have significant reservations about allocating this site. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.</p> <p><i>Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.</i></p>	<p>Responses noted.</p> <p>Planning application DC/15/1072/OUT for 1270 dwellings (in FHDC, and extends into Breckland D C) currently under consideration.</p> <p>Consider potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>
23405 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Support	<p>Whilst Sport England supports the principle of this development, it is considered that the scheme must make adequate provision for outdoor and indoor sports facilities to meet current and future needs in the Brandon area. We made similar comments to the submitted planning application relating to this site (Ref: DC/15/1072/OUT) (our letter of 15 July 2015 refers). We would recommend that any approval of this allocation should be subject to a requirement for a development brief to guide development on this site.</p>	<p>Responses noted.</p> <p>Planning application DC/15/1072/OUT for 1270 dwellings (in FHDC, and extends into Breckland D C) currently under consideration.</p> <p>Consider potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area).</li> <li>* Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</li> </ul>
<i>B/18 Land south River Little Ouse &amp; west of High Street</i>				
23395 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/18 Restricted access for vehicles	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Highways to be consulted if site pursued. Flood zone 3. Site is not screened to the north and west</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* There are additional issues relating to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) located in these meadows.</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23630 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>The following comments identify constraints on sites and the potential for archaeological preservation and investigation requirements that might pose a barrier to delivery.</p> <p>The following sites may present particular challenges and may not be deliverable:</p> <p>Brandon 18 - most of the allocation site is a Scheduled Monument and statutorily protected - Historic England are very unlikely to agree to allocation. Also encroaches into river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic Brandon. See notes advising evaluation prior to allocation where appropriate.□</p> <p>The site is one of extremely high archaeological importance and sensitivity. The Eastern part (c.50%) is part of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Anglo-Saxon monastic site and its environs, including a known Anglo-Saxon cemetery, SF229, and multi-period other remains). Historic England should be consulted but would be unlikely to support allocation for development. The western part is likely to contain archaeological remains of comparable complexity. The proposed allocation site spans the river edge, and an Anglo-Saxon waterfront identified in excavation is likely to continue into it. Development would affect the immediate setting of the historic core of Brandon and the Scheduled Ancient Monument within a historic valley environment. There are likely to be strong grounds to secure preservation in situ where appropriate of significant remains across much of the site. The District Council should discuss investigation prior to allocation with the County Archaeological Service and Historic England, in order to establish conservation principles and/or establish archaeological strategies. The scheduled monument extents may be revised. Deliverability may be an issue (as per NPPF paragraph 182).</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p> <p>* There are additional issues relating to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) located in these meadows.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>EDUCATION</p>	<p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p>	
		<p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p>		
		<p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>	
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p>	
		<p>TRANSPORT</p>	<p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>	
			<p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p>	
			<p>Coulson road access needs upgrading, which might be unachievable.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22690 - Mr David Haiselden [12544]	Comment	<p>The lowland meadows, which as far as is still known have never been ploughed are of special landscape value, and being so close to the centre of town offer a "green lung".</p> <p>The view across them from Coulson Lane results in many residents and visitors pausing in admiration. It is the one tranquil Brandon view not to include pine trees. Many people over the past 40 years have commented upon this matter. The fields are a valued refuge for wildlife deer, otters, owls and many other migratory and resident birds and a diverse plant life, plus partly they are of architectural interest. The areas adjacent to the river flood in winter.</p> <p>On behalf of many people other than myself plus future generations I ask that the present landscape value of these fields be maintained.</p>	Reponse noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p> <p>* There are additional issues relating to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) located in these meadows.</p>
22804 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Object	<p>We have detailed concerns about this site and consider it should not be allocated because of its archaeological implications. Approximately half of the site is a scheduled monument (site of Middle Saxon occupation) and the remainder is likely to have high archaeological interest. Just to the west of the scheduled monument is believed to be further archaeological sites relating to the Saxon period and the whole river valley is archaeologically rich. This site should not be taken forward.</p> <p><i>This site should not be taken forward.</i></p>	Response noted. Note comments. Potential exclusion on archaeological grounds?	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p> <p>* There are additional issues relating to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) located in these meadows.</p>
<i>B/19 Land south Railway Line including Lignacite Site</i>				
23396 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/19 Already being used for industrial purposes	Response noted - in flood zone 3 as well as in employment use.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>There are two clear parts to this site:</p> <p>* Northern part of the site is an existing employment site.</p> <p>* The southern section of the site is wetland associated with and north of the river corridor. Development of this part of the site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p> <p>* There are additional issues relating to access and flooding</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23635 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Brandon 19 - this is in an area of high archaeological potential, and also encroaches into river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic Brandon.</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. This site lies close to the early crossing point of the river, within and adjacent to the historic core of Brandon and on the north side of the valley of the Little Ouse. The location is topographically favourable for early occupation, and evaluation will establish the impacts of past land use.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>MINERALS AND WASTE</p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> B/19 includes the Lignacite works, which is an important concrete block manufacturer, and some of the surrounding land has planning permission for sand</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>There are two clear parts to this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Northern part of the site is an existing employment site.</li> <li>* The southern section of the site is wetland associated with and north of the river corridor. Development of this part of the site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* There are additional issues relating to access and flooding</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>and gravel extraction.</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Employment and residential access would need to be separated.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22805 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site adjoins Brandon Conservation Area to the west with a mix of existing employment land and open space. There is an opportunity to enhance the approach to the conservation area along the High Street end of the site, but also potential to harm its significance through inappropriate development. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	Omission site  There are two clear parts to this site: * Northern part of the site is an existing employment site. * The southern section of the site is wetland associated with and north of the river corridor. Development of this part of the site would advance the line of development towards the SPA. * There are additional issues relating to access and flooding

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/20 Land at Brandon Cottage, Bury Road</i>				
23668 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility 120m to south and 90m to right with traffic calming (with 2.4m set-back)</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p>
23397 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	<p>B/20 Site would be suitable for houses</p>	<p>Response noted - site not screened from the SPA to the east and south.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/23 Land off Bury Road</i>				
23398 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/23 Not recommended as loss of valuable woodland	Response noted - Site is not screened from SPA; proximity to SSSI, CWS, Forestry Inventory.	Omission site  * SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site. * Veteran beech trees within the forestry plantation of historical/cultural significance. * The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23669 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. There is potential for earthworks to survive in the woods.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</p> <p>* Veteran beech trees within the forestry plantation of historical/cultural significance.</p> <p>* The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/24 Land west of Bury Road</i>				
23670 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. There is potential for earthworks to survive in the woods.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</p> <p>* The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.</p>
23399 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/24 Not recommended as loss of valuable woodland	Response noted - within SPA and CWS	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</p> <p>* The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>B/27 Land off London Road</i>				
23671 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). There is potential for earthworks to survive in the woods.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility needs to be improved.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</p> <p>* Beech trees within the forestry plantation of historical/cultural significance.</p> <p>* The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23400 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/27 Not recommended as loss of valuable woodland	Response noted - within SPA and CWS	Omission site  * SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site. * Beech trees within the forestry plantation of historical/cultural significance. * The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.
22806 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Object	This woodland site currently acts as a buffer and screen between the industrial estate and a scheduled barrow known as White Hill. The development of the site could therefore be very harmful to the significance of the scheduled monument by bringing built development closer and much more visible. We are therefore likely to have significant reservations about allocating this site. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts.  <i>Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts.</i>	Response noted. Consider potential for excluding site on archaeological grounds as described.	Omission site  * SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site. * Beech trees within the forestry plantation of historical/cultural significance. * The site is designated for its high nature conservation value.
<i>B/28 Land at Abbotts Court, north of Victoria Avenue</i>				
23401 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	B/28 Restricted access for vehicles	Response noted. Consider potential for excluding site on archaeological grounds as described.	Omission site  * The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA. * Additional issues relating to loss of garden land on the edge of the conservation area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23631 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>The following comments identify constraints on sites and the potential for archaeological preservation and investigation requirements that might pose a barrier to delivery.</p> <p>The following sites may present particular challenges and may not be deliverable:</p> <p>Brandon 28 - immediately adjacent to Scheduled Monument. See notes advising evaluation prior to allocation.</p> <p>This site should be subject to archaeological evaluation at a very early stage in the development management process to ensure that sites of national importance worthy of preservation in situ where appropriate are identified. This is a large site immediately to the south of a scheduled ancient monument which includes parts of the Anglo-Saxon site of Staunch Meadow, Brandon, and multi-period other archaeological remains. Historic England should be consulted. It is likely that prior to taking this site forward, the extent and boundaries of the scheduled site at Staunch Meadow would need to be re-assessed. Archaeological remains may present constraints to development. Impacts on the river valley, historic core and setting of the scheduled monument may be a consideration. Evaluation would be needed to establish conservation principles and/or enable strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</p> <p>* Additional issues relating to loss of garden land on the edge of the conservation area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>		
		<p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>		
<p>22807 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We have detailed concerns about this site in terms of archaeological impact. It is situated immediately to the south of the scheduled Saxon site on Chequer Meadow and contains mature parkland landscape. The impact of development on the significance and setting of the scheduled monument, and the archaeological impact within the site itself, could be considerable. We are therefore likely to have significant reservations about allocating this site.</p> <p><i>Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. It may not be possible to allocate based on these impacts.</i></p>	<p>Response noted. Consider potential for excluding site on archaeological grounds as described.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site would advance the line of development towards the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to loss of garden land on the edge of the conservation area.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Question B2</i></p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Site B/17 which represents the current planning application for land to the west of Brandon, should be allocated for development in the forthcoming Site Allocations document.</p>	<p>Response noted</p>	<p>This site is not a preferred allocation as it would significantly advance the line of development towards the SPA; additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues; and development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness even in the urban fringe areas.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23357 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	B/01, B/02, B/04, B/05, B/06, B/09, B/10, B/11, B/12 a and b, B/13, B/14, B/15, B/16, B/17, B/18, B/19, B/20, B/23, B/24, B/27, B/28 - the NHG does not have any concerns about residential development at these sites.	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints. Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.
22535 - Jane Tipper [12298]	Comment	01 - It already has planning permission therefore has shown it will not impact on environmental constraints.  16 - It is a brownfield site, shielded by existing development and in a sustainable location. It is unlikely to have adverse effect on environmental constraints.	Response noted	B/01 is one of the preferred options for growth - see Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document. B/16 is considered to be too small to allocate, and is within the settlement boundary and SPA screened so could come forward as 'windfall'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23549 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>According to the Further Site Allocations Issues and Options site option assessments, Persimmon Homes' site at Green Road (B/14) is one of the least constrained sites in Brandon. It is a medium size site, with an identified potential to deliver up to 500 dwellings without relying on large scale infrastructure to deliver housing in the short term.</p> <p>In light of the identified ecological constraints present over much of Brandon and the surrounding area an HRA Screening Report was submitted to FHDC in May 2015 to support representations to the Strategy Housing Land Availability Assessment Review 2015. The Screening Report provided some initial conclusions stating that direct impacts from the proposed development on SPA species and habitats were not reasonably likely and that land was available for ecological mitigation purposes directly to the east of B/14 (see attached site plan with potential area for mitigation hatched blue).</p> <p>Further data gathering has since taken place and an application for Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) was submitted on 6 August to seek advice on refining the scope of the HRA. The appointed ecologist's statement submitted in support of the DAS request has since been updated with additional information and is attached in support of this representation (Wildlife Frontier, October 2015). This statement includes updated information on the presence of SPA bird species along with a suggested design for an 11 Ha area for mitigation and recreation, which includes a separate managed area for SPA species.</p> <p>The Core Strategy settlement hierarchy classifies Brandon as a second tier settlement, considered a sustainable location for new growth and development due to the range of facilities, services and transport infrastructure including a railway station. The site is located on the southern edge of the town and lies adjacent the settlement boundary to the north. The majority of the site comprises an original plantation of pine forest crop with small pockets of native woodland and scattered scrub.</p>	Response noted	B/14 is not one of the preferred options for development as it is within the SPA, is of high ecological importance, and development of this site would represent a significant loss of important brecks landscape features. Developers have not demonstrated to the satisfaction of Natural England that the environmental constraints have been overcome and suitable mitigation can be delivered.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>Initial tree survey works suggests that much of the site's arboricultural value lies in its landscape and amenity benefit since many of the trees themselves are largely unmanaged and of a lower quality. Individual tree specimens of significant quality could be retained and integrated within a layout as part of both private and public spaces.</p>		
	<p>Existing residential development abuts the site to the north whilst existing pine forest crop and scrub enclose the site to the south and east. The site itself is currently not in use and is bound to the north and west by primary infrastructure routes in the form of Bury Road (west) and Green Road (north). Therefore, the site is in a sustainable location well related to the built form of Brandon and is a suitable location for development.</p>		
	<p>Given the site's location in an airbase noise contour zone, an Acoustic Assessment has recommended that noise constraints can be overcome using dwelling design features such as acoustic glazing. Although the delivery of the site is also likely to require some transport improvement to existing infrastructure, it is not expected to be of a scale that would cause significant delays in delivery. Furthermore, early consultation with Suffolk County Highways confirms their expectations that the A11 improvement will result in a significant reduction of trips through Brandon.</p>		
	<p>A direct access can be achieved along the Bury Road in the form of a right turn ghost island junction which will feed a primary distributor road that creates a link to Green Road. The link would emerge opposite Swallow Drive in the form of a mini roundabout which would in itself act as traffic calming feature. There are no other designations on the site or known constraints that cannot be successfully resolved through the planning application process or impact on viability subject to meeting the criteria set out in paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Subject to planning permission, Persimmon Homes intend to deliver housing within the next five years. In support of this a Viability Assessment is being prepared to demonstrate the deliverability of the site.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23402 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	Question B2 answered above	Response noted	See responses and comments submitted about each site.
23106 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Comment	Only sites contained within the Settlement Boundary should be allocated. This would minimise the impact on the SPAs and SACs for stone curlew, nightjar and woodlark and other rare species.	Response noted	Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.
23000 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
22553 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Comment	B01, B02, B12, B13, B17, B20 Most are small sites B12 has been on the local plan for many years B17 I suggest this could be the basic site not going any further than Manor Road junction. The large site B17 could e reduced in size to terminate just past the IES Breckland School playing field. This would have to have some sort of agreement as to the completion of the relief road.	Response noted	B/01 is one of the preferred options for growth - see Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document. The other sites are considered unsuitable for allocation for a number of reasons including fragmented ownership, being within the SPA, and advancing the line of development toward the SPA. See the Omission Sites table appended to the SALP Preferred Options document.
22544 - Mr Steve Tozer [12538]	Comment	The only reasonable site would be the brownfield sites around the station and Fengate Drive areas	Response noted	B/01 is one of the preferred options for growth - see Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.
22604 - Mrs Alison Barnes [12581]	Support	I would support SMALL development off Green Road IF mitigation could be guaranteed for the wildlife. Noise from aircraft is an issue for the WHOLE of Brandon, but modern acoustic insulation could most likely resolve this issue. I would rather see smaller areas of development in suitable pockets of land between existing properties, than large scale destruction of our open spaces.	Response noted	Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.
22699 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Support	All of the sites should be allocated.	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints. Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question B3</i>				
23524 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Comment	Given the issues with existing infrastructure in Brandon as highlighted in this consultation response, the IECA and IDP, a large scale comprehensive development is the most efficient way to deliver the infrastructure that the town needs. Other small scale or piecemeal development represented by smaller site allocations, will only exacerbate existing infrastructure issues which may result in adverse impacts that will not represent sustainable development.	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.  Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.
22554 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Comment	B02, B04, B05, B09, B10, B11, B14, B15, B16, B18, B19, B23, B24, B25, B26 The following sites are classed as flood plains - B11, B15, B18, B19 The following sites are in forestry - B23, B24 The following sites are very small - B2, B4, B15, B20 The following sites have low flying aircraft and woods site - B23 I have a large number of documents which state that it is very bad for your health to live near a flight path. The site shown is directly underneath the RAF Lakenheath very busy airbase and only a mile from the take/off landing path. Please consider particularly with recent fatal aircraft crashes the danger of building too close to flight paths	Response noted	Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.  None of these sites are considered suitable for allocation for a number of reasons including fragmented ownership, being within the SPA, and advancing the line of development toward the SPA. See the Omission Sites table appended to the SALP Preferred Options document.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23287 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>We believe that the following sites should not be allocated for development:</p> <p>* B/17 - this site is currently the subject of a planning application (Forest Heath DC reference: DC/15/1072/OUT). We have objected to the current application for a number of reasons including likely adverse impacts on the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA); loss of UK/Suffolk Priority habitats and adverse impacts on protected and UK/Suffolk Priority species (please see our application consultation response letter dated 17/08/2015 for full details of our objection). Given the significant adverse impacts likely to result from the development of a site of this scale, in this location we do not believe that the site should be allocated based on the scientific evidence currently available.</p> <p>* B/23 - site is within the Breckland SPA; Breckland Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</p> <p>* B/24 - site is within the Breckland SPA; Breckland Forest SSSI and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</p> <p>* B/27 - site is within the Breckland SPA; Breckland Forest SSSI and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</p> <p>We believe that the following sites should not be allocated until their ecological value has been fully assessed, any allocation should take account of this value:</p> <p>* B/11 - site is undesignated but appears to be fen habitat (a UK/Suffolk Priority habitat) adjacent to the River Little Ouse.</p> <p>* B/14 - site is undesignated but appears to be acid grassland (a UK/Suffolk Priority habitat) and is likely to be of high biodiversity value for a range of species groups.</p> <p>* B/18 - site buffers the River Little Ouse.</p> <p>* B/19 - site is undesignated but appears to be wet woodland and fen habitat (both UK/Suffolk Priority habitats) adjacent to the River Little Ouse.</p>	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	None of these sites are considered suitable for allocation for a number of reasons including fragmented ownership, being within the SPA, and advancing the line of development toward the SPA. See the Omission Sites table appended to the SALP Preferred Options document.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23110 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Comment	The sites outside the Settlement Boundary should not be allocated. There is no need for them to satisfy the FHDC housing requirements and they all will have a major impact on the buffer zones designed to protect the habitats of protected species - stone curlew, nightjar and woodlark in particular.	Response noted	Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon. The other sites are considered unsuitable for allocation for a number of reasons including fragmented ownership, being within the SPA, and advancing the line of development toward the SPA. See the Omission Sites table appended to the SALP Preferred Options document.
23403 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	Question B3 answered above	Response noted	
23001 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
22536 - Jane Tipper [12298]	Comment	With the exception of 01 and 16, no others should be allocated due to constraints. B12/B17 has the following extra issues: 1. 3 previous housing application refusals and 2 appeals dismissed. - material consideration 2. It is overlooked by 3 designated heritage assets and the conservation area. 3. Access is not safe or suitable 4. Protected species on site - see more detailed report at B12 /17.	Response noted	Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon including B/01. The other sites are considered unsuitable for allocation for a number of reasons including fragmented ownership, being within the SPA, and advancing the line of development toward the SPA. See the Omission Sites table appended to the SALP Preferred Options document.
22605 - Mrs Alison Barnes [12581]	Object	I would STRONGLY object to development off Manor Road and to the west of Brandon. I have been surveying wildlife here for two years now, and realise the importance of this area ecologically. Development of this land would be catastrophic for many rare and endangered species. Mitigation is NOT a viable option. There is also an archeological aspect to consider. Hall meadow needs further investigations for archeological artefacts. And the history of this area shows it was parkland for Brandon Hall, a listed building. To see it developed would be a travesty.  <i>Development should not be considered to the west of Brandon and Hall meadow/Manor Rd area. It should receive better protection from future development threats!</i>	Response noted	Limited growth proposed for Brandon because of environmental constraints.  Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22545 - Mr Steve Tozer [12538]	Object	B/14 Green Road for reasons as stated in B1 plus the noise from Lakenheath airbase would be too much for the potential residents of the proposed scheme.	Response noted	B/14 is not one of the preferred options for development.
<i>Question B4</i>				
23404 - Brandon Town Council (Mrs Christine Mason) [5542]	Comment	Question B4 Yes, site of Community Centre soon to be demolished.	Response noted This will be investigated further	Noted. Policy B1 in the SALP Preferred Options document allocates three small sites for development in Brandon.
23830 - Mr and Mrs Bajwa [12724]	Comment	B30 - NEW SITE North Court, Brandon	New site submission noted	
23358 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	No	Response noted	Noted
23829 - Mr J R Brabbs [12419]	Comment	Brandon settlement boundary change see attached	Response noted	Site is within the SPA and partially within flood zones 2 and 3. No change to settlement boundary
23550 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	The land to the east of Site B/14 is available for ecological mitigation (see attached plan)	Response noted	B/14 is not one of the preferred options for development as it is within the SPA, is of high ecological importance, and development of this site would represent a significant loss of important brecks landscape features.
23525 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Comment	We are not aware of any other potential sites in Brandon but the limitations of development that we have identified in this consultation response would apply to any other potential allocations including those in less sustainable locations.	Response noted	Noted
23002 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
22546 - Mr Steve Tozer [12538]	Comment	No	Response noted.	Noted

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23814 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Brian Prettyman) [12717]	Comment	Brandon Library and Community Centre - see attached	Site submission noted	Site is proposed for allocation in Policy B1
<hr/>				
<i>4.2.1-4.2.2</i>				
22700 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	Mildenhall deserves more houses. It should be allocated at least 1,500 immediately.  <i>Mildenhall should be allocated at least 1,500 immediately.</i>	Response noted	Flightpaths may change as a result of the announcement to close RAF Mildenhall and restructure activities at RAF Lakenheath over the next 5 - 7 years. The Council will continue to work with USAFE and provide the most up-to-date information as it becomes available.
<hr/>				
22701 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	Noise from aeroplanes will not be an issue after RAF Mildenhall has closed in 2019.  <i>Clarify noise from aeroplanes will likely end in 2019 at the latest.</i>	Response noted	Growth in Brandon is significantly constrained - see above and Preferred Options document.
<hr/>				
<i>4.2.3-4.2.7</i>				
22702 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	Remove Core Strategy paragraph 2.5.9  <i>Remove Core Strategy paragraph 2.5.9</i>	Response noted	Growth in Brandon is significantly constrained - see above and Preferred Options document.
<hr/>				
<i>Question M1</i>				
23268 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Comment	yes - Mildenhall has many facilities that could support large scale development	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall.
<hr/>				
23359 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	Yes - Mildenhall has many facilities that could support large scale development.	Response noted. Mildenhall has environmental designations to the east of the town that constrain site allocations.	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23452 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	Question M1: Mildenhall is a sensible and sustainable location for growth and the proposed closure of RAF Mildenhall, although initially having an adverse impact on the economy of the area, would give opportunities for new employment opportunities to be developed. The impact of the closure on the local housing market will need very careful analysis and this issue is inadequately considered in the current documents.	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23581 - Rural Parish Alliance (Mr Bill Rampling) [12706]	Comment	The 3 market towns offer the best opportunity for development across the district. A sequential approach to development is supported by national planning policy and the RPA.  We believe Mildenhall is capable of absorbing high levels of growth and having the infrastructure to support it.	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23288 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Any growth in Mildenhall (particularly on the eastern side) will be constrained by the need to protect the integrity of the site of European nature conservation importance on the eastern edge of the town. No new development should be allocated in the town until it has been demonstrated that it will not result in a likely significant effect on internationally important nature conservation sites, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects.	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	None of the sites proposed in Policies M1 and M2 of the SALP Preferred Options document are to the east of the town.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23293 - Trumpington Land Ltd [12694]	Comment	<p>Notwithstanding the current Single Issue Review Consultation also being undertaken by the Council, additional growth is required to meet the needs of the District over the Plan Period to 2031. If additional growth does not take place then the District will be unable to meet the market and affordable housing needs of the current and future resident population. Such growth should be focused on the most sustainable settlements to ensure a sustainable pattern of development which can be supported by the necessary services, facilities and infrastructure. Policy CS1 of the Adopted Core Strategy (2010) identifies Mildenhall as a Market Town. Such settlements are at the top of the District's settlement hierarchy and therefore the most sustainable locations for growth to take place. Whilst FHDC are currently consulting on amendments to Policy CS7 'Overall Housing Provision', the proposed distribution of housing growth follows the hierarchy identified within Policy CS1.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development found within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>It is therefore logical that a greater quantum of development should take place in this location.</p>	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23353 - Five Villages Preservation Trust (Dr Allan Marchington) [5854]	Comment	<p>A sequential approach to development should be encouraged, placing the majority of development in and around the 3 main market towns.</p> <p>Mildenhall has the resources, infrastructure and services to support high levels of growth.</p>	Response noted. Mildenhall has environmental designations to the east of the town that constrain site allocations.	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23004 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	<p>As a Market town it has a transport hub, good road network, easy access to A11, A14; Good leisure facilities.</p>	Response noted	Policy M1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes a focus for the growth of Mildenhall to the west of the town and proposes allocation of three sites. Policy M2 allocates a further two sites to provide for other residential development in Mildenhall.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23601 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	Mildenhall is designated as one of the three market towns in the district. The Core Strategy identifies that the highest proportion of new development should be directed to the districts 3 market towns. Sequential development, development located in and around the market towns, is supported through national planning policy and by Herringswell Parish Council. It is a core principle feature of sustainable development given the range of existing services and facilities to be found in the market towns. We believe Mildenhall is capable of sustainably absorbing the high growth options.	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23553 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>Mildenhall could accommodate medium growth.</p> <p>SIR HRA Screening Table 6.2 (HRA screening of housing distributions for potential direct effects of built development) states that "data supplied by the Council indicate that the capacity of all Mildenhall site options which do not intersect the SPA or its constraint zones is 1,644 dwellings therefore under Option 1, 3 and 4, which provide for growth of up to 1,770 dwellings, a likely significant effect cannot be ruled out for any conceivable housing allocation within or adjoining the settlement." It makes the same recommendation as for Brandon: "Carry out Appropriate Assessment in partnership with Natural England and the RSPB to determine the effects of individual site options in the Site Allocations Local Plan and hence the deliverability of housing distributions to this settlement without adverse effects on integrity of Breckland SPA".</p> <p>If sites have been included in the distribution option by FHDC because they have indicated via project level HRA that there is no adverse effect, a consistent approach should be applied to sites in Brandon and suitable sites in the CZ should be tested by HRA.</p> <p>Medium growth is a more appropriate option for distribution of growth to Mildenhall given the uncertainty of the future of the airbase as its closure could significantly affect the sustainability of Mildenhall as a Town and reduce demand for housing.</p> <p>Table 6.3 of the HRA (Screening of housing distributions for potential disturbance to Annex I birds) states that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out for any of the Options at Mildenhall and recommends Appropriate Assessment.</p>	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
22722 - Mr J M Duck [12612]	Comment	I live right next to a flood plain which is full of different wildlife, which is also adjacent to a secondary school. It would be nothing short of a tragedy if building construction of houses is to go ahead and I understand it is needed it should be build to the west of the town.	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Anglian Water and the Environment Agency will be consulted if site pursued.</p>	None of the preferred sites for growth set out in Policies M1 and M2 are in the flood plain.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22528 - Mrs Linz Osborn [5722]	Support	Mildenhall Town needs further investment to encourage retail outlets and other facilities to flourish. Further housing should be considered with infrastructure improvement vital - a link road from the A11 into the heart of the town between Worlington junction and Fiveways Roundabout would relieve huge pressure on local, overcrowded roads in surrounding villages.	Response noted	Policy M1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes a focus for the growth of Mildenhall to the west of the town and proposes allocation of three sites. Policy M2 allocates a further two sites to provide for other residential development in Mildenhall.
22703 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Support	Mildenhall should be allocated at least 1,500 houses immediately, likely more.	Response noted	Policy M1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes a focus for the growth of Mildenhall to the west of the town and proposes allocation of three sites. Policy M2 allocates a further two sites to provide for other residential development in Mildenhall.
22900 - Mr Brian Keane [12511]	Support	Mildenhall is in a key location to create future dwellings and business growth for the next 15 years. As part of the plan it would be good to see more infrastructure planned in the medium term to accommodate the growth this area will see.	Response Noted. Infrastructure needs to be considered within context of the IDP.	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
22606 - Mrs Alison Barnes [12581]	Support	Mildenhall can take the growth with minimal ecological implications.	Response noted	Policy M1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes a focus for the growth of Mildenhall to the west of the town and proposes allocation of three sites. Policy M2 allocates a further two sites to provide for other residential development in Mildenhall.
<i>Question M2</i>				
23005 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Split across several sites so that at least one will always be accessible.	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23453 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	<p>Question M2/M3: We think that public services are already located close together near the current council offices and that this site remains the best location for developing a "hub".</p> <p>We considered all the sites put forward for development around Mildenhall which fall within Barton Mills parish.</p>	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
22529 - Mrs Linz Osborn [5722]	Support	This would free up land in sustainable town locations for additional housing. There would be the opportunity to use renewable technologies to heat and light these new public buildings thus saving money on running costs.	Response noted	<p>Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>
22901 - Mr Brian Keane [12511]	Support	it would be beneficial to all parties to have all services under one site. it will create better value for money for the taxpayer. I think that the site needs to be robustly investigated to ensure that it can offer a facility for the future.	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
22704 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Support	Public services be brought together onto one site if it's cheaper to provide them in this way.	Response noted	<p>Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>
<i>Question M3</i>				
23006 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
23454 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	<p>Question M2/M3: We think that public services are already located close together near the current council offices and that this site remains the best location for developing a "hub".</p> <p>We considered all the sites put forward for development around Mildenhall which fall within Barton Mills parish.</p>	Response noted	Policy M1 proposes site allocations for growth in Mildenhall including space for the Hub project.
22530 - Mrs Linz Osborn [5722]	Support	This would depend on where a new relief road linking the Hub with the A11 could be located. It would seem logical to locate a Hub to the west of Mildenhall.	Response noted	<p>Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/01 South of Gonville Close</i>	Comment	<p data-bbox="528 317 696 336">ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p data-bbox="528 368 1048 539">This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site lies within College Heath.</p> <p data-bbox="528 568 658 587">EDUCATION</p> <p data-bbox="528 619 1048 738">The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p data-bbox="528 767 1003 810">PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p data-bbox="528 839 663 858">TRANSPORT</p> <p data-bbox="528 890 1048 1137">The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p data-bbox="528 1166 864 1185">Transport Statement (TS) required.</p> <p data-bbox="528 1214 1010 1257">Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access village amenities.</p>	<p data-bbox="1072 317 1581 392">The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p data-bbox="1585 317 2085 488">Omission site            * SPA buffer, but screened and would not advance the line of development toward the SPA.            * CWS            * Valued open space, development of this site would constitute a net reduction in recreational space within this residential area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/03 Land to the rear 91-105 Folly Road</i>				
23673 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Fragmented ownership</p>
23311 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Fragmented ownership</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22578 - Mr Brian Raine [12569]	Object	<p>I live at and am Co-Owner of 95 Folly Road. The property was purchased to house 3 generations of our family together with our 5 dogs. The garden is essential to our life here, both for our animals and the pleasure of gardening (including fruit and vegetable production). None of us would consider selling the land for development.</p> <p><i>Removal of M/03 from the plan.</i></p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Fragmented ownership</p>

*M/04 Land to the rear 98-108 Folly Road*

23674 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access village amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Fragmented ownership</p>
---	---------	---	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23312 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site Fragmented ownership

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----------------------

---

*M/06 Land to the rear 7-23 North Terrace*

23675 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment

ARCHAEOLOGY

No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.

EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Unable to determine how access can be achieved.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

Omission site

\* Fragmented ownership

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/10 Land off Finchley Avenue</i>				
23313 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  Most of the site is within the existing industrial estate/employment area, part of Policy EM2k. The remaining 0.39ha is accessed through the industrial area, and is only suitable for employment uses.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23676 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>MINERALS AND WASTE</p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ M/10 is adjacent to Forest Heath's waste vehicle depot and would need to be considered for the relationship with that existing use.</li> </ul> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Employment and residential access would need to be separated.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Most of the site is within the existing industrial estate/employment area, part of Policy EM2k. the remaining 0.39ha is accessed through the industrial area, and is only suitable for employment uses.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p><i>M/11 Land adjacent to College Heath Road</i></p> <p>23677 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site lies within the former extent of College Heath. There is potential for earthworks to survive in the trees.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required.</p> <p>Access must accord with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA</li> <li>* SSSI</li> <li>* CWS</li> <li>* The site is within Open Access land and appears well-used by local residents, but away from the paths and trails it is relatively undisturbed.</li> <li>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/12 Woodlands Park off Brandon Road</i>				
23678 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it may require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>A1065 junction has restricted movements and is outside current speed limit.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA</li> <li>- Trees subject of a TPO on the southern periphery</li> <li>- Relatively remote/unsustainable location.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*M/13 Land between the River Lark and Worlington Road*

23679 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment

ARCHAEOLOGY

No objection in principle to development but it may require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. The site is close to the river edge in the Lark Valley, which is a corridor for multi-period occupation. There is potential for peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting is a consideration.

EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Access onto B1102 needs to follow the Suffolk Design Guide.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

Omission site

- Site lies adjacent to the River Lark - within flood zones 2 and 3.
- Proximity to conservation area - any development has the potential to impact on this.
- Biodiversity value of the River Lark corridor.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23455 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	Site M/13 We agree that this site should be deferred because of the potential for flooding and because we think that an undeveloped area should be left along the river.	Response noted. Majority of site in flood zone 2 (reason for deferral in SHLAA)	Omission site  * Site lies adjacent to the River Lark - within flood zones 2 and 3 * Proximity to conservation area - any development has the potential to impact on this. * Biodiversity value of the River lark corridor.
22808 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site adjoins Mildenhall Conservation Area to the north (not mentioned by the site description) and appears to form a green and open setting for the conservation area along the River Lark. Development of this site could have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of this open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s). Majority of site in flood zone 2 (reason for deferral in SHLAA)	Omission site  * Site lies adjacent to the River Lark - within flood zones 2 and 3 * Proximity to conservation area - any development has the potential to impact on this. * Biodiversity value of the River lark corridor.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p><i>M/14 Formers builders yard north of Worlington Road</i></p> <p>23680 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site has been subject to archaeological evaluation. No further work is needed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>DC/14/2320/FUL Planning permission granted for 9 dwellings. Together with planning permission on site M/29 these sites do not abut or relate well to the settlement boundary therefore it is not considered appropriate to allocate them under policy M2. However once implemented the sites will make a contribution towards the overall housing provision for Mildenhall, so have been counted as an additional provision of 87 dwellings.</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/15 Land south of Lark Road/Raven Close*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23639 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 15, 18, 20, 23 - Impacts on river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic and prehistoric Mildenhall.</p> <p>This site affects low lying land in the floodplain of the Lark. There is potential in particular for waterlogged and peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains and environmental data. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>- 250m from Breckland Forest SSSI</li> <li>- Site lies within flood zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>- The site is sensitive to development, to changes in land use and to planting of woodland.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p>		
		<p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>		
		<p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p>		
		<p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access village amenities.</p>		

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/16 Land north of Brandon Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23643 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 16,17,23,24, 43 - Forest areas of very high archaeological potential as earthworks and buried remains are less impacted on by agriculture. Over Hurst Fen - surviving medieval warren features.</p> <p>The site is largely part of Mildenhall Woods. There are a number of archaeological sites within the forest, some of which whilst not-yet statutorily protected may be of potentially high significance and sensitivity. These survive as earthworks (some of which predate the forest, some of which are related to it), and buried deposits, and range from the Palaeolithic to WWII periods. The site is also topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a watercourse and Hurst Fen to the north east. The site is within the medieval and post-medieval Mildenhall Warren, and earthwork banks survive which will require preservation. There are also earthworks of undated mounds (MNL 516 and 7). This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA</li> <li>- SSSI - development would represent a loss of the designated site.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>		
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT know pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process.</p>		
		<p>TRANSPORT</p>		
		<p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>		
		<p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p>		
		<p>Access would be outside current speed limit.</p>		



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/17 Land north of Thetford Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23644 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 16,17,23,24, 43 - Forest areas of very high archaeological potential as earthworks and buried remains are less impacted on by agriculture. Over Hurst Fen - surviving medieval warren features.</p> <p>The site is largely part of Mildenhall Woods. There are a number of archaeological sites within the forest, some of which whilst not-yet statutorily protected may be of potentially high significance and sensitivity. These survive as earthworks (some of which predate the forest, some of which are related to it), and buried deposits, and range from the Palaeolithic to WWII periods. The site is also topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a watercourse and Hurst Fen to the north east. Roman and medieval features are recorded within it. This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA</li> <li>- SSSI - development would represent a loss of the designated site.</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required.</p> <p>Access must accord with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</p>		

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/18 Land south of Lark Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23640 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 15, 18, 20, 23 - Impacts on river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic and prehistoric Mildenhall.</p> <p>This site affects low lying land in the floodplain of the Lark. There is potential in particular for waterlogged and peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains and environmental data. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA</li> <li>- Flood zones 2 and 3.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>		
23117 - C.J Murfitt Ltd [12677]	Support	This site is available, deliverable and developable in terms of the NPPF. Preliminary evidence base work has been undertaken which supports the site's inclusion in the plan and further more detailed technical work is being undertaken.	Response noted, however the majority of the site is in Flood Zone 3.	Omission site * SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA * Flood zones 2 and 3
<i>M/19 Land west of Mildenhall, south of West Row Road</i>				
22809 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	Although this site does not adjoin any heritage assets, it is a large site to the west of Mildenhall Conservation Area with a number of approaches to/from the conservation along the main road and public rights of way. Development of this site could have an impact on the significance of the conservation area through the reduction of its wider rural setting. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation Policy M1 (with sites M/21 & M/40). Proposed mixed use allocation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23307 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation Policy M1 (with sites M/21 & M/40). Proposed mixed use allocation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23636 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 19 - large area of high potential.</p> <p>This option, in the Lark Valley which is characterised generally by multi-period archaeological sites, should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT combined with sites M/21 and M/3</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation Policy M1 (with sites M/21 & M/40). Proposed mixed use allocation.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Transport Assessment (TA) required

A1101 Roundabout will need assessment and mitigation, outside of current speed limit and must accord with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/20 Land south of Pine Trees Avenue*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23641 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 15, 18, 20, 23 - Impacts on river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic and prehistoric Mildenhall.</p> <p>This site affects low lying land in the floodplain of the Lark. There is potential in particular for waterlogged and peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains and environmental data. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA</li> <li>- 200m from Breckland Forest SSSI</li> <li>- Flood zones 2 and 3.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access village amenities.</p>		
23119 - C.J Murfitt Ltd [12677]	Support	This site is available, deliverable and developable in terms of the NPPF. Preliminary evidence base work has been undertaken which supports the site's inclusion in the plan and further more detailed technical work is being undertaken.	Response noted, however the majority of the site is in Flood Zone 3.	Omission site * SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA * 200m from Breckland Forest SSSI * Flood zones 2 and 3.
<i>M/21 Land west of Miles Hawk Way</i>				
23308 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation Policy M1 (with sites M/19 & M/40)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23681 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option, in the Lark Valley which is characterised generally by multi-period archaeological sites, should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation Policy M1 (with sites M/19 and M/40)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/22 Land south of Mildenhall to River Lark (including Jubilee Field)</i>				
22810 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site lies between two conservation areas (Mildenhall and Barton Mills) and provides open space between the two settlements along the river valley. Development of this site could have a considerable impact on the significance of both conservation areas through the loss of this open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.	Response noted	Omission site * Eastern part of the site is within the SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA * Adjacent to Breckland Forest SSSI * Flood zones 2 and 3.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23682 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site affects low lying land in the floodplain of the Lark. There is potential in particular for waterlogged and peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains and environmental data. A pill box should be retained (MNL 692). This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Eastern part of the site is within the SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>- Adjacent to Breckland Forest SSSI</li> <li>- Flood zones 2 and 3.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>		
23120 - C.J Murfitt Ltd [12677]	Support	This site is available, deliverable and developable in terms of the NPPF. Preliminary evidence base work has been undertaken which supports the site's inclusion in the plan and further more detailed technical work is being undertaken.	Response noted, however the majority of the site in Flood Zone 3	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Eastern part of the site is within the SPA buffer - development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA</p> <p>* Adjacent to Breckland Forest SSSI</p> <p>* Flood zones 2 and 3.</p>
<i>M/23 Land east of Mildenhall to A1065 and Fiveways Roundabout</i>				
22811 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	Development of this site could have a considerable impact on the significance of Barton Mills conservation area through the loss of woodland and erosion of setting. For such a large site, it may be possible to develop on other parts without impacting on the above heritage assets. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Breckland Forest SSSI and part of SPA or within SPA buffers.</p> <p>* Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</p> <p>* CWS</p> <p>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23642 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 15, 18, 20, 23 - Impacts on river valley which is of historic landscape significance in terms of definition/setting of historic and prehistoric Mildenhall.</p> <p>The site is largely part of Mildenhall Woods, and it includes lower lying land in the Lark Valley to the south. There are a number of archaeological sites within the forest, some of which whilst not yet statutorily protected may be of potentially high significance and sensitivity. These survive as earthworks (some of which predate the forest, some of which are related to it), and buried deposits, and range from the Palaeolithic to WWII periods. The site is also topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking a watercourse and Hurst Fen to the east and the River Lark to the south. The site is within the medieval and post-medieval Mildenhall Warren, and earthwork banks survive which will require preservation. There are also earthworks of undated mounds (MNL 516 and 7). Within the river valley, the area includes waterlogged pegged timbers, possibly related to a medieval mill leat (BTM 030). There is high potential for waterlogged remains and palaeoenvironmental deposits in the area. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting at the southern end of the site.</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 16,17,23,24, 43 - Forest areas of very high</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Breckland Forest SSSI and part of SPA or within SPA buffers.</li> <li>- Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</li> <li>- CWS</li> <li>- MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>archaeological potential as earthworks and buried remains are less impacted on by agriculture. Over Hurst Fen - surviving medieval warren features.</p>		
		<p>EDUCATION</p>		
		<p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p>		
		<p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p>		
		<p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p>		
		<p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>		
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p>		
		<p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p>		
		<p>TRANSPORT</p>		
		<p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>		
		<p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Multiple accesses onto A1065, a safety audit is required.		
23456 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	M/23 We are unable to comment on this site because declarations of interest resulted in our meeting becoming inquorate.	Response noted	

M/24 Land north of Mildenhall, east of the A1101 (including airfield landing lights)

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/24 Land north of Mildenhall, east of the A1101 (including airfield landing lights)</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23646 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 16,17,23,24, 43 - Forest areas of very high archaeological potential as earthworks and buried remains are less impacted on by agriculture. Over Hurst Fen - surviving medieval warren features.</p> <p>The site is largely part of Mildenhall Woods, and also includes areas of heathland. There are a number of archaeological sites within the forest, some of which whilst not-yet statutorily protected may be of potentially high significance and sensitivity. These survive as earthworks (some of which predate the forest, some of which are related to it), and buried deposits, and range from the Palaeolithic to WWII periods. The site is also topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking Hurst Fen to the east. An Anglo-Saxon cemetery was excavated immediately to the west, and there is a scheduled neolithic occupation site c400m to the east. Cropmarks and multi-period finds scatters are recorded within the area. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Breckland Forest SSSI and part of SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</li> <li>- CWS</li> <li>- MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Multiple accesses, a safety audit is required.</p>		
<p>23314 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Breckland Forest SSSI and part of SPA. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</li> <li>* CWS</li> <li>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/25 Precinct</i>				
23683 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it may require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. The site is within the historic core of Mildenhall, with potential for medieval and also earlier, prehistoric archaeological remains in particular - recent excavation to the south east identified Iron Age settlement remains. Archaeological evaluation would be required to assess the impact of current Land-use. Evaluation at as early a stage as possible is recommended.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Parking spaces should meet current guidelines.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Town centre site - in existing retail use</li> <li>- Subject to proposed Policy MP1 Town Centre Masterplans.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22812 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site lies within Mildenhall Conservation Area and contains the Grade II listed Nationwide building on its north-west corner (neither are mentioned in the site description). Most of the buildings within the site are of low architectural and townscape quality and development could enhance the significance of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings. However, clarification regarding the listed Nationwide building is needed, as it could be affected by the wider redevelopment of the site. The building should be retained and its surroundings enhanced. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site * Town centre site - in existing retail use * Subject to proposed Policy MP1 Town Centre Masterplans.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/26 Land south of Bury Road and east of A11*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23684 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site affects low lying land in the floodplain of the Lark, close to the site of historic mills at Barton Mills. There is potential in particular for waterlogged and peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains and environmental data, as well as possibly structures and water management features. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Breckland Forest SSSI which is a component of the Breckland SPA and within the SPA buffers.</li> <li>Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>- Flood zones 2 and 3.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Improved access (Mildenhall Road A1101) will need a safety audit. Poor routes for sustainable travel.</p>		
23457 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	<p>M/26 We support deferring this site for residential use. Commercial use of part of the site would be more appropriate. Additional "Cons" are its relatively remote location from the town centre and the barrier formed by the A11.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site * Breckland Forest SSSI which is a component of the Breckland SPA and within the SPA buffers. Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA * Flood zones 2 and 3.</p>
<i>M/27 Site adjacent to Parkers Mill</i>				
22813 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	<p>The development of this site is likely to have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of open space. It is also likely to have a considerable impact on the significance of the scheduled monument through the erosion of open space and suburbanisation of setting. A sizeable buffer would be needed, notwithstanding the conservation area impact. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site * Majority of site is within the Mildenhall Conservation Area on land designated as important open space to be retained. * Trees on site protected by TPO * Remains of a Dovecote which is a SAM</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23685 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it may require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. The site is on the edge of the river and historic core of Mildenhall, with potential for medieval and remains in particular. The site is adjacent to the remains of a dovecote, which is a scheduled monument - Historic England should be consulted about impacts.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Majority of site is within the Mildenhall Conservation Area on land designated as important open space to be retained.</li> <li>- Trees on site protected by TPO</li> <li>- Remains of a Dovecote which is a SAM.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted (in part)</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>M/28 Land at 54 Kingsway</i>				
23686 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site has been subject to archaeological evaluation. No further work is needed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Improved access onto Kingsway (A1101) necessary.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation Policy M2 (with site M/46)</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*M/29 Land south Worlington Road & adjacent to former Dairy Site*

23687 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment

ARCHAEOLOGY

This site has been subject to archaeological evaluation, which has identified prehistoric remains and medieval remains on the Worlington Road frontage. Further site work and assessment will need to be undertaken, secured by an archaeological condition. The site is adjacent to a major Iron Age site, in a topographically favourable location on the side of the Lark Valley close to a crossing point in the river.

EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Application for planning permission submitted.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

M/29 - DC/13/0927/OUT planning permission for 78 dwellings (December 2014). Together with planning permission on site M/14 - These sites do not abut or relate well to the settlement boundary therefore it is not considered appropriate to allocate them under policy M2. However once implemented the sites will make a contribution towards the overall housing provision for Mildenhall, so have been counted as an additional provision of 87 dwellings.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/30 The Old Railway Station Site</i>				
22814 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	The site is just beyond Mildenhall Conservation Area and is largely open space. Development of this site could have an impact on the significance of the conservation area through the reduction of its wider rural setting. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	Omission site * Unsustainable location * Potential coalescence with Barton Mills
23458 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	M/30 We support deferring this site, although it is effectively adjacent to the new edge of the settlement, because it would result in increased coalescence between Barton Mills and the effective boundary of Mildenhall.	Response noted	Omission site * Unsustainable location * Potential coalescence with Barton Mills

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23688 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is adjacent to a major Iron Age site, in a topographically favourable location on the side of the Lark Valley close to a crossing point in the river. Evaluation to the north has identified prehistoric and medieval remains. Evaluation will establish the impact of past Land-use.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Improved access onto Station Road necessary</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unsustainable location</li> <li>- Potential coalescence with Barton Mills.</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/33 Land to west Folly Road</i>	Comment	<p data-bbox="528 320 696 339">ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p data-bbox="528 368 1041 564">This option, in the Lark Valley which is characterised generally by multi-period archaeological sites, should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be defined.</p> <p data-bbox="528 593 658 612">EDUCATION</p> <p data-bbox="528 641 1041 764">The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p data-bbox="528 793 1003 836">PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p data-bbox="528 865 663 884">TRANSPORT</p> <p data-bbox="528 912 1041 1161">The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p data-bbox="528 1190 869 1209">Transport assessment(TA) required</p> <p data-bbox="528 1238 1041 1286">Unable to determine how access can be achieved (a separate access for industrial area would be required)</p>	<p data-bbox="1072 320 1579 389">The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p data-bbox="1597 320 2078 339">It has been confirmed that this site is not available.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23309 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	It has been confirmed that this site is not available.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p><i>M/40 Land west of Industrial Estate</i></p> <p>23690 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option, in the Lark Valley which is characterised generally by multi-period archaeological sites, should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Employment and residential access would need to be separated, unable to determine how this could be achieved.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Policy M1 allocates site M/40 with other adjacent sites for mixed use development to include residential and commercial uses, strategic open space, the Mildenhall Hub project in part, and a Gypsy Traveller site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23310 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Policy M1 allocates site M/40 with other adjacent sites for mixed use development to include residential and commercial uses, strategic open space, the Mildenhall Hub project in part, and a Gypsy Traveller site.
23275 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Quentin Cass) [12691]	Comment	The County Council proposes that this site is extended to include the land shown hatched green on the attached plan. This land is owned by SCC.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Policy M1 allocates site M/40 with other adjacent sites for mixed use development to include residential and commercial uses, strategic open space, the Mildenhall Hub project in part, and a Gypsy Traveller site.
23462 - Rameth Kurdi [12698]	Support	I would like to support the sites of M40/41 for future residential development.  I believe that this side of Mildenhall will require more housing in the future as the majority of new development is on the other side of town.  This appears to be a sustainable location with the current infrastructure with old dairy site having been built a few years ago and the adjacent site with planning. On the face of it this seems like a good site to extend this residential development.	Response noted	Policy M1 allocates site M/40 with other adjacent sites for mixed use development to include residential and commercial uses, strategic open space, the Mildenhall Hub project in part, and a Gypsy Traveller site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*M/41 Land at Meadow View Cottage*

23691 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment

ARCHAEOLOGY

This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is in a topographically favourable location on the side of the Lark Valley close to a crossing point in the river. Evaluation to the east has identified prehistoric and medieval remains. Evaluation will establish the impact of past Land-use.

EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Transport Assessment (TA) required

Potential access outside current speed limit.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

Omission site

- Unsustainable location
- Potential coalescence with Worlington.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23265 - Balmforth Estate Agents (Mr Robert Lewis) [12687]	Comment	<p>I would like to formally submit the following comment.</p> <p>Reference site M41 and M42</p> <p>Having been involved for many years in the new sites in the Mildenhall area we believe that these two sites will meet much needed housing requirements.</p> <p>Having been the selling agent for Bellway at the Old Dairy site and Parker Mill, the southern side of Mildenhall is an extremely suitable (and popular) location. This site is an easy walk to the services and the amenities of the town, unlike some of the other proposed locations</p> <p>With excellent road links to the A11/A14 corridor (without having to go through the town) the site will prove extremely attractive and is also highly likely to be developed with minimal environment issues.</p> <p>A local concern will clearly be the expansion of Mildenhall/Barton Mills towards Worlington. With site M29 already to be developed the addition of M41 and M42 will only take the development up to the existing individual dwelling and will still leave "Green Fields" between the Villages.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>
23572 - Ms Kelly Keane [12465]	Support	<p>Please accept this email as Support of Future residential Development at M41 and M42.</p> <p>Taking into account the minimal restrictions on these sites and with a development of 78 homes on the adjacent field which from talking to the owners they are presently working with forest heath to discharge there pre commencement conditions. This side of Mildenhall would provide sustainable development over the next 15 year period. It is also an area that would improve the entrance to Mildenhall, and provide good road links to the local major routes. There is minimal loss to existing uses for the sites and with both owners working together will be able to work with planners to provide solutions to coalescence issues/concerns.</p>	Response noted. (phoned 18.11.15 to confirm sites are M41 and 42 and not M40)	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23463 - Rameth Kurdi [12698]	Support	<p>I would like to support the sites of M40/41 for future residential development.</p> <p>I believe that this side of Mildenhall will require more housing in the future as the majority of new development is on the other side of town.</p> <p>This appears to be a sustainable location with the current infrastructure with old dairy site having been built a few years ago and the adjacent site with planning. On the face of it this seems like a good site to extend this residential development.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>
22904 - Mr Brian Keane [12511]	Support	<p>this site is located close to m29- already approved planning.</p> <p>the site provides an ideal location for development as owners of site 42 and 41 are working together to provide a joint development site that will enable the coalescence to be factored in through design. the neighbouring site has planning for 78 dwellings and from speaking to the owners who are already developing within the area. they are presently in consultation to discharge the reserved matters and are starting works first qtr 2016.</p> <p>the present nursery building is disused. as there is substantial competition within a 10 mile radius.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>M/42 Rose Forge, south of Worlington Road</i>				
23266 - Balmforth Estate Agents (Mr Robert Lewis) [12687]	Comment	<p>I would like to formally submit the following comment.</p> <p>Reference site M41 and M42</p> <p>Having been involved for many years in the new sites in the Mildenhall area we believe that these two sites will meet much needed housing requirements.</p> <p>Having been the selling agent for Bellway at the Old Dairy site and Parker Mill, the southern side of Mildenhall is an extremely suitable (and popular) location. This site is an easy walk to the services and the amenities of the town, unlike some of the other proposed locations</p> <p>With excellent road links to the A11/A14 corridor (without having to go through the town) the site will prove extremely attractive and is also highly likely to be developed with minimal environment issues.</p> <p>A local concern will clearly be the expansion of Mildenhall/Barton Mills towards Worlington. With site M29 already to be developed the addition of M41 and M42 will only take the development up to the existing individual dwelling and will still leave "Green Fields" between the Villages.</p>	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>
23459 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	<p>M/42</p> <p>We support deferring this site because, although it will be adjacent to the new effective boundary of Mildenhall, it should be preserved as a green buffer between Mildenhall/Barton Mills and Worlington.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23692 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is adjacent to a major Iron Age site, in a topographically favourable location on the side of the Lark Valley close to a crossing point in the river. Evaluation to the north has identified prehistoric and medieval remains. Evaluation will establish the impact of past Land-use.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Potential access outside current speed limit.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unsustainable location</li> <li>- Potential coalescence with Worlington.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23464 - Ms Kelly Keane [12465]	Support	<p>Please accept this email as Support of Future residential Development at M41 and M42.</p> <p>Taking into account the minimal restrictions on these sites and with a development of 78 homes on the adjacent field which from talking to the owners they are presently working with forest heath to discharge there pre commencement conditions. This side of Mildenhall would provide sustainable development over the next 15 year period. It is also an area that would improve the entrance to Mildenhall, and provide good road links to the local major routes. There is minimal loss to existing uses for the sites and with both owners working together will be able to work with planners to provide solutions to coalescence issues/concerns</p>	Response noted. (phoned 18.11.15 to confirm sites are M41 and 42 and not M40)	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>
22903 - Mr Brian Keane [12511]	Support	<p>this site is situated next to a site that is already has planning and the developers are discharging conditions presently and are starting works in the 1st qtr of 2016.</p> <p>this will make this site very viable for development as well as M41 which the owners are looking putting a joint scheme together.</p> <p>the site is next to a new development and is in a very sustainable location.</p> <p>the design of sites 41 and 42 working together would be able to design a scheme taking into account coalescence concerns.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence with Worlington</p>
<i>M/43 Land between A11 &amp; A1101</i>				
23460 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	<p>M/43</p> <p>We support deferring this site because of its remote location from the town centre and the barrier formed by the A11.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Woodland site immediately adjacent to the Breckland Forest SSSI which is a component of the Breckland SPA and within the SPA buffers. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23647 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Mildenhall 16,17,23,24, 43 - Forest areas of very high archaeological potential as earthworks and buried remains are less impacted on by agriculture. Over Hurst Fen - surviving medieval warren features.</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. A rifle range/butts have been recorded, as has an earthwork bank.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Woodland site immediately adjacent to the Breckland Forest SSSI which is a component of the Breckland SPA and within the SPA buffers. Development would represent a loss of the designated site.</li> <li>- Unsustainable location.</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

Poor routes for sustainable travel, all accesses will require safety audit.

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*M/44 Former Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre site*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23693 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site spans the boundary between higher ground and low lying land in the floodplain of the Lark. Mildenhall Warren lies to the north, and medieval finds are recorded in the vicinity. There is potential in particular for waterlogged and peat deposits with well-preserved organic remains and environmental data. This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Encroachment into Mildenhall's historical landscape setting.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access village amenities.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed General Employment Area designation in Policy EM1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23406 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Support	Sport England support for this allocation is subject to the adequate replacement of existing playing fields and sports hall on this site, to meet Sport England's playing fields policy and NPPF Paras 73/74. Outputs from the work currently being carried out by West Suffolk Council (Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy) will help to inform the requirements for replacement provision if this site is developed. Sport England would OBJECT to this allocation unless any redevelopment is subject to the provision of replacement sports facilities on a suitable alternative site.	Response noted	Proposed General Employment Area designations Policy EM1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

*M/46 District Council Offices, College Heath Road*

23694 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment ARCHAEOLOGY

This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological desk-based evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any archaeological remains that might warrant it and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is within the extent of the post-medieval Work House. Desk-based assessment should particularly establish whether or not there was a cemetery. Further evaluation will establish the impact of past Land-use.

EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Transport Statement (TS) required

Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access village amenities.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development. Proposed site allocation Policy M2 (with site M/28).



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question M4</i>				
23360 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	M/01, M/03, M/04, M/06, M/10, M/11, M/12, M/13, M/14, M/15, M/16, M/17, M/18, M/19, M/20, M/21, M/22, M/23, M/24, M/25, M/26, M/27, M/28, M/29, M/30, M/33, M/40, M/41, M/42, M/43, M/44, M/46 - the NHG does not have any concerns about residential development at these sites.	Response noted	Policies M1 and M2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Mildenhall appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1. The other sites listed are not preferred (these are set out in the Omission Sites appendix to the SALP) for a number of reasons including environmental constraints, not being available, or being in multiple ownerships.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23294 - Trumpington Land Ltd [12694]	Comment	<p>These representations fully support the Allocation of Site M/27 'Site Adjacent to Parkers Mill' for the residential development of 14 dwellings. Representations submitted to the SHLAA Consultation have already covered the capacity of the Site and reasons for its reduction, therefore these have not been repeated here.</p> <p>A point of clarification is required in relation to the Red Line Boundary illustrated within the consultation document. For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed allocation site does not include any land within the Parkers Mill Development.</p> <p>The Red Line wraps around the western boundary of this recently completed Site, but does not overlap it at any point.</p> <p>No land within the Parkers Mill development is required to bring Site M/27 forward.</p> <p>Site M/27 is located on the south western edge of Mildenhall. The Mildenhall Key Planning Constraints map provided within the Site Allocations Consultation Document highlights that the Site is partly within floodzones 2 and 3. This has been confirmed by the project's drainage consultant and consequently influenced the quantum and form of development proposed. The constraints map also identifies that Mildenhall is particularly constrained to the north, east and south limiting the potential for additional growth in these locations. This is most evident from the fact that all of the potential sites to the east of Mildenhall outside of the settlement boundary have been 'deferred'. The western side of the Town provides the most unconstrained location for new development.</p> <p>When considering Mildenhall's position as a Market Town and therefore the most sustainable location for new development, solutions need to be found to ensure that adequate housing can be accommodated in this location.</p> <p>Site M/27 is located only 400m from the town centre within easy walking and cycling distance of local services and facilities, as illustrated on the enclosed plan. As part of the Proposed Development a pedestrian route will be provided from Wamil Way through Parkers Mill and on to Mill Street. This will promote sustainable modes of</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- these comments will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>M/27 is not a preferred option for development because of a number of constraints including a Scheduled Ancient Monument and protected trees on site and it is within the conservation area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>transport to be adopted by future residents as well as providing existing residents along Wamil Way with a more convenient pedestrian route into the Town Centre. A Public Right of Way (PRoW) also runs along the western boundary of the Site, outside of the proposed Allocation area. This will allow direct access into the wider PRoW Network, again encouraging more sustainable transportation and recreation.</p> <p>An Outline Planning Application for the residential development of Site M/27, including open space, car and cycle parking and supporting infrastructure, is currently being prepared and is due for submission before the end of 2015.</p> <p>To date, a number of consultations have been undertaken with FHDC, Heritage England and local residents and technical surveys undertaken to demonstrate the deliverability of the Site. The surveys have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Phase 1 Extended Habitat Survey;</li> <li>- Reptile Survey;</li> <li>- Otter and Water Vole Survey; and</li> <li>- Bat Survey.</li> <li>■ Conservation Area Assessment;</li> <li>■ Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment; and</li> <li>■ Arboricultural Assessment.</li> </ul> <p>All of these surveys demonstrate that residential development can be accommodated on the Site, subject to the necessary mitigation of identified impacts. Survey information obtained to date demonstrates that Sustainable Urban Drainage can be implemented on the Site, ensuring a sustainable approach to development is maintained.</p> <p>Additionally, information from the wide range of ecology surveys undertaken has ensured that as the masterplan for the Site evolves it responds sensitively to existing biodiversity and habitats. All of this supporting information will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority alongside the planning application.</p> <p>Work is currently being undertaken to amend the Masterplan in response to comments from the Public Consultation event and Heritage England, particularly with regard to the Scheduled Ancient Monument located on the</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		northern boundary of the Site. This early engagement has allowed the Masterplan to evolve and support a comprehensive and high quality submission. The landowner is committed to bringing this Site forward for residential development and working with the Authority to ensure a high quality and appropriate form of development is achieved.		
23007 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
22531 - Mrs Linz Osborn [5722]	Support	West of Mildenhall along the West Row road, including the Mildenhall Hub and relief road direct onto the A11 north/ south.	Response noted	Policy M1 proposes site allocations for growth in Mildenhall including space for the Hub project. Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.
<i>Question M5</i>				
23008 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422] 23009 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	no view	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23289 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>We believe that the following sites should not be allocated for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* M/01 - site is designated as the College Heath Road CWS.</li> <li>* M/11 - site is within the Breckland SPA; the Breckland Forest SSSI and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</li> <li>* M/16 - site is within the Breckland SPA; the Breckland Forest SSSI and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</li> <li>* M/17 - site is within the Breckland SPA; the Breckland Forest SSSI and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</li> <li>* M/23 - site is within the Breckland SPA; the Breckland Forest SSSI and the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</li> <li>* M/24 - site is within the Breckland SPA; the Breckland Forest SSSI and the Mildenhall Airfield Lights CWS.</li> </ul> <p>We believe that the following sites should not be allocated until their ecological value has been fully assessed, any allocation should take account of this value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* M/13 - this is a narrow site which includes a large amount of river frontage. The river corridor needs to be buffered and protected from light spillage and semi-natural habitat on site must be retained and protected from any development.</li> <li>* M/22 - the site is a large area of grassland which buffers the River Lark and part of the Thetford Forest Park CWS.</li> <li>* M/26 - the site appears to comprise of a good habitat mosaic and forms a buffer to the River Lark and the Cut-Off Channel.</li> </ul>	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	Agreed. None of these sites are included in policies M1 and M2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22547 - Mr Julian Bingley [11609]	Object	<p>Not within development boundary M15/18/20 and M22/23/44 Wildlife considerations Flood risk (Zone 3) Infrastructure problems Greenfield site Wood lark/Nightjar buffer zones Local Plan Inspector(1995) supported Forrest Heath in rejecting any development here.</p> <p><i>Permanently remove these Sites from any future consideration</i></p>	Response noted	None of these sites are included in Polices M1 and M2. However, 4ha of site M/44 (Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre Site) is allocated for B1 and B2 employment uses in Policy EM1.
22548 - Mr Julian Bingley [11609]	Support	<p>The Mildenhall Air base closure will provide a massive housing opportunity. Surely no decision on any controversial housing developments can be made until the future of the Base is finalized.</p>	Response noted	Noted. The council cannot make any decisions on the future of RAF Mildenhall until the intentions and timescales of the MoD have been determined.
<i>Question M6</i>				
23816 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Brian Prettyman) [12717]	Comment	M47 - Wamil Court see attached	New site submission noted	This site has previously been submitted by SCC and has been considered as part of a previous SHLAA review process. The site will be considered within the context of the forthcoming SHLAA consultation process.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>4.3.1-4.3.14</i>				
23365 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	4.3.11  The rail links serving Newmarket are including in the discussion about good public transport in Newmarket. The NHG considers that this is an over-exaggeration of the rail services at Newmarket. Although there is a stop at Newmarket there are no station facilities and the line operates an hourly service in each direction. The railway line in this location is also single track, which has an impact on the frequency of services. The NHG considers that the limitations of the existing service provision means that it does not represent a good public transport link at this point in time. There is no mention of the existing poor traffic conditions in Newmarket, which were referred to in the 2009 IECA report and referred to in the Deloitte Report as requiring further assessment. The NHG considers that Newmarket is frequently congested - especially during the period when horses are moving around the town - and that this is a barrier to future development. The existing road network does not provide opportunities to address the existing problems, which will be exacerbated by further large scale development in Newmarket. This would have a detrimental impact on the horse-racing industry with consequential negative economic impacts..	Response noted - these issues will be considered further with consultees and stakeholders when sites are assessed for the next stage of the local plan process.	Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed.  Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.
23469 - Racehorse Owners Association (Mr Richard Wayman) [12670]	Object	4.3.11 Newmarket has very limited rail service. Traffic is already an issue in the town. This would be exacerbated by further development	Response noted	Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23498 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Object	4.3.11 to state good transport links in Newmarket is wildly optimistic. The current train station has no facilities and is oversubscribed. Visitor numbers to ground area rank in the top 20 UK stations, serving almost 300,300 people per year. This figure would rise if rail links, infrastructure and services were to be improved. Visitor numbers to the town are currently 350,000 to the racecourse alone, an increase of 50,000 on the previous year. This is set to increase further with the opening of the National Heritage Centre. Newmarket's transport links both rail and highways require significant improvement to be even judged as good.	Response noted	Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.
23480 - Bedford House Stables (Luca Cumani) [12674]	Object	4.3.11 With reference to the subject of a good public transport infrastructure within Newmarket including the railway line - there is only a train stop and no station facilities. Trains only run on an hourly basis to and from Ipswich/Cambridge. There is also no mention of the frequent traffic congestion on the main roads of Newmarket. The roads are subject to heavy congestion should there be a closure on one of the trunk roads A11/A14. Further substantial development would only exacerbate the existing problem	Response noted	Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed.  Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.
23485 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Object	4.3.11 The rail links serving Newmarket are included in the discussion about good public transport in Newmarket. There is a stop at Newmarket but it is inadequate as there are no station facilities and the line operates an hourly service in each direction. This does not represent a good public transport link.  There are already poor traffic conditions existing in Newmarket, which is frequently congested and a barrier to future development. The existing small road network does not provide opportunities to address the existing problems, let alone any new development. Any existing traffic problems will be exacerbated by further substantial development in Newmarket. This would have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry.	Response noted	Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed.  Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22705 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>"Newmarket is considered to be one of the more sustainable locations for new development within the district because of the range of services and facilities available in the town and because of its good transport links."</p> <p>This sentence must be removed immediately.</p> <p><i>"Newmarket is considered to be one of the more sustainable locations for new development within the district because of the range of services and facilities available in the town and because of its good transport links."</i></p> <p><i>This sentence must be removed immediately.</i></p>	Response noted	Growth in Brandon is significantly constrained - see above and Preferred Options document.
22865 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Object	4.3.11 - very poor rail links and traffic already big problem	Response noted	Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.
<i>4.3.15-4.3.19</i>				
22942 - RWS Ltd. [12659]	Support	Newmarket is a sustainable settlement, benefiting from the widest range of facilities, services, employment opportunities and public transport in the District. This therefore makes the town the most sustainable location for further growth. As the largest town in Forest Heath, Newmarket should expect to take a reasonable proportion of housing growth, since it would be the most sustainable option, in line with paragraph 14 of the NPPF.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
<i>Question N1</i>				
23476 - Bedford House Stables (Luca Cumani) [12674]	Comment	No the area is unable to take any further big developments. Money should be invested elsewhere	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22869 - Mr Justin Wadham [12641]	Comment	NO - can't take anymore. Resources should be invested in other locations.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23490 - Mr Simon Thompson [12662]	Comment	No - can't take anymore. Resources should be invested in other locations.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
22874 - Mrs Lucy Wadham [12642]	Comment	No- can't take anymore. Resources should be invested in other locations	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23465 - Racehorse Owners Association (Mr Richard Wayman) [12670]	Comment	The ROA is very concerned that further development would reduce Newmarket's appeal as a training centre. Racehorse owners would be concerned about more traffic as well as increased congestion and noise levels.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23554 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	Newmarket could accommodate medium to high growth.  The HRA Screening found no likely significant effect of high growth at Newmarket either directly or via disturbance to Annex 1 birds. However, high growth should be assessed according to impact on the Horse Racing Industry. If HRA demonstrates a higher level of growth in Brandon is achievable without adverse impact on the SPA, redistributing some growth from Newmarket to Brandon would reduce potential impact on the HRI and facilitate the continued sustainability of Brandon.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23582 - Rural Parish Alliance (Mr Bill Rampling) [12706]	Comment	<p>The 3 market towns offer the best opportunity for development across the district. A sequential approach to development is supported by national planning policy and the RPA.</p> <p>We believe Newmarket is capable of absorbing high levels of growth as the infrastructure is available to support it.</p> <p>Mitigation of any adverse traffic issues has been shown to be possible and would not be possible or available if the housing allocation was provided in other more rural locations.</p>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23279 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	No- can't take anymore. Resources should be invested in other locations	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23361 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	The NHG considers that Newmarket cannot accommodate more than a very low level of additional residential growth without having a detrimental impact on the horse-racing industry, with consequential adverse impacts on the local and national economy. The NHG considers that the potential for mitigation is limited and that as such investment should be directed to other locations in the District.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23269 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Comment	Newmarket can only accommodate low level of additional growth without having a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
22785 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	Yes because Newmarket is a sustainable location for growth within the district as identified in the adopted core strategy and the review of the core strategy	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23602 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	<p>Newmarket is designated as one of the three market towns in the district. The Core Strategy identifies that the highest proportion of new development should be directed to the districts 3 market towns.</p> <p>Sequential development, development located in and around the market towns, is supported through national planning policy and by Herringswell Parish Council. It is a core principle feature of sustainable development given the range of existing services and facilities to be found in the market towns.</p> <p>We believe Newmarket is capable of sustainably absorbing high growth options and this is supported by the New Anglia Strategic Economic plan which intends to "transform the economy of Norfolk and Suffolk and establish the New Anglia area as a centre of global business excellence". To this end, they have set out a plan to harness the "district sector strengths and our natural assets to deliver more jobs, new businesses and housing"<sup>1</sup></p> <p>The plan has "identified all the places in our area that host high impact sector activity ..." "For each growth location, we have set out the priority sectors supported, the housing and jobs expected to be delivered and the place- specific interventions necessary to deliver this growth ..."</p> <p>The document makes it clear that it has been developed in partnership with and endorsed by a wide range of stakeholders, which for our region, include; Forest Heath District Council and Mathew Hancock MP.</p> <p>The plan clearly supports growth at Newmarket; "Economic growth in the corridor is supported by housing growth planned at Attleborough (4,000) and Thetford (5,000), Brandon (730), Mildenhall (1,070) and Newmarket (1,230)"</p> <p>We believe it is possible to mitigate against any potential impact to the racing industry to allow this market town to absorb the housing allocation in a sustainable manner, rather than creating a market town which is set in aspic and unable to offer a sustainable life style to residents.</p> <p>We support development of site N14.</p>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23471 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [4986]	Comment	Any future development in Newmarket, and in Exning, will be contingent on the successful mitigation of any possible detriment to Horse Racing Industry operations.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23529 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Comment	Newmarket is designated as one of the three market towns in the District. The core strategy identifies that the highest proportion of new development should be directed to the District's three market towns. We believe Newmarket is capable of sustainably absorbing high growth options and this is supported by the New Anglia Strategic Economic Plan which intends to 'transform the economy of Norfolk and Suffolk, and establish the New Anglia Area as a centre of global business excellence.' To this end they have set out a plan to harness the district centre plans and assets to deliver more jobs, businesses and housing. We also believe the requirement for affordable housing is greatest within Newmarket. We support the development of site N14 (Hatchfield Farm).	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23494 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment	No, due to the unique nature of Newmarket being the globally recognised home of horseracing and a national sporting asset as highlighted in the recent Deloitte report, significant residential redevelopment should seek to be achieved elsewhere within the district. Horse racings ongoing success and economic development is critical to the local and national economy. Therefore, significant residential development would have a detrimental impact of the horseracing industry and its growth potential as a significant contributor to the UK economy. Significant development should be redirected to other locations within the district.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23010 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	As a Market town it has a transport hub, good road network, easy access to A11, A14 Good leisure facilities.  Newmarket could see a significant improvement to their highway infrastructure with additional development.	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23481 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Comment	Definitely not. Newmarket is overdeveloped and additional 'growth' will result in damage to the horse racing industry	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23354 - Five Villages Preservation Trust (Dr Allan Marchington) [5854]	Comment	<p>A sequential approach to development should be encouraged, placing the majority of development in and around the 3 main market towns.</p> <p>Newmarket has been subject to many challenges from the horse racing industry. We are in agreement that this is an important industry for the area, but we are concerned that approaches to development in this area may have become rather principled rather than evidence based.</p> <p>Mitigation against possible adverse traffic issues has been shown to be possible at the recent enquiry for houses at Hatchfield farm and is realistically the only way to deal with major road infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Restricting development at Newmarket and placing it in the rural villages will only lead to further issues of increased traffic movements at Newmarket as people from the villages seek out the services, such as schools, Drs, shops, employment etc from Newmarket.</p> <p>We believe it is essential this market town receives the majority of development proposed in these options. Placing large amounts of housing in rural villages is not a sustainable option.</p>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
22861 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	No - can't take anymore. Resources should be invested in other locations	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22706 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>No. Newmarket cannot take any large-scale housing (i.e. Hatch field Farm). Everyone knows it, and with Deloitte's economic assessment demonstrating the importance of Newmarket's £200 million horse racing industry, it would be beyond idiotic to threaten 8,500 jobs in and around the town dependent on racing.</p> <p><i>Newmarket should have no further major housing developments imposed on it. All of its elected representatives have opposed Hatchfield Farm at Forest Heath District Council every time it has come up for a vote. It's time the council listened.</i></p>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
23835 - Mr George Lambton [6059]	Support	<p>Newmarket should take a share of growth commensurate with its position as the largest market town in the district. Sufficient land is available which is not subject to the constraints of the equine policy to provide this growth. Although the importance of the Horseracing industry to the economy has been confirmed in two recent reports, no evidence has emerged to contradict the views of the Inspector (2012) in the Hatchfield Farm Appeal, that the level of development envisaged in the Core Strategy would not have a detrimental impact on the attractiveness of Newmarket as a centre of excellence for the training and breeding of racehorses.</p>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
22607 - Mrs Alison Barnes [12581]	Support	<p>Newmarket should take its fair share of new housing instead of just 'dumping it' on all the smaller, less affluent towns and villages.</p>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 taking into consideration the constraints including protection of horse racing land.
<i>All sites allocations map</i>				
22943 - RWS Ltd. [12659]	Support	<p>Site N/09 has been identified by the Council as having the potential for development. However the site has been deferred due to conflict with horse racing policy. Whilst the limits of policy DM49 allow the development of horse racing land for other uses when allocated, the policy in itself has prevented the allocation of sites due to their horse racing use.</p> <p>The site is suitable, available and achievable for development.</p>	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>N/03 Former Gas Works, Exning Road</i>				
23695 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No on-site constraints, on previous site of gas works, although would recommend a condition to secure display panels presenting the history of the site and buildings to be demolished.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Existing planning permission for retail development F/2011/0712/FUL</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>N/08 Allotments Studlands Park</i>				
23097 - West Suffolk Councils (Mr Jonathan Geall - WSC Housing Development and Partnership) [12654]	Comment	The Strategic Housing Service would like to see the southern boundary of the N/08 site extended to Hyperion Way - see attached site map for proposed site boundary.	.	
		We believe this would enable a residential development better aligned to the road and street scene, and would allow existing/new amenity use to be more easily accommodated within the site. A larger development area could also allow for a site design better able to accommodate/mitigate any noise from the A14.		
		The additional land is in ownership of Forest Heath District Council as is the existing N/08 site.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23696 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. The site is on a valley side in the vicinity of Iron Age occupation.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Former allotment site in community recreational use</li> <li>- Proximity to the A14 - potential noise/pollution issues.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access town amenities.</p>		
22897 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Object	Too close too A14: noise/pollution do not make it very attractive.	Response noted. Used as informal recreation and cycle track	Omission site  * Former allotment site in community recreational use * Proximity to A14 - potential noise/pollution issues.
		<i>Shield houses from noise pollution at least.</i>		
<i>N/09 Brickfield Stud, Exning Road</i>				
22636 - C V Lines [12587]	Comment	Exning Road is dangerous @ the best of times more traffic would make it lethal	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22663 - Mr Paul Grover [12595]	Comment	Surely this is "horse land" no development her A precedent will be set and this is unacceptable.	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22671 - Mr R E Bye [12597]	Comment	No. Exning does not want to be joined to Newmarket	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22647 - Mr Oliver Stephenson [12591]	Comment	links village to Newmarket (making it an extension of the town) This site is essentially in Exning, not Newmarket, there are more appropriate sites in Newmarket.	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22688 - Ms Anna Wilks [12599]	Comment	Exning and Newmarket will become one. Annexation to the town	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22602 - Mr Paul Shaves [12580]	Comment	I object to this proposed application on the basis of the major loss of the boundaries between Newmarket and Exning. Therefore losing Exning,s independence as a village. Loss of valuable grazing/stud land for the racehorse industry. Increased traffic on a road that has a recent history of road traffic accidents. Loss of valuable wildlife habitat and the disturbance of arcuological area	Response notes Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
23568 - E Braybrooke [12665]	Comment	Brickfields Stud is part of Exning and 600+ potential cars going through Exning or Newmarket. Also depending how far the building goes it is marshy potential flooding problems	Response noted. Check with SCC Highways.	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
23437 - T Pike [12667]	Comment	objection	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22642 - Gillian Wiseman [12589]	Comment	Brickfield Stud is part of Exning and would still put a strain on the school and other services eg water/sewerage disposal/roads/health care as will all the other suggested sites	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22718 - Mr & Mrs H D Scott [12611]	Comment	Not a suitable site as the movement of horses in this area is already causing traffic hold ups. Also we have already had one fatality close to this site during the last year.	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
23420 - Ms Jacqui Reggiani [12664]	Comment	It will annexe Exning to Newmarket - Already we experience traffic chaos, an over subscribed school and full doctors surgery. The water pressure it at times appalling so cannot cope with further use.	Response noted. Check with SCC Highways.	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23697 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site has been subject to some evaluation. Further archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage, with excavation of defined areas.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Improved sustainable routes likely to be necessary.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1.
22658 - Mrs Rosemary Grover [12592]	Comment	"Horseland" just remain "horseland"	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22815 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site lies immediately to the south-east of Exning Conservation Area. Although separated by the A14, travelling between Exning and Newmarket one passes Brickfield Stud which is largely green and open land. This contributes to significance of the conservation area by retaining a green gap between Exning and Newmarket. Development of the site could have an impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of this open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
23425 - J Braybrooke [12668]	Comment	Brickfield Stud is what it says. If other "horse establishments" cannot be used for housing neither can this. (Queensbury Lodge) an example	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22639 - Mr & Mrs G and E O'Neill [12588]	Comment	That Exning is a small village and should remain as such, it does not have the facilities for anything bigger!! It has one School and one shop How could it cope with anything more?? and the traffic any development would cause is not worth thinking of!! existing roads could not cope with increase in traffic	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22853 - Mr & Mrs TM & CA Gowing [12638]	Comment	Against this. Is contrary to racehorse industry policy and will lead to the annexation of Exning into Burwell	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22683 - Mr Paul Winter [12556]	Comment	Development here would cause urban sprawl with Newmarket and increase traffic and road usage. This is on top of 120 house being built in Exning and Burwell's other development. All using the Exning Road and limited resources. Exning was found in the 600's and should retain its heritage and identity, not be joined to Newmarket. Also, this is a place for training racehorses, which is in situ now.	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22668 - Ms Sarah King [12596]	Comment	Against it. Exning would then become an annexe of Newmarket. 300+ houses would place too high a demand on school places. Problems with traffic would also occur	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22633 - S Lines [12586]	Comment	This road is dangerous at the best of times, more housing would make it lethal	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22677 - Mrs D Bright [12598]	Comment	This would annexe Exning to Newmarket. This is a stud. More traffic through Exning village	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22652 - D Hitchcock [12590]	Comment	This site is beside the B1103 road which would be the only access and exit. The road is frequently used by large commercial vehicles using a nearby industrial site.	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22846 - Mrs Olivia Pitts [12639]	Comment	NO 1. Building on racing industry land 2. Annexation to Newmarket 3. Air pollution from A14 for new residents	Response noted Subject to equine policy constraints	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
23431 - EB & J Sugden [12666]	Comment	As far as I know this have always been a stud and should remain so	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22947 - RWS Ltd. [12659]	Object	<p>Objection to deferral. Site N/09 has been identified by the Council as having development potential. However the site has been deferred due to conflict with horse racing policy. Policy DM49 allows the development of horse racing land for other uses, but only when allocated through a Local Plan review. Yet the proposed deferral is because the site is in equine use - a circular argument. The only reason for not allocating the site appears to be that it is equine use but this review is the only opportunity to allocate this site for housing.</p> <p><i>The site is suitable, available and achievable for development. It is immediately adjacent to the current settlement boundary for Newmarket, which is identified as the preferred location for the highest proportion of new development under the Core Strategy (2.5.9). The site adjoins an established residential area and is in close proximity to a wide range of services and is therefore considered to be in a sustainable location. In addition to the above comments the site should therefore be allocated for development.</i></p>	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22708 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>It is outrageous to waste public money entertaining proposals for land already covered by equine policy constraints.</p> <p><i>Remove this proposal from consideration immediately.</i></p>	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22568 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Object	<p>this would lead to the annexation of exning into Newmarket. no school capacity. should be kept as horse related land.</p> <p><i>should not be developed therefore no changes.</i></p>	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22598 - Mr Richard Douglas [12579]	Object	<p>Change of use from Horse Racing, Stud Land etc., would set a precedent for other planning applications, present and future.</p> <p><i>Find an alternative site.</i></p>	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
22582 - Miss K Amanda Tanner [12572]	Support	<p>Equine land - development against local agreement for equine land to be retained for equine use Annexation of Exning to Newmarket</p>	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*N/10 Land at Balaton Stables, Snailwell Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23698 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No requirement</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Existing tree impedes visibility onto Fordham Road</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equine policy</li> <li>- Site is within Newmarket Conservation Area</li> </ul> <p>Appraisal as important open space to be retained.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22816 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Object	As the site description notes, the site features within the Newmarket Conservation Area Appraisal as an important area of open space to be retained. It provides a green break along the Snailwell Road as one enters/leaves Newmarket. Development of this site would have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of this important open space. We have reservations about its allocation. It may not be possible to allocate this site.  <i>It may not be possible to allocate this site.</i>	Response noted	Omission site  * Equine policy * Site is within Newmarket Conservation Area Appraisal as important open space to be retained.
22707 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	It is outrageous to even consider land subject to equine policy constraint for development.  <i>Remove this proposal from consideration immediately.</i>	Response noted	Omission site  * Equine policy * Site is within Newmarket Conservation Area Appraisal as important open space to be retained.
22893 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Support	Very good location	Response noted	Omission site  * Equine policy * Site is within Newmarket Conservation Area Appraisal as important open space to be retained.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23527 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Support	<p>The Balaton Place site in Newmarket is well suited to for a housing allocation in the Forest Heath site allocations. The site is sustainably located close to the centre of the largest town in the District. The surrounding residential development means that development for housing will accord with the character of the area. The site can be provided with a vehicular access onto the Fordham Road that will meet local and national highway design requirements.</p> <p>4.2 The development of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area. The site is hidden from public view by the thick belt of trees along the Fordham Road, and by private housing around much of the remainder of its boundaries. The surrounding trees and houses isolate the site from the wider area, and the surrounding housing is largely modern. The development will therefore not have an impact on the historic character of the area.</p> <p>4.3 The development of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry just as the development of Balaton Lodge and the associated stables did not have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry in the 1990's. The site has been owned and used by the AHT since the 1940's. Recent planning permission for housing development of an AHT paddock in Kentford has demonstrated that AHT land can be developed without the need to consider planning policies to safeguard equine facilities.</p> <p>4.4 The AHT's work relating to the horse racing industry is vital to the horse racing industry in Newmarket, as well as nationally and internationally. The AHT employs 250 people at its Kentford base and so is a major local employer. The development of the Balaton site in Newmarket for housing will support a major local charity and employer, and will support the equine industry. If any further information is required from the local planning authority to assess this proposal the AHT would be happy to assist in whatever way is required.</p>	Response noted	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*N/11 Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23699 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Evaluation identified areas of archaeological remains that will require excavation</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know pluvial flood, issue which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved regarding horse walks etc</p>		
22889 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Object	<p>Driving into Newmarket during peak times is already problematic. Fitzroy Street, which is already far too busy for a conservation area, is used to bypass the traffic on the high street on a regular basis. This site right at the beginning of the town would only aggravate the traffic, and it is also too close to the racecourse.</p> <p><i>Restrict access to Black Bear Lane and Fitzroy Street to residents only would be a must. But not sure how easy it would be to enforce it.</i></p>	Response noted. Check with SCC Highways. Subject to equine policy constraints	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>
22709 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>It is totally unnecessary to waste public money considering proposals that are subject to equine policy constraints.</p> <p><i>Remove this proposal from consideration immediately.</i></p>	Response noted	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>
22834 - Unex (No.3 ) Limited [12631]	Object	<p>The former swimming pool site, which was previously designated as site N/29 in the earlier draft Site Allocations document, should be proposed again for a residential / mixed-use allocation. This is a High Street site in a very sustainable location. Development of this site would bring townscape and public realm improvements at an important gateway into Newmarket and would also provide an alternative means of access into the Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction.</p> <p><i>Add the former swimming pool site and the site of the White Lion public house into the proposed site allocations.</i></p>	Response noted	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22817 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Object	<p>Inappropriate development on this site has the potential for considerable harm to the significance of the conservation area and listed buildings. Any development should seek to deliver the repair and long-term sustainable use of the listed buildings. There is potential for sensitive low-key development comprising the repair and reuse of the stable buildings, but not development across the remainder of the site area. If residential development is proposed, the suggested potential capacity of this site would result in the loss of the paddocks. Including all of the paddocks within the site allocation is problematic.</p> <p><i>Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation (including its boundary) will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set. We would welcome further discussions regarding this site and potential development options to inform any allocation decision.</i></p>	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>
22829 - Tap Investments Limited [12632]	Support	<p>Site N/11, Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction is a highly sustainable site suitable for a residential and mixed-use development. It is available and has no technical constraints which would prevent its development. The site, excluding Queensbury Lodge, is owned by Tap Investments Limited who are ready and willing to work with the Council to bring forward the development of this site which will help the Council to meet its housing numbers. Considerable support has previously been shown for the development of this land.</p>	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints and important open space in conservation area.	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>
22924 - The Gredley Charitable Trust [12630]	Support	<p>The trustees of the Gredley Charitable Trust, who are the owners of the Queensbury Lodge part of the land enclosed by the red line on the Council's plan, welcome its inclusion in the draft Site Allocations document. The newly adopted Joint Development Management Policies Policy DM 49 legitimately permits the Council to grant a change of use, to a use not directly related to the horse racing industry, if allocated as a proposal in an adopted Local Plan. The trustees are ready and willing to work with the Council to identify the optimum viable use for the site.</p>	Response noted	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22569 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Support	eminently suited for housing as no longer needed for racing	Response noted	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>
22868 - The Gredley Charitable Trust [12630]	Support	The trustees of the Gredley Charitable Trust, who are the owners of Queensbury Lodge, welcome its inclusion in the draft Site Allocations document. The trustees are very willing to work with the Council to identify a suitable use for the site and buildings. The newly adopted Joint Development Management Policies DPD Policy DM 49 legitimately permits the Council to grant a change of use, to a use not directly related to the horse racing industry, if allocated as a proposal in an adopted Local Plan. The trustees only own Queensbury Lodge.	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints and important open space in conservation area.	<p>The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1</p> <p>The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>N/12 Coronation Stables, Station Approach</i>				
23700 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but may require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent. Evaluation will be required in the first instance to establish impacts of previous Land-use. The site is topographically favourable for early occupation, on a valley side.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access town amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>- Equine policy constraints.</p>
22894 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Comment	<p>Very good location, however the strong smell of horses from surrounding area may not appeal to everyone.</p>	<p>Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Equine policy constraints</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22818 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site adjoins Newmarket Conservation Area (not mentioned by the site description) and includes stable buildings. Understanding the contribution this site makes to the significance of the conservation area will be important, as there is the potential for development to impact on the significance of this heritage asset. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s). Subject to equine policy constraints	Omission site * Equine policy constraints
22710 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	It is totally unnecessary to waste public money considering proposals that are subject to equine policy constraints.  <i>Remove this proposal from consideration immediately, and tell the owner to restore the properties immediately.</i>	Response noted	Omission site * Equine policy constraints
<i>N/14 Land east of Newmarket, south of A14 (Hatchfield Farm)</i>				
22783 - Lord Derby [5831]	Comment	Lord Derby welcomes the continued recognition in the SALP that land at Hatchfield Farm (Site N14) has the potential to be identified as a mixed use housing and employment allocation.  However, it is considered inappropriate to give any comment on the quantum of development until the Secretary of State issues his decision on the current planning application for 400 homes.	Response noted. Decision awaited on planning appeal on part of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23701 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site has been subject to some evaluation. Further archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage, with excavation of defined areas.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Hatchfield Farm - awaiting appeal decision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22712 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>After seven years of local residents and businesses telling Forest Heath and Lord Derby that tearing up Hatchfield Farm would be disastrous for Newmarket's horse racing stables and studs, and threaten many of the 8,500 jobs in Newmarket's racing industry, it's high time the council listened.</p> <p><i>Remove Hatchfield Farm from the Core Strategy and the SHLAA immediately.</i></p>	Response noted. Decision awaited on planning appeal on part of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)
22731 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>Building on Hatchfield would make a disastrous traffic situation worse and make it impossible to train horses in Newmarket - if people who employ thousands of local residents in good jobs are all telling you this - why as a council will you not listen?</p> <p>Take Hatchfield Stud Farm out of consideration for site allocations, take it out of the local plan, and make it equine land as it should be!</p> <p><i>Take Hatchfield Stud Farm out of consideration for site allocations, take it out of the local plan, and make it equine land as it should be!</i></p>	Response noted. Decision awaited on planning appeal on part of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)
23532 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Support	We also believe the requirement for affordable housing is greatest within Newmarket. We support the development of site N14 (Hatchfield Farm).	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)
22570 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Support	<p>location is ideal to develop the town but with suitable upgrades to the local roads, especially the a14 junction.</p> <p>low grade land at present.</p> <p>next to employment areas and retail also.</p> <p>st felix school should be rebuilt to support the drastic lack of places in the town.</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)
23603 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Support	We support development of site N14	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22892 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Support	Easy access to A14 and close to supermarket. However, the north of the site is not very appealing being so close to the A14. Having lived in Studlands for one year the noise is the most annoying thing when you leave so close to the A14, but this would affect the north of the site which could be avoided by shielding houses from noise pollution. However living in close proximity to the A14 may not be so healthy.	Response noted. Decision awaited on planning appeal on part of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)
<i>N/15 Old Newmarket station site car park</i>				
22890 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Comment	Location wise this site is very interesting but it would aggravate the access to the current railway station which I believe should be expanded and improved. The more houses are built in close proximity to the railway station, the less likely is the current railway station going to be improved.	Response noted	Omission site Site confirmed as not available.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23702 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No requirement</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access town amenities.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Site confirmed as not available.
22711 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>A new railway station is required here.</p> <p><i>Only allow development here if a new railway station, or the re-opening of the old one, is included in the plans.</i></p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Site confirmed as not available.</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*N/18 George Lambton playing fields*



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23703 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site has been subject to geophysical survey. Trenched archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>- Loss of valued community open space (designated formal open space)</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Improvements to sustainable travel links to facilities and employment likely to be necessary.</p>		
23407 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Comment	Sport England will only support the redevelopment of the George Lambton Playing Fields subject to the provision of replacement playing fields to meet in full the policy requirements contained within our adopted policy 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' and the policy guidance contained within Paras 73 and 74 of the NPPF.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Loss of valued community open space (designated formal open space)</p>
22571 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Object	<p>this land was given to the town for recreation and should stay this way. for its size Newmarket has very little recreation land and the loss of this would be disgraceful.</p> <p>the comment on linking in with st felix school is also wrong, that should be rebuilt asd there are a shortage of schoolplaces,</p> <p><i>leave it as it is, it was donated as rcreation and should be left as such.</i></p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Loss of valued community open space (designated formal open space)</p>
22891 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Support	<p>Easy accesso to A14 and and close to supermarket. This area is rarely used as playing field but it would be good to retain some of the green areas within the site. There's a small risk of being close to a flood zone, but it would only affect the west side of the site.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Loss of valued community open space (designated formal open space)</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*N/20 Grassland off Leaders Way and Sefton Way*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23704 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how this site will link into the adopted highway.</p>		

---

N/21 Land south of Exning Road and adjacent to Hamilton Road

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*N/21 Land south of Exning Road and adjacent to Hamilton Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23637 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Newmarket 21 - this is an area with very high potential for significant Roman archaeology relating to the Seven Springs (possibly a unique site). See notes advising evaluation prior to allocation.</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. It lies close to Roman wells which suggests significant activity in the area, and forms part of a spur of land overlooking the Seven Springs and Favin's Head, which is topographically favourable for occupation. Early evaluation is advised.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Equine policy</li> <li>- Designated open space (1995 Local Plan)</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).		
		Transport Assessment (TA) required		
		Improved sustainable routes likely to be necessary		
22898 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Support	Very good location and not too close to the A14 make this site a sensible option. Exning road should not be the only access to the site and hamilton road shall be considered as an additional access road to the site, taking some of the pressure from a potentially busy Exning road.	Response noted. Check access issues with Suffolk CC Highways. Subject to equine policy constraints	Omission site  * Equine policy * Designated open space (1995 Local Plan)
<i>N/31 Former Scaltback Middle School site</i>				
23408 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Comment	The future of Scaltback Middle School has been the subject of a public consultation exercise. Sport England supports the retention of the playing fields on this site as they are currently in use by Newmarket RFC. However, the site also contains other community sports facilities including changing rooms to serve the playing fields and a sports hall. These must be retained in any development proposals unless alternative facilities are provided. Sport England would object to this allocation if it resulted in the loss of sports facilities on this site.	Response noted. Unclear what plans Suffolk CC have for the site	Omission site  * Site to be retained in community use.
23276 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Quentin Cass) [12691]	Comment	It is noted that the site of the former school buildings and developed areas is proposed as a residential site. The County Council supports this inclusion but notes the following; that the proposed boundary should exclude the area in the south-eastern corner which is the site of the Newmarket Sports Development Association (NSDA) pavilion. SCC has agreed to grant a lease of this site and the whole of the playingfields to the NSDA on behalf of Newmarket Rugby Club. The current proposals for the remainder of the site are for a sports and community hub linked to the refurbishment of the existing sports hall and including some enabling residential development on part of the site, to be identified.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Site to be retained in community use.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23706 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. Within the existing school buildings footprint, potential is low</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access town amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site - site to be retained in community use</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>N/32 Former St Felix Middle School site</i>				
23707 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. Close to a ring ditch EXG 032</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Improved sustainable routes likely to be necessary</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1
23409 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Comment	<p>Sport England will only support the redevelopment of the St Felix School site subject to the retention or provision of replacement playing fields/sports facilities to meet in full the policy requirements contained within our adopted policy 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' and the policy guidance contained within Paras 73 and 74 of the NPPF.</p>	Response noted. Unclear what plans Suffolk CC have for the site	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23277 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Quentin Cass) [12691]	Comment	This site is currently being held by the County Council pending possible future education need. This will be clearer when more is known about the outcomes of other planning decisions in Newmarket which themselves may impact on school provision. If the site is not needed for a school, the County Council will seek to dispose of the site for best consideration and in discussion with partners in the Newmarket Vision and as informed by planning documents, such as this one and the forthcoming Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1
22572 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Object	Newmarket will be developed and as it is already short of school places this site should be rebuilt as a school for primary school ages to soak up the extra demand which will be created with building nearby possibly at hatchfield farm.  <i>school spaces are needed in the town and this should be rebuilt to cater for this need</i>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>N/33 Land at Phillips Close</i>				
23708 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. Bronze Age burials are recorded in the vicinity EXG 027</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Sustainable Transport links (cycle, pedestrian and bus) required to access town amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question N2</i>				
23280 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	N/03, N/08, N/31, N/32 - this site is on the Fordham Road and hence mitigation required to prevent further congestion. N/20 and N/33 the sites should continue to be allocated for housing associated with the horse racing industry.	Response noted	Sites N/20, N/32 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket. Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22788 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>N/10                      The Balaton Place site in Newmarket is well suited to for a housing allocation in the Forest Heath site allocations. The site is sustainably located close to the centre of the largest town in the District. The surrounding residential development means that development for housing will accord with the character of the area. The site can be provided with a vehicular access onto the Fordham Road that will meet local and national highway design requirements.                      4.2 The development of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area. The site is hidden from public view by the thick belt of trees along the Fordham Road, and by private housing around much of the remainder of its boundaries. The surrounding trees and houses isolate the site from the wider area, and the surrounding housing is largely modern. The development will therefore not have an impact on the historic character of the area.                      4.3 The development of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry just as the development of Balaton Lodge and the associated stables did not have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry in the 1990's. The site has been owned and used by the AHT since the 1940's. Recent planning permission for housing development of an AHT paddock in Kentford has demonstrated that AHT land can be developed without the need to consider planning policies to safeguard equine facilities.                      4.4 The AHT's work relating to the horse racing industry is vital to the horse racing industry in Newmarket, as well as nationally and internationally. The AHT employs 250 people at its Kentford base and so is a major local employer. The development of the Balaton site in Newmarket for housing will support a major local charity and employer, and will support the equine industry. If any further information is required from the local planning authority to assess this proposal the AHT would be happy to assist in whatever way is required.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site                      * Equine policy                      * Site is within Newmarket Conservation Area                      Appraisal as important open space to be retained.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22875 - Mrs Lucy Wadham [12642]	Comment	A degree of residential development on N/03 would be okay No concern about development on N/08 Housing in N/20 should be racing industry related housing Development of N/13 would be fine N/33 would be acceptable for the development of housing restricted to those involved in horseracing.	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03 and N/08 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues. There is no site N/13.
22951 - RWS Ltd. [12659]	Comment	Site N/09 should be allocated. It has been identified by the Council as having development potential. However the site has been deferred due to conflict with horse racing policy. Policy DM49 allows the development of horse racing land for other uses, but only when allocated through a Local Plan review. Yet the proposed deferral is because the site is in equine use - a circular argument. The only reason for not allocating the site appears to be that it is equine use but this review is the only opportunity to allocate this site for housing.	Response noted	Part of site (2.9ha) is proposed as a site allocation in Policy N1
23834 - Mr George Lambton [6059]	Comment	Site N18 should be allocated. It is within the settlement boundary and not subject to equine policy restraints. The recent (2013) planning application was refused on retail and leisure impact grounds alone. All other elements were considered satisfactory, including the provision of suitable replacement recreational facilities elsewhere in the town and for which a number of options continue to exist, including improvements to Newmarket College Playing fields, the former middle school sites N31 & N32, and sites N/09 & N/21 Brickfield and Pinewood Studs. N18 can make a significant contribution to Newmarket's growth requirement in the plan period.	Response noted	Site N/18 is not considered suitable for development as it is designated formal open space.
23011 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23491 - Mr Simon Thompson [12662]	Comment	N/03, N/08, N/31, N/32 - this site is on the Fordham road and hence mitigation required to prevent further congestion N/20 and N/33 the sites should continue to be allocated for housing associated with the horse-racing industry	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues.
23466 - Racehorse Owners Association (Mr Richard Wayman) [12670]	Comment	N/03 some residential development acceptable N/08 & N/31 = no concerns about this being allocated N/20 & N/33 = site should be allocated but restricted to housing for racing.	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues, N/31 is to be retained for community use.
23362 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	N/03: The NHG is happy to see some residential development at this site potentially with a smaller retail element. N/08: The NHG does not have any concern about this site being developed for housing. N/20: The NHG considers that this site should continue to be allocated for housing associated with the horse-racing industry and that it should count towards the Council's affordable housing requirement. The delivery of affordable housing should be identified as a 'pro'. N/31: The NHG does not have any concern about this site being developed for housing. N/33: The NHG considers that the site should be restricted to housing for those involved in the horse-racing industry and that it should count towards the Council's affordable housing requirement. The delivery of affordable housing should be identified as a 'pro'.	Response noted This will inform further assessment of these sites	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues.
22862 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	N/03 The gasworks look of for some housing along with the supermarket N/08 allotments - ok for housing N/20 ideal for racing related housing N/31 Scaltback ok for housing N/33 Philips Close - perfect for racing related housing	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket. Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23482 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Comment	N/03 a small input of residential development would be acceptable on this site N/08 this could be developed for housing N/20 there is a shortage of racing-related housing in Newmarket so I believe this site should continue to allocated for housing associated with the horse-racing industry N/31 no concern about this being developed for housing N/33 again there is a shortage of racing-related housing in Newmarket to support the young people in the racing industry so the site should be allocated but should be retained for housing for those people involved in the horse racing industry	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues.
23270 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Comment	N/03, N/08, N/31, N/32 - this site is on the Fordham Road and hence mitigation required to prevent further congestion N/20 and N/33 the sites should continue to be allocate for housing associated with the horse-racing industry	Response noted	Sites N/20, N/32 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket. Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues
23477 - Bedford House Stables (Luca Cumani) [12674]	Comment	N/03 a small amount of residential development would be beneficial in this area N/08 already in a residentially developed area on the outskirts of Newmarket - no issues N/31 no issues for housing developments N/33 if this site were to be redeveloped then it should be in order to support the lack of housing for the horse racing industry.	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues.
22870 - Mr Justin Wadham [12641]	Comment	N/03 - A degree of residential development on N/03 would be okay N/08 - No concern about development on N/08 N/20 - Housing on N/20 should be racing industry related housing N/13 - Development of N/13 would be fine. N/33 would be acceptable for the development of housing restricted to those involved in horseracing.	Response noted	Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/03 and N/08 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues. There is no site N/13.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23495 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment	<p>N/03 - some residential development on this site alongside the retail offer would be acceptable.</p> <p>N/08 - residential development would be acceptable</p> <p>N/20 - there is a need for racing related housing in Newmarket, this site should retain the allocation for racing related housing</p> <p>N/31 - residential development would be acceptable</p> <p>N/33 - there is a need for racing related housing in Newmarket, this site would be a valuable contribution</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites N/20 and N/33 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/03, N/08, and N/31 are not considered suitable or available for residential use: N/03 has permission for retail use, N/08 is in community recreational use and proximity to the A14 may have noise and pollution issues.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23472 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [4986]	Comment	<p>N/20</p> <p>1. This housing allocation is deliverable and because the site is, and will continue to be owned by Jockey Club Estates, any revenues from the development will be re-invested back into the Horse Racing Industry.</p> <p>2. Reference to the Local Plan 1995 Policy 4.4 under the policy for N/20 is now 20 years old and obsolete. In any case, the site is NOT 'within equine use'. JCE's representations to be SHLAA 2015 consultation in May confirmed that this site as 'unused grass land'. The Site Allocations Preferred Options version should correct these facts. The allocation, as now proposed, will be restricted for housing those working in the Horse Racing Industry only and therefore even though we do not consider the site to be 'within equine use' at the moment, it will be for residential use to serve the Horse Racing Industry in the future. This housing is intended to be 'affordable housing' to help meet the Council's affordable housing target.</p> <p>N/33</p> <p>1. This housing allocation is deliverable and because the site is, and will continue to be owned by Jockey Club Estates, any revenues from the development will be re-invested back into the Horse Racing Industry.</p> <p>2. The references under 'Potential Capacity' should be amended to account for the fact that the allocation would be for '73 (net additional dwellings based on the 2015 SHLAA consultation response.' Delete reference to '2014 SHLAA'. The allocation, as now proposed, will be restricted for housing those working in the Horse Racing Industry only and therefore even though we do not consider the site to be 'within equine use' at the moment, it will be for residential use to serve the Horse Racing Industry in the future. This housing is intended to be 'affordable housing' to help meet the Council's affordable housing target.</p> <p>3. Although the policy states that the site is in an area where 'equine related land uses are prevalent', the site is also a 'brownfield ' site in a predominantly residential area of the town.</p>	Response noted	Site N/20 is included in Policy N1 and is allocated for housing in Newmarket.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22714 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	Land at Phillips Close Former St Felix Middle School site Former Scaltback Middle School site Old Newmarket station site car park Grassland off Leaders Way and Sefton Way Former Gas Works, Exning Road  <i>Remove the following from the SHLAA and Core Strategy: Hatchfield Farm</i>	Response noted	Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1 (including some of the sites listed, but also includes land at Hatchfield Farm).
22850 - Tap Investments Limited [12632]	Support	Site N/11 Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction should be allocated for residential/ mixed-use development.	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints and important open space in conservation area.	The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1  The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.
22845 - The Unex Group (Mr Stephen Walsh) [5804]	Support	Site N/11 Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction should be allocated for residential / mixed-use development.	Response noted. Subject to equine policy constraints and important open space in conservation area.	The site is proposed for allocation as part of Policy N1  The site may be appropriate for an element of enabling residential development and the potential capacity will be explored by the Council and other stakeholders within the context of a Design Brief.
<i>Question N3</i>				
22727 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618] 23496 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment		Response noted. Decision awaited on planning appeal on part of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy N1 (400 dwellings)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23492 - Mr Simon Thompson [12662]	Comment	<p>N/09: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horseracing industry. It is close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry. The site is too far from existing facilities to encourage people to walk to facilities.</p> <p>N/11: The site is protected by the horse racing policy.</p> <p>N/12: this site is used by the horse racing industry</p> <p>N/14: development of this large site will cause traffic congestion and have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry</p> <p>N/15: The site is used for parking of horse boxes during the sales at Tattersalls. The loss of this facility will have a direct and negative impact on this vital part of the thriving horse-racing industry in Newmarket.</p> <p>N/18: It is important that existing playing fields are protected for the benefit of existing residents. The loss of this site to housing will also increase the level of traffic on the road in close proximity to existing horsewalks and horse-racing facilities. This will have a negative impact on the industry.</p> <p>N/21: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horseracing industry. It close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry.</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites N/09, N/11, N/14, N/20, and N/32 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/10, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>
23012 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmom) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23473 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [4986]	Comment	As the landowners of site N/21, Jockey Club Estates Ltd did not submit the site into the SHLAA process as a potential housing allocation. The site has been submitted by FHDC.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Equine policy</li> <li>* Designated open space (1995 Local Plan)</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22871 - Mr Justin Wadham [12641]	Comment	N/09 is a site which is an existing horseracing facility and should be retained for the benefit of horseracing. Developing N/10 would significantly increase traffic congestion on the Fordham Road. N/11 is an existing horseracing facility and should be retained as such. N/15 is used for horsebox parking during the Tattersalls sales. N/18 are playing field and must be protected for the benefit of existing residence. N/21 is a horseracing facility and must be retained as such N/32 the development of this site would contribute further towards already excessive traffic congestion on Fordham Road.	Response noted	Sites N/09, N/11, N/14, and N/32 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/10, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.
22863 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	N/09 existing horse racing land and still very viable as such N/10 would increase the traffic on the already very busy Fordham Road N/11 The site is covered by the horse racing policies and still has ongoing potential for the racing industry N/14 If developed would be a major disaster to the traffic flow on Fordham Road and the A14 junction N/15 Important park for boxes at the sales and in future we need bigger and better station facilities and is ideal for parking and station buildings N/18 playing fields are a big community asset and the traffic on the Fordham Road would be again increased. N/21 This should be covered by the horse racing policies N/32 Traffic on the Fordham Road	Response noted	Sites N/09, N/11, N/14, and N/32 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.  Sites N/10, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23483 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Comment	<p>N/09 this site is an existing horse racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse racing industry. its close proximity to existing horse racing facilities and any redevelopment for housing would exacerbate traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse racing industry. The site is too far from other facilities for people to walk comfortably to facilities N/10 any development of this site for housing will greatly contribute towards increased traffic congestion on the already busy Fordham Road. As there are many horse crossings and horse racing facilities on Fordham Road any development will impact negatively on the horse-racing industry and these facilities. Huge mitigation would have to be undertaken to address any negative traffic impacts on this area.</p> <p>N/11 the site is an existing horse racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse racing industry. It close to existing horse racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse racing industry.</p> <p>N/14 the Hatchfield Farm site should not be developed. Development of this site would have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry, including, due to the increase of traffic on the already congested Fordham Road: safety of horses and people; and damage to the perception of Newmarket as it will be further urbanised.</p> <p>N/15 the site is used for horsebox parking during the sales at Tattersalls. The loss of this facility will have a direct and negative impact on this vital part of the thriving horse-racing industry in Newmarket.</p> <p>N/18 Newmarket is already undersubscribed with public open space and it is important that existing playing fields are protected as such for the benefit of existing residents. The loss of this site to housing will also increase the level of traffic on the busy Fordham Road, which in turn will have a negative impact on the racing industry.</p> <p>N/21 the site is an existing horse racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse racing industry.</p> <p>N/32 the development of this site for housing will contribute towards increased traffic congestion on the already busy Fordham Road, which will impact</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites N/09, N/11, N/14, N/20, and N/32 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/10, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		negatively on the horse racing industry. If it is developed any negative traffic impacts will need to be adequately mitigated.		
23478 - Bedford House Stables (Luca Cumani) [12674]	Comment	<p>N/09 this is an existing horse racing related facility. Sitting on the edge of one of the main training areas in Newmarket. Redevelopment would cause disruption to this area and increase congestion.</p> <p>N/10 this is located close to the centre of town. Any development in this area would have a negative impact on the already busy Fordham Road</p> <p>N/11 this is an existing horse racing facility and should remain as one. Any housing development in this area would have a negative impact on the other horse racing facilities that are in close proximity.</p> <p>N/15 this site has offices and is also used as a parking area for horseboxes during the Tattersalls sales. The loss of this site to housing development would have a serious knock on effect for parking issues</p> <p>N/18 this site is heavily utilised playing field and due to the lack of other playing fields in the town should remain as one. Housing development would have a huge negative impact on the already busy Fordham Road</p> <p>N/20 this site is too close to training gallops</p> <p>N/21 this is an existing horse racing facility and should be retained as one</p> <p>N/32 this is another site that would contribute towards traffic congestion on the already busy Fordham Road</p> <p>N/14 Using this site as a substantial housing development would have a huge negative impact on the racing industry due to the increase of traffic on the already congested Fordham Road</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites N/09, N/11, N/14, N/20, and N/32 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/10, N/15 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p> <p>Sites N/09, N/11, and N/14 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/12, N/15 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23363 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	<p>The NHG submitted detailed evidence to the recent Hatchfield Farm inquiry to explain the conflict between traffic movements and horse movements around the town. It also demonstrated that the perception of harm has just a negative impact on the industry as actual harm. The NHG demonstrated that the conflict between traffic and horse movements cannot be mitigated on a site-by-site basis. The NHG believes that medium or large scale residential development cannot be delivered without adverse impact on the movement of horses around the town, which will prejudice the industry as a whole. This opinion should be taken into account when reviewing the site-specific comments below.</p> <p>N/09: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry. It is close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry. The NHG considers that the site is too far from existing facilities to encourage people to walk to facilities. These concerns should be reflected in the list of 'cons'.</p> <p>N/11: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry. It is close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry. These concerns should be reflected in the list of 'cons'.</p> <p>N/12: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry.</p> <p>N/14: The NHG's objections to this site were rehearsed at both public inquiries into the planning applications proposed at Hatchfield Farm. The NHG remains of the opinion that the redevelopment of this site for housing/mixed use will adversely impact upon the horse-racing industry to the detriment of both the local and national economy. Furthermore, the Council has neglected to refer to traffic and equine impact as 'cons'.</p> <p>N/15: The site is used for horsebox parking during the sales at Tattersalls. The loss of this facility will have a direct and negative impact on this vital part of the thriving horse-racing industry in Newmarket. The loss</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- the comments on each of these sites will inform further assessment of sites in Newmarket.</p>	<p>Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1. Allocations include land at Hatchfield Farm as this is available, deliverable and a sustainable location for growth which does not adversely affect the HRI.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>of this facility will inhibit the ability of this station to function as a successful public transport facility in future if improvements to the route/frequency are made. These concerns should be reflected in the list of 'cons'.</p> <p>N/18: It is important that existing playing fields are protected for the benefit of existing residents. The loss of this site to housing/mixed use will also increase the level of traffic on the road in close proximity to existing horse-walks and horse-racing facilities. This will have a negative impact on the industry. These concerns should be reflected in the list of 'cons'.</p> <p>N/21: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry.</p> <p>N/32: This site is located on the already congested Fordham Road, which the NHG considers the development of this site will exacerbate. This concern should be reflected in the 'cons'.</p>		
22876 - Mrs Lucy Wadham [12642]	Comment	<p>N/09 is a site which is an existing horseracing facility and should be retained for the benefits of horseracing. Developing N/10 would significantly increase traffic congestion on the Fordham Road</p> <p>N/11 is an existing horseracing facility and should be retained as such</p> <p>N/15 is used for horsebox parking during the Tattersalls sales.</p> <p>N/18 are playing fields and must be protected for the benefit of existing residence</p> <p>N/21 is a horseracing facility and should be retained as such</p> <p>N/32 the development of this site for housing would contribute further towards already excessive traffic congestion on Fordham Road.</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites N/09, N/11, and N/14 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/12, N/15 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>
23467 - Racehorse Owners Association (Mr Richard Wayman) [12670]	Comment	<p>N/09, N/11 and N/21 should be retained for benefit of racing</p> <p>N/10, N/18 and N/32 = would all contribute to increased traffic congestion on Fordham Road</p> <p>N/15 = would impact on world-renowned Tattersalls sales</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites N/09, N/11, and N/32 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/10, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23281 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	<p>N/09 The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry. It is close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards an increase in traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry. The site is too far from existing facilities to encourage people to walk to facilities.</p> <p>N/11 The site is protected by horse racing policy</p> <p>N/12 This site is used by the horse racing industry</p> <p>N/14 development of this large site will cause traffic congestion and have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry</p> <p>N/15 The site used for parking of horse boxes during the horse sales at Tattersalls. The loss of this facility will have a direct and negative impact on this vital part of the thriving horse-racing industry in Newmarket</p> <p>N/18 It is important that existing playing fields are protected for the benefit of existing residents. The loss of this site to housing will increase the level of traffic on the road in close proximity to existing horse-walks and horse-racing facilities. This will have a negative impact on the industry.</p> <p>N/21 The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry. It is close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry.</p>	Response noted	<p>Part of site N/09 is included as a housing allocation in Policy N1 (with an indicative capacity of 87 dwellings).</p> <p>Sites N/11 and N/14 are also included as housing allocations in Policy N1.</p> <p>Sites N/12, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>
22713 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	<p>After seven years of local residents and businesses telling Forest Heath and Lord Derby that tearing up Hatchfield Farm would be disastrous for Newmarket's horse racing stables and studs, and threaten many of the 8,500 jobs in Newmarket's racing industry, it's high time the council listened.</p> <p><i>Remove Hatchfield Farm from the Core Strategy and the SHLAA immediately.</i></p>	Response noted	<p>Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1. Allocations include land at Hatchfield Farm as this is available, deliverable and a sustainable location for growth.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22730 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	Take Lord Derby's disastrous Hatchfield Farm plans out of the local plan and site allocation.  It's a stud farm with two fields (why aren't the fields racing land, as they are surrounded by racing land?!).  <i>Make the two fields in Hatchfield Farm Stud racing land.</i>	Response noted	Policy N1 is the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with policy CS1. Allocations include land at Hatchfield Farm as this is available, deliverable and a sustainable location for growth.
<i>Question N4</i>				
23479 - Bedford House Stables (Luca Cumani) [12674]	Comment	No the town is already over developed and has a lack of amenities to facilitate more housing/people	Response noted	Noted. No new sites have been put forward for consideration in Newmarket.
23497 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment	No	Response noted	Noted. No new sites have been put forward for consideration in Newmarket.
22864 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	NO	Response noted	No new sites have been considered. Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
22872 - Mr Justin Wadham [12641]	Comment	Newmarket is already overdeveloped. The current rail service serving Newmarket are very limited and do not represent a good public transport link. Meanwhile poor traffic conditions in inner Newmarket which is frequently and sometimes impossibly congested, constitute a serious barrier to further future development.	Response noted	No new sites have been considered. Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23484 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Comment	No - Newmarket is already overdeveloped for the size of the town and the facilities and infrastructure available.	Response noted	No new sites have been considered. Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
22877 - Mrs Lucy Wadham [12642]	Comment	Newmarket is already overdeveloped. The current rail service serving Newmarket are very limited and do not represent a good public transport link. Meanwhile poor traffic conditions in inner Newmarket which is frequently and sometime impossibly congested, constitute a serious barrier to further development.	Response noted	Noted. No new sites have been put forward for consideration in Newmarket. Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23815 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Brian Prettyman) [12717]	Comment	N07 Studlands Park site off Parkers Walk see attached	New site submission noted	This site is an extension to an existing site submitted by SCC. Site N/07 has been considered within the context of previous SHLAA and Site Allocation Local Plan preparation processes and the revised site area will be considered as part of the forthcoming SHLAA consultation process.
23468 - Racehorse Owners Association (Mr Richard Wayman) [12670]	Comment	No	Response noted	No new sites have been considered. Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.
23493 - Mr Simon Thompson [12662]	Comment	No - Newmarket is already overdeveloped.	Response noted	No new sites have been considered. Policy N1 in the SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Newmarket appropriate to its status as a market town in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23271 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Comment	<p>As reported at the Hatchfield Farm inquiry any large scale residential development will have a negative impact on the horse racing industry.</p> <p>N/09: The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry. It close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry. The site is too far from existing facilities to encourage people to walk to facilities.</p> <p>N/11: The site is protected by the horse racing policy  N/12: This site is owned by Tattersalls and we request that it is removed as a potential for residential development.  N/14: development of this large site will cause traffic congestion and have a detrimental impact on the horse racing industry.  N/15: The site is used for parking of horse boxes during the sales at Tattersalls. Hence the site cannot be developed for any alternative use.  N/18: It is important that existing playing fields are protected for the benefit of existing residents. The loss of this site to housing will also increase the level of traffic on the road in close proximity to existing horse-walks and hors-racing facilities. This will have a negative impact on the horse racing industry.  N/21 The site is an existing horse-racing facility, which should be retained for the benefit of the horse-racing industry. It is close to existing horse-racing facilities and its redevelopment for housing will contribute towards increase traffic congestion, which will impact on the horse-racing industry.</p>	Response noted - each of the comments will inform the further consideration of each site.	<p>Sites N/09, N/11, and N/14 are included in Policy N1 and are allocated for housing in Newmarket.</p> <p>Sites N/10, N/12, N/15, N/18 and N/21 are not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including equine policy constraints, designated public open space, and/or that the site is not available.</p>
23364 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	No - Newmarket is already overdeveloped.	Response noted	Noted. No new sites have been put forward for consideration in Newmarket.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22732 - Mr Sebastian Gosden [12618]	Object	RAF Mildenhall (that closes in 2019 at the latest anyway!)	Response Noted.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the government will be selling off RAF Mildenhall for housing once the United States Air Force vacates the base in 2022. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Core Strategy Single Issue Review. Should this position change during the plan period, the Council will immediately commence a review of the Local Plan.
		<i>Include brownfield land at RAF Mildenhall as a future housebuilding site. To say it's not an option is unjustifiable.</i>		
22860 - Unex (No.3 ) Limited [12631]	Object	The former swimming pool site ( previously designated N/29 ) and the site of the adjacent White Lion public house should be allocated for residential / mixed-use development. Development of the swimming pool site would not only bring about townscape and public realm benefits on an important gateway approach into Newmarket but would also allow an alternative means of access into site N/11 Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction. This is a very sustainable site directly on the High Street.  <i>Add the former swimming pool site and the site of the adjacent White Lion public House to the draft proposed Site Allocations.</i>	Response noted	The swimming pool was originally discounted as it is below the SALP size threshold (approx. 0.16 ha), and as a brownfield site within the settlement boundary it could come forward and would be treated as windfall. The White Lion is also a small site within the settlement boundary (approx. .06ha), and even combined the two sites are below the size threshold.

---

*Representations*

*Nature*

*Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan*

*Council's Assessment*

*Action*

---

***5. Key Service Centres***

*5.1.1-5.1.2*



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23417 - Ms Marilyn Banks [12697]	Comment	<p>it is puzzling that Lakenheath has been earmarked for such large amounts of development when there does not appear to be large numbers of people who would choose to live in Lakenheath.</p> <p>1. There appears to be no facility to amend village/town profiles as and when services change. Surely, this omission has to be addressed when considering sites for development? Lakenheath does not have the full range of services as detailed in this document. Additionally, the library has gone through difficult times, is its survival assured? The Post Office is in a similar position and, indeed, with the recent addition of Post Office vans, its current site seems to be inadequate for the business. Furthermore, rumours abound about the future of the only bank left in the village. Obviously, future planning cannot be swayed by rumour but Lakenheath has failed to secure any additional retail facility, despite ongoing attempts over many years. In such volatile economic times it is difficult to see any change on that front which would benefit Lakenheath.</p> <p>2. Forest Heath has always been portrayed as a "tourist" destination and Lakenheath, apart from lying in a unique environment twixt Fen and Breck, has the nationally renowned RSPB site, but, with the potential destruction of the natural wildlife corridor to the north/west of the village and the continuing saga at Lakenheath Hall, something which has lasted for 10 years and is a clear eyesore for anyone travelling to/from Lakenheath, who would want to spend any time in the village? A tourist destination surely warrants thoughtful and appropriate planning?</p> <p>3. Most of the proposed development fails to provide anything like adequate parking. As the village has been told on many occasions, the only public transport available - a bus service to either Thetford or Mildenhall, where if lucky there may be a connection onwards - is heavily subsidised and could, therefore, if money gets really tight, be withdrawn. The service is, in any event, totally inadequate for workers, and cars are not a choice but a necessity. Without any actual transport consultation why are developers still allowed to build without suitable parking facilities? Is it not easy enough to ascertain the number of cars per</p>	Response noted - Check with Highways / drainage.	Lakenheath is a Key Service Centre, and Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>property and plan on a current basis? Car ownership is unlikely to diminish. Parking issues are a matter of concern to much of the village and a significant cause of anti social behaviour. Why has there been no attempt made to revitalise the use of Lakenheath railway station?</p> <p>4. Lakenheath is, at the current time, essentially a rural environment. Such an environment suggests space but the density of some of the proposed development put before the Parish Council in the last two years will be overwhelming to the surrounding properties. Furthermore, another cause of anti social behaviour, is high density housing. There is nothing creative or sympathetic in allowing development of such density that ones neighbour can be heard sneezing.</p> <p>5. The village does not cope, at the current time, with heavy rainfall. Eriswell Road has no adequate drainage in place and other trouble spots are :- Mill Road at its junction with the High Street; Wings Road; Back Street; Mutford Green at its junction with Station Road; Quayside Court at its junction with Station Road and Highlands. There are no doubt other areas but, with the exception of Back Street, the roads mentioned are the main thoroughfares.</p>		
23489 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	5.1.2 RAF Lakenheath presents a noise constraint, as outlined in paragraph 5.1.2, however sites to the north of the town will be least effect due to their distance from the site.	Response noted	Noise constraints (MOD Soundproofing 70 and 83 db) noted on the constraints map in the document.
<i>Question L1</i>				
23366 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	Yes - Lakenheath has existing services and the potential to offer expanded services to facilitate new residential development, which will be further supported by the planned expansion of operations at RAF Lakenheath.	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23013 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	No, due to lack of potential supply of infrastructure to support growth by way of employment and transport.	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23555 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>Lakenheath could accommodate medium growth.</p> <p>If HRA demonstrates a higher level of growth in Brandon is achievable without adverse impact on the SPA, growth should be redistributed from Lakenheath to Brandon, which is a higher order settlement and should be the centre for growth in the north of the district. Only medium growth could be considered at Lakenheath due to the lack of employment provision.</p> <p>Table 6.3 of the HRA (Screening of housing distributions for potential disturbance to Annex I birds) states that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out for any of the Options at Lakenheath and recommends Appropriate Assessment.</p>	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23034 - R J Rolph [5462]	Comment	<p>How is Lakenheath classed to take large numbers of houses while Newmarket-Mildenhall and Brandon are medium numbers?</p> <p>These three all have numerous shops, good bus services and industrial sites and jobs. Lakenheath has neither of these!!</p> <p>All from Lakenheath will have to travel for work meaning more traffic chaos.</p> <p>Lakenheath had no infrastructure - insufficient sewage system - schools - doctors or shops. We are told infrastructure will come with development but no one can say what this will be.</p> <p>Of the wider issues concerning all where will the hospital capacity come from. dentists GP's &amp; schools??</p>	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP preferred options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a key service centre in line with Policy CS1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23486 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	Additional growth should take place in Lakenheath, as the town has the environmental capacity to ensure high growth as discussed in the Core Strategy review. Paragraph 5.1.4 suggests that the town has the capacity for an additional 2,660 dwellings; however the highest growth scenario proposed currently in the Core Strategy review is 890-985 homes. Therefore, the growth proposed is well within the town's capacity, provided the necessary infrastructure improvements are made. It should be possible to make the infrastructure improvements, as laid out below. Unlike some of the smaller order centres, such as the primary villages, Lakenheath has several pre-existing services that make the town a suitable candidate for growth. The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that the town has a co-op convenience store, a GP surgery, library, post office, bank and several pubs. This means that new residents can meet many of their daily needs / errands within the town, rather than having to drive out of the town. If growth is to proceed, a new primary school is required. There are various potential locations for this school, including a site discussed below, L/28.	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23035 - Mrs Julia Barton [12663]	Comment	I am writing in concern to the amount of housing currently planned for Lakenheath especially the development on the edge of the village towards Hockwold. It is sad that developers are allowed to build outside the village boundary, which in turn means trees, woodland wildlife and farmland will be lost for ever. I know we need houses but please consider infilling within the village, please be sensitive with all the planning applications, our village is a village after all and we want to keep it that way.	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP preferred options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a key service centre in line with Policy CS1
23507 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	Additional growth should take place in Lakenheath. The adopted Core Strategy identifies Lakenheath as a Key Service Centre, a level of settlement which is second in the settlement hierarchy. As such the settlement should be allocated growth commensurate with its status in the hierarchy. Given the constraints to development across the rest of the District sustainable locations for development should receive allocations in the plan period in order to deliver the housing that is needed.	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/03 Land rear of 65, 69, 73 Station Road</i>				
23709 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. The site is in a topographically favourable location near the fen edge and a prehistoric cemetery</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Refused planning permission</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. small site within the settlement boundary</li> <li>. appeal on refusal of 14 dwellings dismissed as overdevelopment.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/06 Land to rear of Chalk Farm and Gatehouse, High Street</i>				
23710 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is within the historic core of Lakenheath as outlined in the county historic environment record</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle links to town facilities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Garden land and potential access issues</li> <li>. Visually important open space in conservation area appraisal</li> <li>. Trees on the northern boundary area protected by a TPO</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22819 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	As the site description notes, the site lies within Lakenheath Conservation Area, forms the curtilage of a listed building and is visually important open space in the conservation area appraisal. Development of this site could have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area and listed building through the loss of this important open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.	Response noted	Omission site * Garden land and potential access issues * Visually important open space in conservation area appraisal * Trees on the northern boundary are protected by a TPO.

**Representations****Nature****Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action***L/07 3 Cemetery Road*

23711 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment

ARCHAEOLOGY

Given past Land-use and previous investigation in the area, for this particular site no requirement. Other sites in the vicinity may be considered of archaeological interest.

EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Existing access onto Cemetery Road would need to be relocated and visibility to meet Manual for Streets. Crossing point over Cemetery Road will be necessary.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

Omission site

- . Not available
- . Garden land with good trees on site
- . Access opposite junction



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/12 Land north of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23712 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Site likely to need two accesses as will be accessed by existing estate road, Cycle links will need to be provided.</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>L/13 Rabbithill Covert, Station Road</i>				
23713 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This site has been subject to adequate archaeological evaluation and there is no need for further work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23316 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2
23509 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	This assessment shows that the northern Lakenheath sites such as L/13 and L/36 are the least constrained available housing sites. They are sustainably located adjacent to the built up area. They are not constrained by flood risk, TPO trees, noise, explosives safeguarding zones or ecology. There are limited sites available within the settlement boundary however these are small and reliance should not be placed on these coming forward unless the landowners demonstrate a willingness to develop the land.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2
<i>L/14 Land off Maids Cross Way</i>				
23318 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Alternative option - rejected:  * Site would only deliver housing and a more appropriate area is available to the north that can deliver more comprehensive development.  * Uncertainty around the SPA frequent nesters buffer.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23714 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle links to town facilities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Alternative option - rejected:</p> <p>* Site would only deliver housing and a more appropriate area is available to the north that can deliver more comprehensive development.</p> <p>* Uncertainty around the SPA frequent nesters buffer.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/15 Land off Covey Way &amp; Maids Cross Hill</i>				
23715 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHEAOLGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Preliminary archaeological evaluation has been undertaken. Further evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is within known sites of multiple periods, including the Lower Palaeolithic site at Maidscross Hill.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Adjacent to SPA frequent nesters buffers, however, this is currently being updated using the most recent data.</li> <li>* The site is 2.2km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 0.9km from RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the location of the site immediately adjacent to Maidscross Hill SSSI and consequential impacts relating to recreational pressure and urban effects.</li> <li>* Some woodland cover and corresponding ecological and landscape value.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Planning application DC/14/2042/OUT for up to 132 dwellings pending decision</p>

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action***L/18 Near Broom Road, off Eriswell Drive*

23716 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment ARCHAEOLOGY

This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.

#### EDUCATION

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

#### TRANSPORT

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle links to town facilities.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

Omission site

\* The site is 2.9km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 0.5km from RAF Lakenheath SAC.

\* The site is outside the Breckland frequent nesters buffers, however, this is currently being updated using the most recent data.

\* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.

\* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)

\* Additional issues relating to the location of the site immediately adjacent to Maidscross Hill SSSI and consequential impacts relating to recreational pressure and urban effects.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/19 Land north-east of South Road</i>				
23717 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Preliminary archaeological evaluation has been undertaken. Further evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Access roads would need to be upgraded (to current standards) if not accessed from adjacent site.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site is 1.6km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and immediately adjacent to and partially within the 200m buffer to RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* The site is outside the Breckland frequent nesters buffers, however, this is currently being updated using the most recent data.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the location of the site immediately adjacent to Maidscross Hill SSSI and consequential impacts relating to recreational pressure and urban effects.</li> <li>* Development would also have the potential to impact on Breckland SAC and the adjacent Caudle Farm and Broom Road Fields CWS</li> <li>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> <li>* Majority of site occupies the inner explosives safeguarding zone</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/22 Land south of Broom Road</i>				
23718 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Preliminary archaeological evaluation has been undertaken. Further evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is within known sites of multiple periods, including the Lower Palaeolithic site at Maidscross Hill.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site is 1.9km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 0.3km from RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* The site is outside the Breckland frequent nesters buffers, however, this is currently being updated using the most recent data.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the location of the site immediately adjacent to Maidscross Hill SSSI and consequential impacts relating to recreational pressure and urban effects.</li> <li>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> </ul> <p>Note: Project level HRA (DC/14/2073/FUL) for this site was not able to screen out LSE.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/25 Land east of Eriswell Road and south of South Road</i>				
23719 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Preliminary archaeological evaluation has been undertaken. Further evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site is 1.3km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and immediately adjacent to, and partially within the 200 buffer to RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* The site is outside the Breckland frequent nesters buffers, however, this is currently being updated using the most recent data.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the location of the site immediately adjacent to Maidscross Hill SSSI and consequential impacts relating to recreational pressure and urban effects.</li> <li>* Development would also have the potential to impact on Breckland SAC and the adjacent Caudle Farm and Broom Road Fields CWS</li> <li>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> <li>* Majority of site occupies the inner explosives safeguarding zone</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/26 Land west of Eriswell Road</i>				
23720 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work to follow on from evaluation already undertaken.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L1</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/27 Land south of Broom Road</i>				
23721 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Preliminary archaeological evaluation has been undertaken. Further evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is within known sites of multiple periods, including the Lower Palaeolithic site at Maidscross Hill.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site is 1.6km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and immediately adjacent to, and partially within the 200 buffer RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* The site is outside the Breckland frequent nesters buffers, however, this is currently being updated using the most recent data.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the location of the site immediately adjacent to Maidscross Hill SSSI and consequential impacts relating to recreational pressure and urban effects. Development would also have the potential to impact on Breckland SAC and on Caudle Farm and Broom Road Fields CWS</li> <li>* MOD noise safeguarding (70 db)</li> <li>* Majority of site occupies the inner explosives safeguarding zone</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/28 Middle Covert, land south of Station Road</i>				
23722 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown). There is potential for earthworks to survive in the wooded area and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Will require footway and cycle links into town facilities and neighbouring estate roads. Trees likely to obstruct visibility splays.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Group tree preservation order</li> <li>* The site is 2.5km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 1.8km from RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the woodland land use and corresponding ecological and landscape value of the north of the site.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23317 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Group tree preservation order * The site is 2.5km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 1.8km from RAF Lakenheath SAC. * Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA. * Additional issues relating to the woodland land use and corresponding ecological and landscape value of the north of the site.
<hr/>				
<i>L/29 Matthews Nursery</i>				
22820 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	As the site description notes, the site lies within Lakenheath Conservation Area and has been subject to a number of planning applications. Development of site could have an impact on the significance of the conservation area depending on the contribution it makes to that significance. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Planning permission F/2010/0338/FUL for A1 retail store and F/2010/0337/OUT for 13 dwellings	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L1
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23723 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is in a topographically favourable location close to the Fen edge.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>L/35 Land off Briscoe Way</i>				
23724 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>The site has been evaluated and there is no requirement for further work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>L/36 North Lakenheath</i>				
23315 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23725 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation identified a plough damaged ring ditch and multi-period features which will require excavation, and further evaluation is required in the first instance.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
23510 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	This assessment shows that the northern Lakenheath sites such as L/13 and L/36 are the least constrained available housing sites. They are sustainably located adjacent to the built up area. They are not constrained by flood risk, TPO trees, noise, explosives safeguarding zones or ecology. There are limited sites available within the settlement boundary however these are small and reliance should not be placed on these coming forward unless the landowners demonstrate a willingness to develop the land.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*L/37 Land north of Cemetery*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23648 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Lakenheath 37, 38 - represent encroachment and may set a precedent for development outside the core in an archaeologically sensitive area</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. This site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, on higher ground overlooking Lakenheath Common Fen. Archaeological finds of all dates are recorded in the area, and there is a roman building to the west.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Unsustainable location poorly related to existing settlement boundary</li> <li>* No means of access to the highway network</li> <li>* The site is 2.3km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 1.5km from RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>* Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>* Additional issues relating to the proximity of the site to Maidscross Hill SSSI LNR.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		modes of travel).  Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle links to town facilities.		
23319 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Unsustainable location poorly related to existing settlement boundary * No means of access to the highway network * The site is 2.3km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 1.5km from RAF Lakenheath SAC. * Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA. * Additional issues relating to the proximity of the site to Mads Cross Hill SSSI LNR.
<i>L/38 Land to north of Maids Cross Hill</i>				
23320 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Unsustainable location poorly related to existing settlement boundary * The site is 2.2km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 1.1km from RAF Lakenheath SAC. * Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA. * Additional issues relating to the proximity of the site to Mads Cross Hill SSSI LNR.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23649 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Lakenheath 37, 38 - represent encroachment and may set a precedent for development outside the core in an archaeologically sensitive area</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. This site lies in an area of high archaeological potential, on higher ground overlooking Lakenheath Common Fen. Archaeological finds of all dates are recorded in the area, and there is a roman building to the west.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unsustainable location poorly related to existing settlement boundary</li> <li>- The site is 2.2km from Breckland Farmland SSSI the nearest component of Breckland SPA and 1.1km from RAF Lakenheath SAC.</li> <li>- Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA.</li> <li>- Additional issues relating to the proximity of the site to Maidscross Hill SSSI LNR.</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Transport Assessment (TA) required Pedestrian and cycle links to existing network necessary.		

---



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*L/39 Land north of Drift Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23726 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy L2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).		
		Transport Assessment (TA) required		
		Site does not link onto an adoptable highway. Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle links to town facilities.		
<hr/>				
<i>Question L2</i>				
23014 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Based on the above the village capacity is in the region of 530 dwelling units.	Response noted	Sites L/26, L/29, and L/35 are included as allocations in Policies L1 and L2.  Sites L/6, L/7, L/14, L/15, L/18, and L/22 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: garden land, within the settlement boundary, protected trees, not being available, being within the inner explosives safeguarding zone, MOD noise safeguarding, SPA, SAC, CWS and SSSI.
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23487 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	<p>L/35 - This site should be developed and currently has a resolution to grant for a development of 67 dwellings, however development has been delayed due to the need to address infrastructure issues with several other sites in Lakenheath and complete a s106 Agreement to meet planning obligations.</p> <p>L/12 - This site lies directly north of L35. If developed, the site would form a natural extension to both Lakenheath and to site L35 and would also be developed by Bennett. Access could therefore be created as L35 is built out, ensuring sufficient capacity on the entrance of L12. It would also be possible to gain access from Sharpes Corner or Station Road to the south west of the site. The Sustainability Appraisal states that the major constraints against development at the site include education, land quality, access to convenience stores and employment sites. These constraints are common to most of the other sites identified. A potential site for a primary school is on the land to the east of the town on L/28, which would resolve this constraint. A convenience store is over 800m away. However if this is considered to be an issue that requires remediating before any development, it would be possible to consider putting a shop in any new development. With regard to land quality, there is an inconsistency across the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Site Allocations Local Plan. The SA lists L/12 as being grade 1 or 2, whilst the Site Allocations Local Plan lists it as grade 3. We can confirm that the site is Grade 3, and therefore the classification in the SA should be amended to an Amber grading. This change reduces the number of major constraints to 3 for this site.</p> <p>L/39 - The site lies to the north of Lakenheath, between L12 and L36. Access to the site could be achieved through the development at L12 or L36. The SA states that the site is not within 1.5km of a conservation area or special protection area and is over 500m from the nearby SSSI, therefore development of the site will not negatively impact environmental or heritage assets in the town. In the Site Allocations document, the site is listed as being at risk of flooding, however the Environment Agency's map suggests that only the very northern most part of the site is designated as flood zone 3. This constraint, therefore, should not preclude any</p>	Response noted	<p>Sites L/12, L/35 and L/39 are included as allocations in Policy L2.</p> <p>Site L/28 is not considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including: SPA, SAC, SSSI, group TPO, and ecological value of the site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>development on the site. Further, mitigation measures could be taken in this northern section of the site to ensure flood risks are minimised. If the site were limited to only the area that does not suffer from flooding then this would reduce the number of constraints for this site to 3 as shown in the diagram above. However, in practice we think that this issue could be overcome by good design and layout concentrating open space provided with the development in that small part of the site which is identified at risk of flooding.</p> <p>The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that the north of Lakenheath has a potential range of between 1,200 and 2,140 homes. Therefore, the allocations at L/35, L/12 and L/39 are within the capacity of the area.</p> <p>L/28 - The site lies to the northeast of the town. The site can be delivered in 2 parts according to the extent of the woodland Tree Preservation Order (TPO), with the southern part not covered by the Order having a capacity of providing 42 dwellings as identified in the Further Issues and Options document. We suggest that given the existence of the TPO the site is subdivided into 2 sites for the purpose of the next Site Allocation document (i.e. L/28a for the Southern part and L/28b for the Northern part).</p> <p>The existence of a woodland Tree Preservation Order is not something that inherently prevents any development, the trees just need to be considered and any losses or replanting should be factored into the planning process. Bennett have obtained specialist advice from Haydens, an arboricultural consultancy firm on their potential plan for a school and housing on the site, and they have shown that a carefully designed and sympathetic scheme could be delivered despite the TPO.</p> <p>A layout plan already provided to the Planning Authority indicates that a further 45 dwellings together with a primary school site of 2.02 ha (5 acres) could be accommodated in the northern part of the site (L/28b) covered by the TPO whilst protecting and retaining the mature and important trees on the site, of which there are relatively few.</p> <p>This potential school site has a number of advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Its immediate availability subject to planning permission</li> <li>* The avoidance of risk, delay and uncertainty in</li> </ul>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>negotiations with landowners and the use of compulsory purchase powers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site is closer to the centre of Lakenheath than alternative sites, yet the school location towards the north would be good to serve the existing, and future needs of that part of the village</li> <li>* The central location of the site (compared to competing sites) will reduce the number of car journeys required to drop off and pick up pupils, and allow pupils to walk to the school.</li> <li>* The favourable location of the site away from the airbase and identified areas of noise constraint.</li> <li>* The school would have direct access off Station Road</li> <li>* The site provides a school site of 2.02 ha (5 acres) sufficient to meet the County's requirement of a site of 5 acres for a school with future expansion potential.</li> <li>* Our client would be prepared to offer the land for the school at no cost to the County</li> </ul> <p>The combined site is adjacent to the settlement boundary and therefore would form a natural continuation of the town. Access to the southern site (L/28a) could be achieved through Barr Drive, with the northern part of the site benefiting from access directly from Station Road. The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan states that it is possible to extend eastwards, accommodating between 640 - 1,120 homes, without impacting the SSSI. Therefore, the allocation is within the capacity of the area. The site is greenfield land but development would not threaten any flora or fauna on site. Bennett have commissioned Phase 1 and Phase 2 Habitat Survey reports and a separate Bird Breeding Survey, and the authors of these reports confirmed there are no insurmountable constraints that would prevent development. The flora on the northern and southern sections of site are common and widespread. The combined sites of L/28a and L/28b should, therefore, be allocated.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23367 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	L/03, L/06, L/07, L/12, L/13, L/14, L/15, L/18, L/19, L/22, L/25, L/26, L/27, L/28, L/29, L/35, L/36, L/37, L/38, L/39 - the NHG does not have any concerns about the suggested development at these sites.	Response noted	Sites L/12, L/13, L/26, L/29, L/35, L/36, and L/39 area allocated in Policies L1 and L2.  Sites L/03, L/06, L/07, L/14, L/15, L/18, L/19, L/22, L/25, L/27, L/28, L/37, and L/38 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: garden land, within the settlement boundary, protected trees, not being available, being within the inner explosives safeguarding zone, MOD noise safeguarding, SPA, SAC, CWS and SSSI.
23508 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	The village of Lakenheath has been identified in local planning policy as appropriate for new housing of the scale proposed. The north of the village is considered the most sustainable location for growth and unlike other areas around Lakenheath lacks any real constraints to development. The L/36 site provides the opportunity for a new much needed primary school, with scope to include a pre-school, and a significant quantity open space that will future proof the needs of the village. The comments on the submitted planning application and the documents supporting the planning application show that all constraints to development can be overcome.	Response noted	Policies L1 and L2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Lakenheath appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23115 - CgMs (Mr Matthew Eyre) [12619]	Support	L26 - Support  This site is in a sustainable edge of settlement location, within a reasonable distance of medical centres and the existing primary school, and is not subject to any specific ecological, landscape or heritage designations.  An appropriate layout and design quality will be able to mitigate the very limited flood risk issue at the NW corner of the site and noise considerations.	Response noted	The site is included as a residential allocation in Policy L1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23118 - CgMs (Mr Matthew Eyre) [12619]	Support	<p>L25 and L27 - Support</p> <p>The planning application documents submitted for these sites has addressed all considerations and demonstrated they can be delivered with appropriate mitigations, other than the location of the blast zone around the airbase grounds.</p> <p>As a result, SHLAA reference ER/04 Land at Little Eriswell has been submitted as a viable alternative to these sites to meet the housing need within the district.</p>	Response noted	Both sites L/25 and L/27 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: being within the inner explosives safeguarding zone, MOD noise safeguarding, SPA, SAC, CWS and SSSI.
<hr/>				
<i>Question L3</i>				
23015 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Explanation as to why sites should not be allocated.	Response noted	<p>Sites L12 &amp; L13, L36 and L39 are included as allocations in Policy L2.</p> <p>Sites L3,L28, L37 &amp; L38 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: within the settlement boundary, group TPO, unsustainable location, SPA, SAC, and SSSI.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23511 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	<p>We consider that the land to the north of Lakenheath is the best located, and most sustainable land for housing in Lakenheath because it has the fewest constraints to development. The sites around the south east of Lakenheath are particularly constrained. This area is close to the Maidscross SSSI and County Wildlife Site, and the buffers around Stone Curlew nesting areas. The proximity of the sites to the Maidscross SSSI makes it difficult to prevent the residents of large housing developments from using the area for recreation. Small developments would have less impact. Ecology constraints affect sites L/25, L/19, L/27, L/22, L/18, L15 and L/38.</p> <p>1.2 As shown on the Forest Heath District Council "key Planning Constraints" plan for Lakenheath Noise from RAF Lakenheath affects sites L/18, L/22, L/27, L/19, and L/25.</p> <p>1.3 Sites L25/ L/19 and L/27 are affected by an explosives safeguarding zone.</p> <p>1.4 Sites L/38 and L/37 are too remote from the built up area to be worthy of consideration for housing.</p> <p>1.5 Site L/28 is affected by trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).</p> <p>1.6 Land to the west of Lakenheath if affected by flood risk, falling in Environment Agency Flood Zones 2 and 3. Area around Lakenheath which are outside flood zones should therefore be the preferred locations for development.</p> <p>1.7 This assessment shows that the northern Lakenheath sites such as L/13 and L/36 are the least constrained available housing sites. They are sustainably located adjacent to the built up area. They are not constrained by flood risk, TPO trees, noise, explosives safeguarding zones or ecology. There are limited sites available within the settlement boundary however these are small and reliance should not be placed on these coming forward unless the landowners demonstrate a willingness to develop the land.</p>	Response noted	L/13 and L/36 are included as allocations in Policy L2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23488 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	<p>Site L/15 suffers from 6 major constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Site L/27 suffers from 8 major constraints including the fact that the majority of the site lies within the MOD explosives safeguarding zone.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Site L/22 suffers from 5 major constraints.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Site L/26 suffers from 8 major constraints.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Site L/19 suffers from 8 major constraints including the fact that it occupies the MOD explosives safeguarding zone.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Site L/25 suffers from 11 major constraints including the fact that the majority of the site lies within the MOD explosives safeguarding zone.</li> </ul>	Response noted	<p>Site L/26 is included as an allocation in Policy L2.</p> <p>Sites L/15, L/19, L/22, L/25, L/26 and L/27 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: MOD noise safeguarding, SPA, SAC, CWS and SSSI and ecological value.</p>
23290 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L/19; L/22; L/25 and L/27 border part of the Breckland Special Area of Conservation (SAC); RAF Lakenheath SSSI and Maids Cross Hill SSSI and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). It should be ensured that any development allocated at these sites does not result in a likely significant effect on the designated sites, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects. The sites also incorporates Caudle Farm and Broom Road Fields CWS, which includes one of the largest known populations of grape hyacinth (<i>Muscarin neglectum</i>) (a UK/Suffolk Priority species) outside of a statutorily designated site. It should be ensured that any development allocated at these sites does not result in an adverse impact on the CWS or the species for which it is designated. It should be noted that the boundary of the CWS is currently under review to incorporate a further area which supports grape hyacinth.</p> <p>We believe that the following site should not be allocated until the ecological value has been fully assessed, any allocation should take account of this value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* L/15 - this site is adjacent to Maids Cross Hill SSSI and contains a mosaic of habitats and therefore requires further assessment of its ecological value.</li> <li>* L/28 - this appears to be a largely wooded site, there is very little woodland habitat in this area and therefore further assessment of its ecological value is required prior to any allocation.</li> </ul>	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	<p>None of these sites (L/15, L/19, L/22, L/25, L/27 and L/28) are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: MOD noise safeguarding, SPA, SAC, CWS and SSSI, and ecological value.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question L4</i>				
23016 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422] 23116 - CgMs (Mr Matthew Eyre) [12619]	Support		Response noted	No new sites have been considered as a result of the consultation.
<i>Question RL1</i>				
23299 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	Crest Nicholson consider that significant additional growth should indeed take place at Red Lodge, as a very important component of the spatial strategy for Forest Heath District, reconsideration of which was forced by the outcome of the High Court challenge in 2011. The provision of appropriate levels of infrastructure is axiomatic. The justification for the "very high" growth options for Red Lodge is set out in the separate response to the Single Issue Review.	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23355 - Five Villages Preservation Trust (Dr Allan Marchington) [5854]	Comment	<p>We do not support very high growth in this location. This is not a sustainable option for growth. It relies on the majority of development being placed in one rural location, void of services, infrastructure and employment opportunities.</p> <p>The land is owned by one land owner leaving the district exposed to the possibility that they would not be able to maintain the 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>This village has undergone massive housing development and the infrastructure has always been lacking.</p> <p>The infrastructure is once again at capacity with a second school already needed and no site available.</p> <p>Opportunities for "holistic" growth were available when growth at Red Lodge was previously promoted as an opportunity for the regeneration of the village. The end result was very far from "holistic" growth. The village has since often been referred to as an example of poor planning.</p> <p>Red Lodge requires time to absorb the current levels of growth before commencing further development in this location. The failing infrastructure needs upgrading and the sewerage issues in this location need addressing and resolving.</p>	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways, water supply and waste water disposal are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23516 - Gamham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>It is vital that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. Red Lodge is classified as a Key Service Centre in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. Key Service Centres are second only to Market Towns in the Settlement Hierarchy and can therefore readily accommodate a fairly high level of growth. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that in Red Lodge 'land will be allocated for a minimum of 800 dwellings on brownfield or mixed brownfield/ greenfield sites the majority of which are to be built after 2021' and 'land will be allocated in the form of greenfield urban extensions for 400 dwellings from 2021-2031;' Therefore it is clear that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. It is also clear that the 2021 figure is somewhat unrealistic with sites such as this being able to be brought forward in the short term i.e. 2016-17</p> <p>It is recognised that the additional growth will need supportive infrastructure improvements. Although there has been great improvements to the services and facilities in Red Lodge, such as the growth of the primary school, the completion of the Millennium Centre, sports pavilion, courts, pitches and allotments, play areas, primary school, convenience shops, post office, pharmacy, café, public house, takeaways, and a dental and doctors surgery; an additional expansion of circa 1,200 homes will require infrastructure improvements. The infrastructure improvements required will include the further expansion of the primary school, and doctor's surgery, transport infrastructure improvements and retail growth, all of which can be secured through planning obligations or the Community Infrastructure Levy, on sites such as Land to the south of the Carrops.</p>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23017 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Red Lodge has already grown to capacity. There is still a serious issue regarding the removal of foul waste from Red Lodge to Tuddenham. The problems for the residents appears to be ignored . Until this is resolved in the least no further development should be considered.	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including water supply and waste water disposal are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>
23531 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Comment	Red Lodge is a commuter town and the traffic generated from the current development here has a damaging impact on the surrounding villages. It is unable to support any additional housing over and above the approved current levels. The road network is unable to safely absorb an extra 2,170 houses, the public transport network is substandard making residents dependant upon private car use, there are no pedestrian links to the rail network and an infrequent service is offered from Kennett station. The station car park is regularly full and a gridlock situation develops, threatening users' safety. Residents and Parish Councils are not convinced that the current drainage network can support any further development in this location as sewerage issues continue to be a problem and have not been satisfactorily resolved despite assurances from AWA. Educational provision is also a major concern as the existing primary school is at capacity. Although 2 sites have been identified for a second school, but one is considered too expensive and the other would be located on the business park with a loss of employment opportunities.	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways, water supply and waste water disposal are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23583 - Rural Parish Alliance (Mr Bill Rampling) [12706]	Comment	<p>This rural village (Red Lodge) has faced massive growth in recent years. This has often been held up as a poor example of planning policy and execution.</p> <p>We do not support additional growth at this location, we do not believe the infrastructure is available to support it or that there are appropriate employment opportunities.</p> <p>We believe this village needs the opportunity to address the issues created through the over expansion of the village before embarking on further large scale development.</p>	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways, water supply and waste water disposal are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>
23512 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>It is vital that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. Red Lodge is classified as a Key Service Centre in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. Key Service Centres are second only to Market Towns in the Settlement Hierarchy and can therefore accommodate a fairly high level of growth. Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that in Red Lodge 'land will be allocated for a minimum of 800 dwellings on brownfield or mixed brownfield/ greenfield sites the majority of which are to be built after 2021' and 'land will be allocated in the form of greenfield urban extensions for 400 dwellings from 2021-2031;' Therefore it is clear that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. It is also clear that sites such as this could come forward sooner than 2021, not only assisting the Council is housing delivery but also reducing pressure for greenfield or less sustainable sites to come forward.</p>	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23514 - Mr Bill Gaskin [12703]	Comment	<p>It is vital that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. Red Lodge is classified as a Key Service Centre in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. Key Service Centres are second only to Market Towns in the Settlement Hierarchy and can therefore accommodate a fairly high level of growth.</p> <p>3.4 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that in Red Lodge 'land will be allocated for a minimum of 800 dwellings on brownfield or mixed brownfield/ greenfield sites the majority of which are to be built after 2021' and 'land will be allocated in the form of greenfield urban extensions for 400 dwellings from 2021-2031;' Therefore it is clear that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. It is also clear that the 2021 figure is somewhat unrealistic with sites such as this being able to be brought forward in the short term i.e. 2016-17.</p> <p>3.5 It is recognised that the additional growth will need supportive infrastructure improvements. Although there has been great improvement to the services and facilities in Red Lodge, such as the growth of the primary school, the completion of the Millennium Centre, sports pavilion, courts, pitches and allotments, play areas, primary school, convenience shops, post office, pharmacy, public house, takeaways, and a dental and doctors surgery; an additional expansion of circa 1,200 homes will require infrastructure improvements. The infrastructure improvements required will include the further expansion of the primary school, and Doctor's Surgery, transport infrastructure improvements and retail growth, all of which can be secured through planning obligations or the Community Infrastructure Levy on sites such as Coopers Yard and Café.</p>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23604 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	<p>The Core Strategy identifies that the highest proportion of new development should be directed to the districts 3 market towns.</p> <p>1 New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership for Norfolk and Suffolk</p> <p>Sequential development, development located in and around the market towns, is supported through national planning policy and by Herringswell Parish Council. It is a core principle feature of sustainable development given the range of existing services and facilities to be found in the market towns.</p> <p>Red Lodge was identified as a key service centre in the Core Strategy although it was acknowledged the planned school and village centre needed to be completed before it could fulfill that function. Whilst they have since been delivered, it should be noted that the village is already in need of a second primary school.</p> <p>In addition the existing primary school has entered into special measures. A government inspector concluded that funding issues and rising pupil numbers were hampering the schools efforts to improve. The inspector reported that; "the school is growing rapidly and leaders are over-whelmed with funding issues, building works and significant increases in pupil numbers". "these are getting in the way and reducing their capacity to concentrate on the schools most important agenda- improving the quality of teaching to raise pupils achievement".</p> <p>The document claims 2 sites have been chosen for a second school, but one is considered too expensive and the other is to be provided on the business park with a loss of employment opportunities. No consultation has taken place for these 2 site options with either the current school, residents, parents or parish councils.</p> <p>Red Lodge is unable to support any additional development over and above the approved current levels. The road network is unable to safely absorb an additional 2170 houses, the public transport network is substandard making residents dependant upon private car use, there are no pedestrian links to the rail network and an infrequent service is offered from Kennett station. The station car park is regularly full and a gridlock situation develops, threatening users safety.</p>	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways, water supply and waste water disposal are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

The sewerage issue has been raised by residents, Parish Councils, District Councillors, County Councillor and our MP, on many many occasions and despite reassurances by Anglian Water (AW), residents in Red Lodge and Herringswell are far from convinced the infrastructure exists to support ANY further development in this location, using the current drainage network.

We note the reference to the Hyder report referred to in the draft infrastructure delivery plan to 2031, which claims the recent capacity improvements undertaken by AW at Tuddenham Waste water recycling centre are sufficient to accommodate proposed development at Red Lodge.

The report however;

1. Failed to provide any details of the volume for the pumping station at Herringswell
2. Failed to provide the flow levels passing through the system
3. Failed to provide the pump motor types and performance characteristics of the equipment.
4. Failed to account for flows generated by an additional branch of the system from Herringswell Manor and was even unaware of its existence.
5. Failed to approach local residents to understand their issues or invite comments from any of the affected parties.
6. Relied on estimated population figures
7. Relied on estimated wastewater flows.

In short, all the report could accurately inform the council of was that the sewerage is received at the Tuddenham wastewater-recycling centre, but it was still unable to inform the council or residents why problems are experienced along the way.

In addition it should be noted that the 2 previous studies prepared by Hyder had both supported an embargo on development until after 2021.

Any improvements carried out by AW have gone unnoticed by residents who remain plagued by flooding of their gardens and the horrendous stench frequently given off by the pumping station.

A report prepared to evaluate the findings of the Hyder report and presented to a meeting at Herringswell Parish Council is attached.

The number of houses at Red Lodge has long since out stripped the employment opportunities. Red Lodge

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>is a commuter village and this should be addressed ahead of any discussions to increase the housing stock levels in this location. The option to place a second school on land designated as employment land should be strongly resisted. SCC have known for several years that a second school site was required and did nothing with land owners to negotiate alternative sites until their backs were to the wall. Land owners have now grasped at a situation to profit from their mis management and the price of land suitable for locating a school site on has gone through the roof. This however is not a reason to consider building on employment land.</p> <p>Herringswell Parish Council support the use of brownfield sites within the current development boundary at Red Lodge.</p> <p>We note site RL/06 has been split into RL/06a and RL/06b. the document has only provided a potential capacity figure for both these sites as 374 houses, but site RL/06a already has planning approval for 371 houses. Therefore the combined potential for this site is greater than the stated 374.</p> <p>We do not support the inclusion of site RL/07 White Star Stud as this is outside the development envelope for Red Lodge and therefore into open countryside. This is in the Parish of Herringswell, where the Core Strategy restricts development. In addition this site is also protected with the equine policies and falls within the 1500m stone curlew nesting zone.</p> <p>We do not support site RL/12 as this is outside the development envelope for Red Lodge and therefore into open countryside. This is in the Parish of Herringswell, where the Core Strategy restricts development. In addition this site is also protected with 1500m stone curlew special protection area and 1500m stone curlew nesting zone.</p> <p>Site RL13 would be an alternative site for the school, but require investment by the County Council to manage noise levels from the A11. We understand this is possible, but the CC are currently resisting that level of investment. This would also offer a school site that is not as close in proximity to the existing school.</p> <p>Site RL/15. We strongly OBJECT to this site. This lies outside the settlement boundary for Red Lodge in open countryside. It would result in the loss of good</p>		

---

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

---

agricultural land and lead to a massive over development of one part of our district. We followed a plan lead approach to development at Red Lodge for the most recent 1200 housing development. This has however been held up by planners, developers, residents and councils across the country as an example of how not to develop a village. We believe this village should be allowed the time to grow into its present housing numbers before facing more massive over development.

Sites RL/16, RL20 and RL/21 should be retained for employment use and should not be considered for an additional school site as this could lead to further tensions within the village where it is already believed all the services have been given to the "new side" of Red Lodge. We would not support this land for residential use as employment opportunities v are extremely limited in the village.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23519 - Gamham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>It is vital that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. Red Lodge is classified as a Key Service Centre in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy. Key Service Centres are second only to Market Towns in the Settlement Hierarchy and can therefore accommodate a fairly high level of growth.</p> <p>3.4 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that in Red Lodge 'land will be allocated for a minimum of 800 dwellings on brownfield or mixed brownfield/ greenfield sites the majority of which are to be built after 2021' and 'land will be allocated in the form of greenfield urban extensions for 400 dwellings from 2021-2031;' Therefore it is clear that additional growth should take place in Red Lodge. It is also clear that the 2021 figure is somewhat unrealistic with sites such as this being able to be brought forward in the short term i.e. 2016-17.</p> <p>3.5 It is recognised that the additional growth will need supportive infrastructure improvements. Although there has been great improvement to the services and facilities in Red Lodge, such as the growth of the primary school, the completion of the Millennium Centre, sports pavilion, courts, pitches and allotments, play areas, primary school, convenience shops, post office, pharmacy, public house, takeaways, and a dental and doctors surgery; an additional expansion of circa 1,200 homes will require infrastructure improvements. The infrastructure improvements required will include the further expansion of the primary school, and Doctor's Surgery, transport infrastructure improvements and retail growth, all of which can be secured through planning obligations or the Community Infrastructure Levy on sites such as Coopers Yard and Café.</p>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23556 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>Red Lodge could accommodate medium to high growth.</p> <p>HRA Table 6.3 (HRA Screening of housing distributions for potential water quality and waste water discharge effects) states that spare capacity at Tuddenham WwTW can accommodate at least 1,000 additional homes in its catchment which covers Tuddenham, Red Lodge and Herringswell. No allocations are made to Tuddenham or Herringswell in the SIR but Options 2 and 3 both provide for up to 2,170 homes at Red Lodge. In the absence of upgrades, there is therefore the potential for likely significant effects on European sites which are hydrologically connected to the Tuddenham WwTW. Therefore, Options 2 and 3 (very high growth) for Red Lodge require significant upgrades to the Tuddenham WwTW. It is not clear at this stage if this is achievable and this could cause delays in delivery early in the plan period. Therefore, only Options 1 (medium) and 4 (high growth) should be considered.</p> <p>Table 6.3 of the HRA (Screening of housing distributions for potential disturbance to Annex I birds) states that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out for any of the Options at Red Lodge and recommends Appropriate Assessment.</p>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23295 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner consider that significant additional growth should indeed take place at Red Lodge, as a very important component of the spatial strategy for Forest Heath District, reconsideration of which was forced by the outcome of the High Court challenge in 2011. The provision of appropriate levels of infrastructure is axiomatic.</p> <p>The justification for the "very high" growth options for Red Lodge is set out in the separate response to the Single Issue Review.</p>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23282 - Jaynic Investments LLP [12521]	Comment	<p>Additional growth must take place in sustainable locations, with sites need to be 'suitable', 'achievable' and 'deliverable'.</p> <p>Additional growth may well take place where additional infrastructure improvements are required, but in the first instance sustainable locations should be considered. Red Lodge is one such sustainable location.</p> <p>As detailed within our representations in respect of the Single Issue Review (SIR) of Core Strategy Policy CS7 - Further Issues and Options, Jaynic Investments LLP and Boyer consider that Red Lodge can accommodate a significant proportion of Forest Heath's required housing growth over the plan period. In this respect, it is noted that Options 2 and 3 of the SIR proposes an allocation of between 1,970 - 2,170 dwellings in Red Lodge over the plan period. We would support this housing requirement for Red Lodge.</p> <p>As previously highlighted, it is not considered that growth within Brandon and Newmarket would be 'achievable' due to the high number of environmental constraints associated with these 'Market Towns'. These include environmental considerations, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Flood Zones 2 and 3, as well as the influence of the Horse Racing Industry which we consider may prohibit major development within Newmarket.</p> <p>It is felt that Red Lodge can accommodate a significant expansion to the village and it is noted that the 'Site Allocations Local Plan - Further Issues and Options' highlights a potential 7,166 dwellings within the village, from land identified within the SHLAA. Whilst it is considered that a proportion of these dwellings will not be 'achievable' or 'deliverable', it is considered that there are a large number of 'available', 'achievable' and 'deliverable' sites within Red Lodge which could assist in meeting the Council's Housing Requirements. Many of these, such as the site detailed at Question RL2, are available now and could make an immediate contribution to the Council's Housing Supply.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is considered that Red Lodge is a sustainable 'Key Service Centre' which features a range of services to accommodate an increased Housing Supply (subject to any additional infrastructure being required and funded as a result of</p>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>increased growth). These include:            Shops - Happy Kids Costumes, Turnpike Road;            Rhodabourne, Turnpike Lane; MJs Café &amp; Bar, Mill Street; Claudette Couture, Foxglove Close; Red Lodge Village Centre, including NISA Convenience Store, a pharmacy, lettings agency, Mediterranean restaurant, fish and chip take away and cafe/bistro            Public Houses/Restaurants - Red Lodge Inn, Turnpike Road; Red Lodge Steakhouse and Bar, Turnpike Road; Red Lodge Transport Café, Turnpike Road            Schools - St. Christopher's CEVCP School, Bellflower Crescent; Greenhays Nursery School, Green Lane; Jumpin' Beans Pre School, based at Millennium Centre; Bluebell Childcare, Heath Farm Road            Doctors - Reynard Surgery, Turnpike Road            Dentists - Red Lodge Dental Surgery, Boundary Road            Community Uses - Red Lodge Millennium Centre, Lavender Close; Allotments            Public Open Space - Red Lodge Sports Club &amp; Pavilion, Hundred Acre Way;            Public Transport - Red Lodge served by bus routes 16, 16A and 16B, running between Newmarket - Red Lodge - Mildenhall - Bury St Edmunds, 7 days a week            Overall it is clear that Red Lodge is a sustainable location which can accommodate an increased level of housing development. Furthermore, the accompanying 'Key Constraints Map' demonstrates that there are many areas within Red Lodge, both brownfield and greenfield sites, which would appear to be relatively unconstrained and thus available and achievable for new development. This is highlighted on the 'Opportunities and Constraints' plan attached as Appendix 2.</p>		
23368 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	Yes - The NHG considers that the Council should build upon the existing investment in Red Lodge and expand the new community.	Response noted	<p>Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways, water supply and waste water disposal are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22576 - Mr Chris Davison [12565]	Object	There is simply not the investment there that would be required to cope with sustainable growth!	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
		<i>Consider alternatives to Red Lodge. Newmarket, Mildenhall both have significant transport infrastructure &amp; are better able to cope with growth.</i>		
22909 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Support	Yes, Red Lodge is an evolving settlement and is capable of supporting additional residential and infrastructure growth. It is a highly sustainable location for such development.	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
<i>All sites allocations map</i>				
22586 - Freckenham Parish Council (Mr Lawrence Barton) [12574]	Object	Impact on Freckenham and Worlington  Development on the Freckenham side of the A11 (West) will increase Elms Road Traffic to Freckenham and surrounding villages  Elms Road, Freckenham is unsuitable for current traffic volumes let alone any increase and it terminates at the double "S" bend of which have had accidents where Air Ambulances have been involved.  Comments on the Red Lodge Development  Infrastructure including school facilities does not have sufficient capacity for the existing housing level. Whilst there are plans to build a second school we are concerned that it is still insufficient  <i>There is better potential to grow in the larger towns in the district.</i>  <i>The growth to these towns equates to a smaller percentage increase to that community.</i>	Response noted	Red Lodge is a Key Service Centre, and Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.  Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/01 Land to rear 2-4 Elms Road and 6-8 Turnpike Road</i>				
23727 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Omission site Multiple ownership
23842 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>This site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable. The fact that it also has a number of existing beneficial uses should rule it out from further consideration.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23856 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>This site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable. The fact that it also has a number of existing beneficial uses should rule it out from further consideration.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	.	
<i>RL/02 Land to rear 14-16 Turnpike Road</i>				
23728 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>Multiple ownership</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23843 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	Again, this site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - multiple ownership
23857 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	Again, this site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - multiple ownership
<i>RL/03 Land off Turnpike Road Phase 2 (Red Lodge masterplan)</i>				
22910 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Comment	It is noted that site RL/03 is an allocated site despite being in closer proximity to the SSSI than site RL/07 which is currently deferred with its proximity to the SSSI being noted as one of the grounds for this deferral. If the assessment is to be comparable, either the proximity to the SSSI should result in the deferral of site RL/03 as with site RL/07 or this ground for deferral should be removed from the assessment of site RL/07.	Response noted. Ensure consistency of approach for 'deferral'/elimination of sites at the later stage(s). Multiple ownership issues - but reasonable prospect of development	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1
23858 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	The fact that pre-application discussions have taken place is noted, but the site's multiple ownership casts doubt on its availability and deliverability.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1
23844 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	The fact that pre-application discussions have taken place is noted, but the site's multiple ownership casts doubt on its availability and deliverability.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23729 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination of archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Will require improved cycling and pedestrian routes. A formal crossing point across Turnpike Road will be necessary to gain access to the school and shops.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/04 Coopers Yard and Café</i>				
23845 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	The fact that this is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary is outweighed by the stated disadvantages. The fact of multiple ownership and absence of any known interest in development casts serious doubts about the site's availability and deliverability, however suitable it might be. In addition, any loss of employment land should ideally be compensated for by equivalent provision elsewhere.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1
22911 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Comment	It is noted that site RL/04 is an allocated site despite being in closer proximity to the SSSI than site RL/07 which is currently deferred with its proximity to the SSSI being noted as one of the grounds for this deferral. If the assessment is to be comparable, either the proximity to the SSSI should result in the deferral of site RL/04 as with site RL/07 or this ground for deferral should be removed from the assessment of site RL/07.	Response noted. Ensure consistency of approach for 'deferral'/elimination of sites at the later stage(s). Multiple ownership and in use as haulage depot and transport café	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23730 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1
23859 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>The fact that this is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary is outweighed by the stated disadvantages. The fact of multiple ownership and absence of any known interest in development casts serious doubts about the site's availability and deliverability, however suitable it might be. In addition, any loss of employment land should ideally be compensated for by equivalent provision elsewhere.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23521 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Support	<p>Site RL/04 Coopers Yard and Café should be allocated as a site for residential development. The site is a brownfield site and therefore redevelopment of the site would accord with both local and national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)'.</p> <p>3.7 The Core Strategy states that 'there is a lack of brownfield capacity meaning a large proportion of land allocations will be greenfield.' Therefore site RL/04 presents a rare opportunity to develop a suitable brownfield within the District and should therefore be allocated. The brownfield nature of this site has been seen as a positive endorsement of the sites development credentials in both the Issues and Options document and the SHLAA.</p> <p>3.8 The Issues and Options document states that the site is capable of accommodating a residential development size of 57 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It is recognised that landscaping will be required on the boundaries of the site and a development of this scale is likely to require children play facilities.</p> <p>3.9 The pros (positives) of the site that have been listed are that it is a brownfield site and that it is within the settlement boundary. The constraints of the site that have been listed are that it is in multiple ownership, will result in the loss of employment land and there is no known interest in development. As stated previously the site is wholly in the ownership of the Garnham Properties, with the exception of the bungalow marked in green in the figure 3 below. Therefore it is questionable whether the site is in multiple-ownership and could be developed with or without the inclusion of the bungalow. In addition, this bungalow does not restrict access to the site.</p> <p>The site owner, Garnham Properties is now interested in putting the site forward for development. Residential development of the site would not result in the loss of an employment site as Turner Transport lease the site and following the conclusion of the lease will relocate to alternative premises. The café also provides limited employment and its loss will be off-set by the employment opportunities that the population increase</p>	Response noted	Part of site in proposed site allocation Policy RL1



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		will bring to Red Lodge. Furthermore, it can be argued that the current use of the site as a haulage yard is wholly inappropriate given the surrounding residential uses of the site. Therefore, the site should be allocated for residential development.		
<i>RL/05 Land adjoining public house, Turnpike Road and Turnpike Lane</i>				
23846 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	The consultation document states that the site is identified as open space in the Red Lodge Masterplan. Whatever its advantages for development, its status as open space means that in our opinion it should be ruled out from any further consideration unless alternative provision within Red Lodge can be provided.	Response noted	Omission site - multiple ownership
		It is considered that this site should not be allocated.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23731 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Another formal crossing point adjacent to this and the previous site may be required to gain access to school and shops etc.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Omission site Multiple ownership
23860 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>The consultation document states that the site is identified as open space in the Red Lodge Masterplan. Whatever its advantages for development, its status as open space means that in our opinion it should be ruled out from any further consideration.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted	Omission site - multiple ownership

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land east of Red Lodge</i>				
23732 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Evaluation has identified a barrow and other features on the site which will require excavation.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application submitted for first phase. There is a need for an emergency access to the north and good sustainable links. Contributions to traffic calming in neighbouring affected villages also required.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL1</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23855 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>Crest Nicholson seek the allocation for housing of the site RL/06 (a) and (b) Land adjoining Twins Belt, land east of Red Lodge. The current planning status of the site is noted from the description in the consultation document, with a resolution to approve a development of 374 dwellings and for A1 retail development (reference F/2013/0257/HYB) subject to a legal agreement. The decision has yet to be issued and for this reason Crest Nicholson seek the allocation of RL06 (a) for housing. Further information about the site, proposed development and associated infrastructure requirements are available in planning application submission documents.</p> <p>Land to the north identified as RL/06 (b) is also available and deliverable housing site for which an allocation is sought. It has a potential capacity of 161 dwellings based on a site area of 5.37ha and a density of 30 dph.</p> <p>The location of the site within the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew is acknowledged.</p> <p>However, in this case, the ecological assessment that was undertaken by Aspect Ecology as part of the current planning application considered the impact of development on RL/06 in its entirety. As part of this assessment a Habitats Regulations Assessment was undertaken and Habitat Restoration Management Plan prepared and agreed with Natural England for Site RL/06 as a whole. The mitigation measures required for developing site RL/06 have to be implemented.</p> <p>In contrast, the need for such mitigation measures can now be avoided altogether by the appropriate choice of other sites being put forward for development for the first time; in other words, it does not justify the allocation of any other fresh sites to which these measures would have to be applied.</p> <p>It is also noted that the site lies within the settlement boundary, and extends the built up area of Red Lodge to a very limited extent in relation to its capacity. It therefore represents a suitable rounding off of Red Lodge in this easterly direction.</p> <p>The consultation document has identified no other constraints which would hinder the completion of development in this part of the settlement. This is confirmed by the information contained in planning</p>	Response noted.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL1.

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
23605 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	We note site RL/06 has been split into RL/06a and RL/06b. the document has only provided a potential capacity figure for both these sites as 374 houses, but site RL/06a already has planning approval for 371 houses. Therefore the combined potential for this site is greater than the stated 374.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL1

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23836 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly catogorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a)</p>	Response noted.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.</p> <p>The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.</p> <p>This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.</p> <p>The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.</p> <p>Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.</p> <p>The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		
23410 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Comment	This allocation offers the opportunity to extend the existing sports facilities which lie to the west and north of the application site. Sport England would support this allocation if it incorporated an extension to the existing community sports facilities.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL1



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/07 The White Star Stables, Warren Road</i>				
23733 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved. Green Lane will require permission and upgrading in conjunction with rights of way. Footway and cycleway provision required.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* Equine policy constraints</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23861 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	The stated advantage, that the site adjoins the existing settlement boundary, weighs very little in the site's favour. In contrast, we consider that any one of the stated disadvantages should be sufficient to exclude this site from any further consideration; together, they weigh very heavily against the site.  It is concluded that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted.	Omission site - SPA - Equine policy constraints.
23847 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	The stated advantage, that the site adjoins the existing settlement boundary, weighs very little in the site's favour. In contrast, we consider that any one of the stated disadvantages should be sufficient to exclude this site from any further consideration; together, they weigh very heavily against the site.  It is concluded that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted.	Omission site - SPA - Equine policy constraints.
23606 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Object	We do not support the inclusion of site RL/07 White Star Stud as this is outside the development envelope for Red Lodge and therefore into open countryside. This is in the Parish of Herringswell, where the Core Strategy restricts development. In addition this site is also protected with the equine policies and falls within the 1500m stone curlew nesting zone.	Response noted	Omission site  * SPA * Equine policy constraints
22765 - Ms Sarah Chaney [12545]	Object	Large impact on environment effecting wildlife and the stone curlew. Not within the settlement boundary. Access to the site would mean Warren Road would become dangerous. Road already busy with large volumes of traffic.  <i>There are no changes that could make this application worth considering</i>	Response noted Check with highways	Omission site  * SPA * Equine policy constraints
23003 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Support	Please see attached document and indicative plan.	Response noted	Omission site  * SPA * Equine policy constraints

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/08 Land to rear 4 to 14b Turnpike Lane</i>				
23848 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>It is not clear from the consultation document how much of the site lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. The site therefore does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 100 to 103. Since there are alternatives to accommodate the nominal capacity of the site of 98 dwellings, the Sequential Test is not passed and the Exception Test does not apply. The aerial photograph in the consultation document does make clear however the extent of mature tree cover. In combination with the flood risk constraint, this renders the site unsuitable for development. In addition, the description of the site refers to matters which could also be regarded as constraints: since part of this site consists of domestic gardens, there may well be problems arising from multiple ownership for site assembly, and the presence of an industrial unit may lead to an issue of relocation.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Established woodland on the south of the site</li> <li>- Part of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3</li> <li>- Multiple ownership</li> <li>- Within settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of site came forward for development.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23734 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is topographically favourable for early occupation and there is potential for peat deposits to survive.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Established woodland on the south of the site</li> <li>* Part of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3</li> <li>* Multiple ownership</li> <li>* Within settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of site came forward for development</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Access will be closely located to the current speed limit change from 30mph to derestricted. Cycle and pedestrian provision to include a crossing point across Turnpike Road. This site will require traffic calming features (e.g. gateways, buff bands and/or other road markings) due to the proximity of the speed limit change.</p>		
23862 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>It is not clear from the consultation document how much of the site lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. The site therefore does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 100 to 103. Since there are alternatives to accommodate the nominal capacity of the site of 98 dwellings, the Sequential Test is not passed and the Exception Test does not apply. The aerial photograph in the consultation document does makes clear however the extent of mature tree cover. In combination with the flood risk constraint, this renders the site unsuitable for development. In addition, the description of the site refers to matters which could also be regarded as constraints: since part of this site consists of domestic gardens, there may well be problems arising from multiple ownership for site assembly, and the presence of an industrial unit may lead to an issue of relocation.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Established woodland on the south of the site</li> <li>- Part of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3</li> <li>- Multiple ownership</li> <li>- Within settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of site came forward for development.</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*RL/09 Land at Greenhays Farm*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23735 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>MINERALS AND WASTE</p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RL/09, RL/18 and RL/19 are very close to a waste transfer station (access within Suffolk, main site within Cambridgeshire). The relationship to that existing use would need to be considered.</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>know fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA buffer</p> <p>* Within settlement boundary</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>		
23863 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>The fact that even a small part of the site lies with in the 1500 metre buffer zone the nesting of stone curlew strongly indicates that allocation of the site should be avoided. This is reinforced by the presence of an existing beneficial use in the form of the day nursery.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer</li> <li>_Within settlement boundary</li> </ul>
23849 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The fact that even a small part of the site lies with in the 1500 metre buffer zone the nesting of stone curlew strongly indicates that allocation of the site should be avoided. This is reinforced by the presence of an existing beneficial use in the form of the day nursery.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer</li> <li>- Within settlement boundary</li> </ul>
22768 - Ms Sarah Chaney [12545]	Object	<p>Loss of nursery to village for development is of concern.</p> <p>Large detrimental impact on wildlife</p> <p><i>Nursery would require establishing elsewhere as part of the plan</i></p>	Response noted. Infrastructure requirements to be considered within the context of the emerging IDP.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer</li> <li>* Within settlement boundary</li> </ul>



**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action*****RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren***

23736 - Suffolk County Council  
(Mr James Cutting) [11903]

Comment ARCHAEOLOGY

No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.

**EDUCATION**

The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.

PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT

**TRANSPORT**

The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).

Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.

The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.

Omission site

- \* Small site surrounded by roads
- \* Within settlement boundary
- \* Below size threshold for allocation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23837 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly catogorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a)</p>	Response noted.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small site surrounded by roads</li> <li>- Within settlement boundary</li> <li>- Below size threshold for allocation.</li> </ul>

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.

The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.

This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.

The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.

Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.

The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>RL/11 Land east of Turnpike Road</i>				
23850 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>There may be some threats to the quality of the SSSI arising from its proximity to the lorry park forming the other half of the site, and the area of open space identified as Site RL/05. This would however not in any way justify its development for housing; the site's partial status as an SSSI should be regarded as an absolute and overriding constraint.</p> <p>It is therefore concluded that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted.	Omission site - SSSI
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23737 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision. Thought should be given to the relocation of lorry parking.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Omission site * SSSI
23864 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>There may be some threats to the quality of the SSSI arising from its proximity to the lorry park forming the other half of the site, and the area of open space identified as Site RL/05. This would however not in any way justify its development for housing; the site's partial status as an SSSI should be regarded as an absolute and overriding constraint.</p> <p>It is therefore concluded that this site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted.	Omission site - SSSI

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/12 Land east of Warren Road</i>				
23851 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	This site is a contained and natural southern extension to Red Lodge where the stated SPA disadvantage is capable of mitigation with land within the same ownership.  It is considered that this site could be allocated.	Response noted.	Omission site - SPA - Site physically and visually separated from the settlement by strong landscape belt.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23738 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>In addition to access and sustainable travel, this site likely to require dwellings to front the road and, therefore, traffic calming measures are likely to be necessary.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* SPA</p> <p>* Site physically and visually separated from the settlement by strong landscape belt.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23607 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Object	We do not support site RL/12 as this is outside the development envelope for Red Lodge and therefore into open countryside. This is in the Parish of Herringswell, where the Core Strategy restricts development. In addition this site is also protected with 1500m stone curlew special protection area and 1500m stone curlew nesting zone.	Response noted	Omission site * SPA * Site physically and visually separated from the settlement by strong landscape belt.
<i>RL/13 Land west of Newmarket Road</i>				
23865 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	The site is already designated for employment use, and indeed is considered ideal for that purpose given its prominent and accessible location adjacent to the A11. That very proximity renders it unsuitable, for reasons of noise, for residential development.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted.	Proposed employment site allocation Policy EM1
23608 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	Site RL13 would be an alternative site for the school, but require investment by the County Council to manage noise levels from the A11. We understand this is possible, but the CC are currently resisting that level of investment. This would also offer a school site that is not as close in proximity to the existing school.	Response noted	Proposed employment site allocation Policy EM1
23852 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	The site is already designated for employment use, and indeed is considered ideal for that purpose given its prominent and accessible location adjacent to the A11 but any loss of employment land should be compensated for by equivalent provision elsewhere. Replacing lost employment land should be a precondition to this site allocation.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted.	Proposed employment site allocation Policy EM1



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23739 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>In addition to access and sustainable travel, another formal crossing point adjacent this site may be required to gain access to school and shops etc</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed employment site allocation Policy EM1

RL/15 Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/15 Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23838 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly catogorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a)</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of RL2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.</p> <p>The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.</p> <p>This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.</p> <p>The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.</p> <p>Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.</p> <p>The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		
23461 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Mr J Bercovici) [5059]	Comment	<p>RL/15 This site should be deferred. We do not believe that further major development at Red Lodge is appropriate at this time. The A11 forms a natural barrier and if development took place west of the A11, this would effectively be creating another new community. There is potential for coalescence between Barton Mills and Red Lodge.</p>	Response noted. SSSI impact zone, HSE major hazard pipeline	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2
22821 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	<p>This site includes a scheduled bowl barrow on the north-east edge adjoining the A11 (this is not mentioned in the site description). While there is potential for development, the significance of the scheduled monument should be understood and conserved, with an adequate buffer. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.</p>	Response noted. Consider ref. as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset.	Response noted. SSSI impact zone, HSE major hazard pipeline

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23638 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Red Lodge 15 - this site includes known prehistoric funerary monuments. There may be risks in allocating such a large area without evaluation. See notes advising evaluation prior to allocation.</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination of archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. This large site has not been previously systematically surveyed, apart from the areas of Worlington Quarry. There is a group of five prehistoric burial monuments recorded in the NE part of the site, one of which is a Scheduled Monument (31091). A further tumulus is recorded within the allocation. It has high potential for large areas of archaeological landscape.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>MINERALS AND WASTE</p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RL/15 A large part of the site is within Worlington Quarry, which has planning permission for sand and</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		gravel extraction and infilling with inert waste.		
		<b>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</b>		
		The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.		
		<b>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</b>		
		know pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process		
		<b>TRANSPORT</b>		
		The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).		
		Transport Assessment (TA) required		
		Will require substantial highway and sustainable travel mitigation measures including for surrounding villages, The roundabout with the A11 will need to be modelled for capacity.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22587 - Freckenham Parish Council (Mr Lawrence Barton) [12574]	Object	<p>Impact on Freckenham and Worlington</p> <p>Development on the Freckenham side of the A11 (West) will increase Elms Road Traffic to Freckenham and surrounding villages</p> <p>Elms Road, Freckenham is unsuitable for current traffic volumes let alone any increase and it terminates at the double "S" bend of which have had accidents where Air Ambulances have been involved.</p> <p>Comments on the Red Lodge Development</p> <p>Infrastructure including school facilities does not have sufficient capacity for the existing housing level. Whilst there are plans to build a second school we are concerned that it is still insufficient</p> <p><i>There is better potential to grow in the larger towns in the district.</i></p> <p><i>The growth to these towns equates to a smaller percentage increase to that community.</i></p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2
23609 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Object	<p>Site RL/15. We strongly OBJECT to this site. This lies outside the settlement boundary for Red Lodge in open countryside. It would result in the loss of good agricultural land and lead to a massive over development of one part of our district. We followed a plan lead approach to development at Red Lodge for the most recent 1200 housing development. This has however been held up by planners, developers, residents and councils across the country as an example of how not to develop a village. We believe this village should be allowed the time to grow into its present housing numbers before facing more massive over development.</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23273 - Worlington Parish Council (Councillor Rupert Osborn) [12690]	Object	Any development to the West of the A11 (RL15) on the site map will be completely unacceptable to Worlington residents due to the massive traffic congestion this would cause in our village and those in the immediate vicinity such as Freckenham and Barton Mills. Further development creeping towards Worlington will dramatically affect the character of the village in both appearance and our environment will never recover. Worlington would become a 'suburb' of an ever-expanding Red Lodge. In addition, there would be unacceptable loss of agricultural land and disturbance of SSSI and Stone Curlew habitat. This proposal must be dismissed immediately.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/16 Employment land north of Hundred Acre Way</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23839 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly catogorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a)</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of RL2

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.

The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.

This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.

The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.

Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.

The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		
23610 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	Sites RL/16, RL20 and RL/21 should be retained for employment use and should not be considered for an additional school site as this could lead to further tensions within the village where it is already believed all the services have been given to the "new side" of Red Lodge. We would not support this land for residential use as employment opportunities v are extremely limited in the village.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23740 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/18 Land south of the Carrops</i>				
23866 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	It is difficult to see how 41 dwellings could be accommodated on this site, or even how residential development could satisfactorily take place at all. Its awkward shape, and the fact that some of it lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, are sufficient to exclude it from any further consideration.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - Flood Zones 2 and 3 - records of protected species in the area - visually sensitive site on the edge of the settlement within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of the site came forward for development

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23741 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>MINERALS AND WASTE</p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <p>□ RL/09, RL/18 and RL/19 are very close to a waste transfer station (access within Suffolk, main site within Cambridgeshire). The relationship to that existing use would need to be considered.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Site likely to require frontage onto Turnpike Road and access off the adopted highway. Traffic calming will</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Flood zones 2 and 3</li> <li>* Records of protected species in the area</li> <li>* Visually sensitive site on the edge of the settlement within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of site came forward for development</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		be necessary due the location of the speed limit change. Cycle and pedestrian provision into existing network and crossing point across the carrops to link into existing facilities.		
23853 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	It is difficult to see how 41 dwellings could be accommodated on this site, or even how residential development could satisfactorily take place at all. Its awkward shape, and the fact that some of it lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, are sufficient to exclude it from any further consideration.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - Flood Zones 2 and 3 - records of protected species in the area - visually sensitive site on the edge of the settlement within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of the site came forward for development

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23518 - Gamham Properties [12702]	Support	<p>RL18 The site is largely a brownfield site and therefore redevelopment of the site would accord with both local and national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)'. The Core Strategy states that 'there is a lack of brownfield capacity meaning a large proportion of land allocations will be greenfield.' Therefore site RL/18 presents a rare opportunity to develop a suitable brownfield site within the District and should therefore be allocated. The brownfield nature of the site is seen as a positive endorsement of the sites suitability in the Issues and Options consultation document.</p> <p>The Issues and Options document states that the site is capable of accommodating a residential development size of 41 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It is recognised that the need to provide a landscaped buffer between the scrapyard and the residential development and the restriction of development in the flood plain will reduce the net developable area. It is noted that there is reference to the relocation of the scrapyard. However, if it is relocated this will further enhance the development credentials of this site.</p> <p>The 'pros' of the site that have been listed include the fact that it is within the settlement boundary and that it is a brownfield site. The constraints of the site that have been listed are that part of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, there are records of protected species on the site, it is a visually sensitive site on entrance to the settlement and it is better suited to a lower density (below the allocation threshold).</p> <p>As previously stated it is proposed that the areas of the site that are in Flood Zone 2 and 3 would be left undeveloped and be utilised for both public and incidental open space. This will not only reduce the impact that flooding would have on any development of the site but also create an attractive foreground from the site when approaching from the north-west.</p> <p>It is noted that there are records of protected species</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Flood zones 2 and 3</li> <li>* Records of protected species in the area</li> <li>* Visually sensitive site on the edge of the settlement within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of site came forward for development</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>within the area rather than on the site. As part of the preliminary works associated with this site a detailed Ecological Survey will be undertaken to establish the ecological value on the site; if protected species are found on the site, then appropriate mitigation will need to be incorporated into the development scheme or offset utilising other land interests in the control of the site owner.</p>		
		<p>The visual sensitivity of the site on an entrance to the settlement could be overcome through an extensive landscaping scheme that would also lessen the impact that development would have on the countryside. It has been established that the site constraints will result in site density that is lower than the allocation threshold of 30 dwellings per hectare. However, this should not be a reason to exclude the site from allocation in the local plan. The site represents a rare opportunity to develop a brownfield site, within a settlement boundary, which will result in significant environmental improvements and should therefore be allocated despite the development density being below that prescribed by the Local Plan allocation. In addition, the use of an arbitrary density threshold is questionable as each site should be considered on its merits looking at the benefits which could arise from its development.</p>		
		<p>Therefore it is clear that although the site does have constraints, these can be easily mitigated and therefore the site should be allocated as a development site in the Forest Heath Local Plan.</p>		

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/19 Land south of Green Lane</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23742 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>MINERALS AND WASTE</p> <p>The following identified sites may have an impact on waste disposal or mineral extraction, and would need to be considered in light of Suffolk County Council's adopted Minerals and Waste Plans.</p> <p>□ RL/09, RL/18 and RL/19 are very close to a waste transfer station (access within Suffolk, main site within Cambridgeshire). The relationship to that existing use would need to be considered.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Uncertain how site will be accessed; there are</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Loss of employment land (designated in Red Lodge masterplan)</p> <p>* SSSI impact risk zone</p> <p>* Health and Safety Executive major hazard pipeline.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		restrictions on Green Lane. If access issues can be overcome, visibility and sustainable links will be needed.		
23867 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	Once again, the fact that the site lies within the settlement boundary is outweighed by three separate identified disadvantages relating to nature conservation. These are enough in our opinion to make the site unsuitable for development in a situation where sufficient land can be found to meet housing requirements which is not constrained in this way.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - loss of employment land (designated in Red Lodge Masterplan) - SSSI impact risk zone - Health and Safety Executive major hazard pipeline
23854 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	Once again, the fact that the site lies within the settlement boundary is outweighed by three separate identified disadvantages relating to nature conservation. These are sufficient in our opinion to make the site unsuitable for development in a situation where sufficient land can be found to meet housing requirements which is not constrained in this way.  It is considered that this site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - loss of employment land (designated in Red Lodge Masterplan) - SSSI impact risk zone - Health and Safety Executive major hazard pipeline
22886 - Ms Helen Thompson [12645]	Object	This is close to SSI which is near to the Stone Curlew nesting area. Building here would inevitably have a devastating effect on their breeding. Along with this the land is also ideal for the feeding and habitat for hedgehogs which if we don't aim to protect could be extinct within the next ten years.  <i>I am unable to support any development on this site now or in the future.</i>	Response noted. SSSI impact zone	Omission site  * Loss of employment land (designated in Red Lodge masterplan) * SSSI impact risk zone * Health and Safety Executive major hazard pipeline.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22770 - Ms Sarah Chaney [12545]	Object	<p>Large impact on environment affecting wildlife and the stone curlew.</p> <p>Loss of hedgerows and the loss of large volumes of trees would impact on not only the stone curlew but all the other small wildlife that is essential to our environment.</p> <p>Site also adjacent to the SSSI.</p> <p>Access to the site would mean Warren Road and the Carrops would become dangerous. Warren Road already busy with large volumes of traffic.</p> <p><i>There are no changes that could make this site an option as any further development in this area would result in a detrimental effect on wildlife</i></p>	Response noted. Check with Suffolk CC Highways. SSSI impact zone	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Loss of employment land (designated in Red Lodge masterplan)</p> <p>* SSSI impact risk zone</p> <p>* Health and Safety Executive major hazard pipeline.</p>
<i>RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road</i>				
23611 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	<p>Sites RL/16, RL20 and RL/21 should be retained for employment use and should not be considered for an additional school site as this could lead to further tensions within the village where it is already believed all the services have been given to the "new side" of Red Lodge. We would not support this land for residential use as employment opportunities v are extremely limited in the village.</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23743 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23840 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly catogorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a)</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

**Representations****Nature****Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.

The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.

This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.

The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.

Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.

The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>RL/21 Land north-east of Bilberry Close</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23841 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly catogorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a)</p>	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.</p> <p>The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.</p> <p>This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.</p> <p>The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.</p> <p>Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.</p> <p>The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		
23612 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	Sites RL/16, RL20 and RL/21 should be retained for employment use and should not be considered for an additional school site as this could lead to further tensions within the village where it is already believed all the services have been given to the "new side" of Red Lodge. We would not support this land for residential use as employment opportunities v are extremely limited in the village.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23744 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy RL2
<hr/>				
<i>Question RL2</i>				
22887 - Ms Helen Thompson [12645]	Comment	RL/05 and RL/04	Response noted	<p>RL/04 is included in Policy RL1 for residential development.</p> <p>RL/05 is not considered suitable for development as it is designated as open space in the Red Lodge Masterplan.</p>



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22771 - Ms Sarah Chaney [12545]	Comment	RI/05, RL04, RL03. These sites would have less impact on the environment	Response noted	RL/03 and RL/04 are included in Policy RL1 for residential development. RL/05 is not considered suitable for development as it is designated as open space in the Red Lodge Masterplan.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23300 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>Crest Nicholson seek the allocation for housing of the site RL/06 (a) and (b) Land adjoining Twins Belt, land east of Red Lodge. The current planning status of the site is noted from the description in the consultation document, with a resolution to approve a development of 374 dwellings and for A1 retail development (reference F/2013/0257/HYB) subject to a legal agreement. The decision has yet to be issued and for this reason Crest Nicholson seek the allocation of RL06 (a) for housing. Further information about the site, proposed development and associated infrastructure requirements are available in planning application submission documents.</p> <p>Land to the north identified as RL/06 (b) is also available and deliverable housing site for which an allocation is sought. It has a potential capacity of 161 dwellings based on a site area of 5.37ha and a density of 30 dph.</p> <p>The location of the site within the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew is acknowledged.</p> <p>However, in this case, the ecological assessment that was undertaken by Aspect Ecology as part of the current planning application considered the impact of development on RL/06 in its entirety. As part of this assessment a Habitats Regulations Assessment was undertaken and Habitat Restoration Management Plan prepared and agreed with Natural England for Site RL/06 as a whole. The mitigation measures required for developing site RL/06 have to be implemented.</p> <p>In contrast, the need for such mitigation measures can now be avoided altogether by the appropriate choice of other sites being put forward for development for the first time; in other words, it does not justify the allocation of any other fresh sites to which these measures would have to be applied.</p> <p>It is also noted that the site lies within the settlement boundary, and extends the built up area of Red Lodge to a very limited extent in relation to its capacity. It therefore represents a suitable rounding off of Red Lodge in this easterly direction.</p> <p>The consultation document has identified no other constraints which would hinder the completion of development in this part of the settlement. This is confirmed by the information contained in planning</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- these comments will inform further assessment of these sites.</p>	<p>Both parts of site RL/6 are included in Policy RL1 as allocations for residential development.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23369 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	RL/01, RL/02, RL/03, RL/04, RL/05, RL/06 a and b, RL/08, RL/09, RL/10, RL/11, RL/12, RL/13, RL/15, RL/16, RL/18, RL/19, RL/20, RL/21 - the NHG does not have any concerns about the suggested development at these sites.	Response noted	<p>Sites RL/03, RL/04, RL/06 a and b, and part of sites RL/15, RL/16, RL/20, RL/21 are included in Policies RL1 and RL2 for residential and mixed use development.</p> <p>Site RL/13 is allocated for B1 and B2 employment uses in Policy EM1 of the SALP Preferred Options document.</p> <p>Sites RL/01, RL/02, RL/05, RL/08, RL/09, RL/10, RL/11, RL/12, RL/18, and RL/19 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: multiple ownership, flood zones, woodland, within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if coming forward for development, SPA buffer, protected species, visually sensitive site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23296 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner consider that significant additional growth should indeed take place at Red Lodge, as a very important component of the spatial strategy for Forest Heath District, reconsideration of which was forced by the outcome of the High Court challenge in 2011. The provision of appropriate levels of infrastructure is axiomatic.</p> <p>The justification for the "very high" growth options for Red Lodge is set out in the separate response to the Single Issue Review.</p> <p>Question RL2: Which of the sites in Red Lodge do you feel should be allocated?</p> <p>The Landowner seek a mixed use residential and employment allocation of part of a revised Site RL/15 "Land north and east of Red Lodge, either side of A11" and the very northern tip of RL/16 "Employment Land North of Hundred Acre Way " that sits to the north of the existing Kings Warren Business Park, in order to create and maintain an appropriate balance between housing and employment in this already fast growing community.</p> <p>The total area of RL/15 depicted and described in the consultation document is indeed very extensive, and could in theory accommodate about 70% of the requirement for the whole District set out in Option 2 (the higher of the two) for total housing provision in the Single Issue Review (SIR).</p> <p>This is clearly not appropriate at this time, but it is equally clear that large land allocations will be needed at Red Lodge to accommodate the "very high" levels of development entailed in Options 2 and 3 of the SIR for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>To that end, The Landowner seeks the allocation of between a quarter and a third of the originally proposed RL/15 site, on both sides of the A11. This includes the areas closest to and adjoining the existing settlement and the northern most tip of RL/16 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(a)) and an area in close proximity to the Red Lodge junction with the A11 (hereafter referred to as RL/15(b)).</p> <p>This amended area is depicted on the attached 1:12,500 drawing dated 1 October 2015.</p> <p>Site RL/15(a) as proposed covers circa 19.8ha. It is estimated that approximately one third of the site would be available for employment uses, including storage and distribution uses with the remainder for</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- these comments (see detailed response) will inform further assessment of these sites.</p>	<p>Sites RL/06, RL/15, RL/16, RL/20 and RL/21 are allocated for residential or mixed uses in Policies RL1 and RL2 of the SALP Preferred Options document.</p> <p>RL/10 is not allocated as it is a small site surrounded by road, it is in the settlement boundary, and below the size threshold for allocation.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>residential, estimated to be in the order of 366 dwellings, and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Site RL/15(b) as proposed extends to 56.75ha. Its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.</p> <p>Under the heading "Cons", the consultation document incorrectly categorises the land as Grade 3 agricultural. The Eastern region 1:250,000 series Agricultural Land Classification grade both RL/15 (a) and (b) as grade 4, a conclusion substantiated by Reading Agricultural Consultants in 2004 in support of the mineral allocation covering the majority of RL/15(b) and which will be reclaimed land on completion of the mineral extraction.</p> <p>The area now sought as an allocation would avoid the third and fourth identified disadvantages as it would lie outside the 1500 metre buffer zone for stone curlew, and outside the SSSI impact risk zone. Whilst a major gas pipeline identified by the HSE does cross the site this can be addressed at the planning application stage with the careful disposition of development on the site to avoid any risks associated with the pipeline. It is therefore concluded that RL/15 (a) and (b) have no significant drawbacks or constraints.</p> <p>This smaller revised area for RL/15 would make a major contribution to meeting the "very high" options for development at Red Lodge, necessary to meet a total requirement of 7,700 dwellings the District as a whole in the Plan period, to avoid excessive levels of development in the more constrained settlements, and necessary to build a thriving and more self-sufficient community at Red Lodge.</p> <p>The Landowner also seek a housing allocation for sites RL/10 Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren, RL/20 Land north of Elderberry Road, and RL/21 Land north of Elderberry Road. These are much smaller sites but are all available, suitable and deliverable and between them would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements in appropriate locations.</p> <p>Agreement has been reached between the landowners and Suffolk County Council over the sale</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>of part of RL/16 the land that sits between Sites RL/20 and RL/21 for two form entry primary school for which there is a known identified need. Residential development on RL/20 would enable the funding of associated highway infrastructure necessary to serve the school and ensure the school adjoins a compatible use.</p> <p>The consultation document identifies no constraints so severe for these sites that could not be overcome. In particular, in respect of part of RL/16, the school site, RL/20 and part of RL/21, the loss of the employment designation can be compensated for with the replacement of employment land within RL/15(a). It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross Site RL/20 (nor RL/16) as stated in the "Cons" for this site as set out in the consultation document. It is also appropriate to mention here, rather than in response to Question RL3, that The Landowner do not consider Site RL/16 is appropriate for residential development, but has noted the school site and regards the southern part of RL/16 (as shown on the attached Areas Site plan drawing no.1668, prepared by barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 1 October 2015) as suitable for a supermarket to serve the growing population and further enhance the range of local amenities available in Red Lodge. It should be noted that the HSE major hazard pipeline does not cross site RL/16 as stated in the `cons` for this site.</p> <p>Finally, The Landowner supports the allocation of Site RL/06 Land adjoining Twins Belt, land East of Red Lodge, on which Crest Nicholson have sought planning permission for residential development with retail (A1) use and open space.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23520 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>Site RL/04 Coopers Yard and Café should be allocated as a site for residential development. The site is a brownfield site and therefore redevelopment of the site would accord with both local and national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)'.</p> <p>3.7 The Core Strategy states that 'there is a lack of brownfield capacity meaning a large proportion of land allocations will be greenfield.' Therefore site RL/04 presents a rare opportunity to develop a suitable brownfield within the District and should therefore be allocated. The brownfield nature of this site has been seen as a positive endorsement of the sites development credentials in both the Issues and Options document and the SHLAA.</p> <p>3.8 The Issues and Options document states that the site is capable of accommodating a residential development size of 57 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It is recognised that landscaping will be required on the boundaries of the site and a development of this scale is likely to require children play facilities.</p> <p>3.9 The pros (positives) of the site that have been listed are that it is a brownfield site and that it is within the settlement boundary. The constraints of the site that have been listed are that it is in multiple ownership, will result in the loss of employment land and there is no known interest in development. As stated previously the site is wholly in the ownership of the Garnham Properties, with the exception of the bungalow marked in green in the figure 3 below. Therefore it is questionable whether the site is in multiple-ownership and could be developed with or without the inclusion of the bungalow. In addition, this bungalow does not restrict access to the site.</p> <p>The site owner, Garnham Properties is now interested in putting the site forward for development. Residential development of the site would not result in the loss of an employment site as Turner Transport lease the site and following the conclusion of the lease will relocate to alternative premises. The café also provides limited employment and its loss will be off-set by the employment opportunities that the population increase</p>	Response noted	This area is allocated for residential development as it is included as parts of RL/03 and RL/04 in Policy RL1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		will bring to Red Lodge. Furthermore, it can be argued that the current use of the site as a haulage yard is wholly inappropriate given the surrounding residential uses of the site. Therefore, the site should be allocated for residential development.		
23283 - Jaynic Investments LLP [12521]	Comment	RL/13 is supported for residential development.	Response noted	Site RL/13 is allocated for B1 and B2 employment uses in Policy EM1 of the SALP Preferred Options document.
23515 - Mr Bill Gaskin [12703]	Comment	Land at and adjoining Willoway Mobile Home Park, west of Turnpike Road, Red Lodge, Suffolk' should be allocated as a site for residential development. The site is predominantly a brownfield site, located within the existing settlement framework and redevelopment of the site would accord with both local and national planning policies. The landowner recognizes the importance of the existing caravan park and proposes to consolidate this at the rear part of the site.	Response noted	This area is allocated for residential development as it is included as parts of RL/03 and RL/04 in Policy RL1.
23513 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	Site RL/11 Land to the east of Turnpike Road should be allocated as a site for residential development. The site is largely a brownfield site and therefore redevelopment of the site would accord with both local and national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)'. The Core Strategy states that 'there is a lack of brownfield capacity meaning a large proportion of land allocations will be greenfield.' Unlike the proposed allocation in the Issues and Options document, the land owner proposes that the development should simply take place on the lorry parking area, whilst preserving the wooded area. Therefore site RL/11 presents a rare opportunity to develop a suitable brownfield within the District and should therefore be allocated. The brownfield nature of the site is seen as a positive endorsement of the sites suitability in the Issues and Options consultation document.	Response noted	RL/11 is not considered suitable for development as it is a SSSI.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23517 - Gamham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>RL18 The site is largely a brownfield site and therefore redevelopment of the site would accord with both local and national planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 'planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)'. The Core Strategy states that 'there is a lack of brownfield capacity meaning a large proportion of land allocations will be greenfield.' Therefore site RL/18 presents a rare opportunity to develop a suitable brownfield site within the District and should therefore be allocated. The brownfield nature of the site is seen as a positive endorsement of the sites suitability in the Issues and Options consultation document.</p> <p>The Issues and Options document states that the site is capable of accommodating a residential development size of 41 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. It is recognised that the need to provide a landscaped buffer between the scrapyard and the residential development and the restriction of development in the flood plain will reduce the net developable area. It is noted that there is reference to the relocation of the scrapyard. However, if it is relocated this will further enhance the development credentials of this site.</p> <p>The 'pros' of the site that have been listed include the fact that it is within the settlement boundary and that it is a brownfield site. The constraints of the site that have been listed are that part of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, there are records of protected species on the site, it is a visually sensitive site on entrance to the settlement and it is better suited to a lower density (below the allocation threshold).</p> <p>As previously stated it is proposed that the areas of the site that are in Flood Zone 2 and 3 would be left undeveloped and be utilised for both public and incidental open space. This will not only reduce the impact that flooding would have on any development of the site but also create an attractive foreground from the site when approaching from the north-west.</p> <p>It is noted that there are records of protected species</p>	Response noted	RL/18 is not considered suitable for development as it is in flood zones 2 and 3, there are records of protected species in the area, and it is a visually sensitive site on the edge of the settlement. It is within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of the site came forward for development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>within the area rather than on the site. As part of the preliminary works associated with this site a detailed Ecological Survey will be undertaken to establish the ecological value on the site; if protected species are found on the site, then appropriate mitigation will need to be incorporated into the development scheme or offset utilising other land interests in the control of the site owner.</p> <p>The visual sensitivity of the site on an entrance to the settlement could be overcome through an extensive landscaping scheme that would also lessen the impact that development would have on the countryside. It has been established that the site constraints will result in site density that is lower than the allocation threshold of 30 dwellings per hectare. However, this should not be a reason to exclude the site from allocation in the local plan. The site represents a rare opportunity to develop a brownfield site, within a settlement boundary, which will result in significant environmental improvements and should therefore be allocated despite the development density being below that prescribed by the Local Plan allocation. In addition, the use of an arbitrary density threshold is questionable as each site should be considered on its merits looking at the benefits which could arise from its development.</p> <p>Therefore it is clear that although the site does have constraints, these can be easily mitigated and therefore the site should be allocated as a development site in the Forest Heath Local Plan.</p>		

*Question RL3*

23370 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	RL/07 - the NHG objects to the loss of an existing horse-racing facility.	Response noted	RL/07 is not considered suitable for development as it is in the SPA and is subject to equine policy constraints.
--	---------	---	----------------	---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22772 - Ms Sarah Chaney [12545]	Comment	RL/09, RL19, RL07 not to be developed due to the impact on the environment and wildlife	Response noted	None of these sites are considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including: being within the SPA buffer, subject to equine policy, within the settlement boundary, would lead to the loss of employment land, and/or within the SSSI impact zone.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23301 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	<p>Before individual sites are considered, the general point needs to be made that there are sufficient opportunities to accommodate the "very high" levels of growth referred to in the SIR without resort to any land which is subject to constraints relating to nature conservation, other than at RL/06. In the case of RL/06, the current planning application considers the impact of the development on the Breckland SPA, the findings of which have been discussed and agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Site: RL/01 Land to rear 2-4 Elms Road and 6-8 Turnpike Road</p> <p>This site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable. The fact that it also has a number of existing beneficial uses should rule it out from further consideration. It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/02 Land to rear 14-16 Turnpike Road</p> <p>Again, this site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/03 Land off Turnpike Road Phase 2 (Red Lodge masterplan)</p> <p>The fact that pre-application discussions have taken place is noted, but the site's multiple ownership casts doubt on its availability and deliverability. It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/04 Coopers Yard and Café</p> <p>The fact that this is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary is outweighed by the stated disadvantages. The fact of multiple ownership and absence of any known interest in development casts serious doubts about the site's availability and deliverability, however suitable it might be. In addition, any loss of employment land should ideally be compensated for by equivalent provision elsewhere. It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/05 Land adjoining public house, Turnpike Road and Turnpike Lane</p> <p>The consultation document states that the site is identified as open space in the Red Lodge</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- these comments will inform further assessment of these sites.</p>	<p>Sites RL/03, RL/04, are allocated for residential development in Policy RL1.</p> <p>Site RL/13 is allocated for B1 and B2 employment uses in Policy EM1 of the SALP Preferred Options document.</p> <p>Sites RL/01, RL/02, RL/05, RL/07, RL/08, RL/09, RL/11, RL/18, and RL/19 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: multiple ownership, designated as open space, SPA, equine policy, part of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3, is within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of the site came forward for development, protected species in the area, visually sensitive site.</p>

**Representations****Nature****Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action**

Masterplan. Whatever its advantages for development, its status as open space means that in our opinion it should be ruled out from any further consideration.

It is considered that this site should not be allocated.

Site RL/07 The White Star Stables, Warren Road

The stated advantage, that the site adjoins the existing settlement boundary, weighs very little in the site's favour. In contrast, we consider that any one of the stated disadvantages should be sufficient to exclude this site from any further consideration; together, they weigh very heavily against the site.

It is concluded that this site should not be allocated.

Site RL/08 Land to rear 4 to 14b Turnpike Lane

It is not clear from the consultation document how much of the site lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3.

The site therefore does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 100 to 103. Since there are alternatives to accommodate the nominal capacity of the site of 98 dwellings, the Sequential Test is not passed and the Exception Test does not apply.

The aerial photograph in the consultation document does make clear however the extent of mature tree cover. In combination with the flood risk constraint, this renders the site unsuitable for development.

In addition, the description of the site refers to matters which could also be regarded as constraints: since part of this site consists of domestic gardens, there may well be problems arising from multiple ownership for site assembly, and the presence of an industrial unit may lead to an issue of relocation.

It is considered that this site should not be allocated.

Site RL/09 Land at Greenhays Farm

The fact that even a small part of the site lies within the 1500 metre buffer zone the nesting of stone curlew strongly indicates that allocation of the site should be avoided. This is reinforced by the presence of an existing beneficial use in the form of the day nursery.

For these reasons, it is considered that this site should not be allocated.

Site RL/11 Land east of Turnpike Road

There may be some threats to the quality of the SSSI arising from its proximity to the lorry park forming the other half of the site, and the area of open space identified as Site RL/05. This would however not in

***Representations******Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan******Council's Assessment******Action***

any way justify its development for housing; the site's partial status as an SSSI should be regarded as an absolute and overriding constraint.

It is therefore concluded that this site should not be allocated.

Site RL/13 Land west of Newmarket Road

The site is already designated for employment use, and indeed is considered ideal for that purpose given its prominent and accessible location adjacent to the A11. That very proximity renders it unsuitable, for reasons of noise, for residential development.

It is considered that this site should not be allocated.

Site: RL/18 Land south of the Carrops

It is difficult to see how 41 dwellings could be accommodated on this site, or even how residential development could satisfactorily take place at all. Its awkward shape, and the fact that some of it lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, are sufficient to exclude it from any further consideration.

It is considered that this site should not be allocated.

Site: RL/19 Land south of Green Lane

Once again, the fact that the site lies within the settlement boundary is outweighed by three separate identified disadvantages relating to nature conservation. These are enough in our opinion to make the site unsuitable for development in a situation where sufficient land can be found to meet housing requirements which is not constrained in this way.

It is considered that this site should not be allocated.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23284 - Jaynic Investments LLP [12521]	Comment	<p>Jaynic Investments LLP are supportive of the need for Red Lodge to accommodate a certain level of housing development in order for Forest Heath to meet its housing requirements (between 1,970 and 2,170 dwellings). However, it is considered that a number of the Options listed within the Site Allocations Local Plan - Further Issues and Options report, are not going to be either, 'deliverable' or 'developable'. These sites, and a summary of their constraints, are listed below. It is considered that these sites have constraints which are likely to be more difficult and time-consuming to overcome and address than RL/13 Land West of Newmarket Road.</p> <p>RL/02 Land to Rear 14-16 Turnpike Road - No expression of interest in development</p> <p>RL/04 Coopers Yard and Café - Existing employment site in use; No expression of interest in development</p> <p>RL/05 Land adjoining Public House, Turnpike Road and Turnpike Lane - Loss of Public Open Space</p> <p>RL/07 The White Star Stables, Warren Road - Special protection area stone curlew nesting zone buffer; Site of special scientific interest impact risk zone; Loss of an existing equine use/stud</p> <p>RL/09 Land at Greenhays Farm - Special Protection Area; Loss of existing day nursery when there is a demand for additional day nursery provision within Red Lodge t</p> <p>RL/11 Land east of Turnpike Road - Impact on Site of Special Scientific Interest</p> <p>RL/12 Land east of Warren Road - Special Protection Area; Visually separated from settlement by landscape boundary</p> <p>RL/18 Land south of The Carrops - Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3; Protected Species; Visually sensitive site</p> <p>RL/19 Land south of Green Lane - Special protection stone curlew nesting constraint zone; Site of special scientific interest impact risk zone; Protected species; Former landfill site</p> <p>RL/21 Land north-east of Bilberry Close - Site of special scientific interest impact risk zone; Protected species</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- this assessment will inform further assessment of these sites.</p>	<p>Sites RL/04, RL/06 and RL/21 are included in Policies RL1 and RL2 for residential and mixed use development.</p> <p>Sites RL/02, RL/05, RL/07, RL/09, RL/11, RL/12, RL/18, and RL/19 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: multiple ownership, flood zones, woodland, within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if coming forward for development, SPA buffer, protected species, visually sensitive site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22888 - Ms Helen Thompson [12645]	Comment	RL/19 , RL/09 and RL/07 Developing the sites above would have a detrimental impact on the wildlife in the area	Response noted	None of these sites are considered suitable for development for a number of reasons including: being within the SPA buffer, subject to equine policy, within the settlement boundary, would lead to the loss of employment land, and/or within the SSSI impact zone.
23291 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	We believe that the following site should not be allocated until the ecological value has been fully assessed, any allocation should take account of this value: * RL/08 - this site is adjacent to the River Kennett which is known to support otters. The ecological value of the site should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development. * RL/15 - this site includes the Worlington Chalk Pit CWS, any development allocated within the site should ensure that the CWS is protected from any adverse impacts. Given the size of the site it is also likely to have botanical and faunal interest and its value should therefore be assessed further before any allocation.	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	Site RL/15 is allocated for mixed use as part of Policy RL2.  RL/08 is not considered suitable for development as has established woodland on the south of the site, part of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3, it is in multiple ownership, and is within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of the site came forward for development.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23297 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>Before individual sites are considered, the general point needs to be made that there are sufficient opportunities to accommodate the "very high" levels of growth referred to in the SIR without resort to any land which is subject to constraints relating to nature conservation.</p> <p>Site: RL/01 Land to rear 2-4 Elms Road and 6-8 Turnpike Road</p> <p>This site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable. The fact that it also has a number of existing beneficial uses should rule it out from further consideration. It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/02 Land to rear 14-16 Turnpike Road</p> <p>Again, this site may be suitable for development in terms of the footnotes to paragraph 47 of the NPPF, but on the basis of the information in the consultation document, cannot be regarded as available or deliverable.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/03 Land off Turnpike Road Phase 2 (Red Lodge masterplan) The fact that pre-application discussions have taken place is noted, but the site's multiple ownership casts doubt on its availability and deliverability. It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/04 Coopers Yard and Café</p> <p>The fact that this is a brownfield site within the settlement boundary is outweighed by the stated disadvantages. The fact of multiple ownership and absence of any known interest in development casts serious doubts about the site's availability and deliverability, however suitable it might be. In addition, any loss of employment land should ideally be compensated for by equivalent provision elsewhere. It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/05 Land adjoining public house, Turnpike Road and Turnpike Lane</p> <p>The consultation document states that the site is identified as open space in the Red Lodge Masterplan. Whatever its advantages for development, its status as open space means that in our opinion it should be ruled out from any further consideration unless alternative provision within Red</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- these comments will inform further assessment of these sites.</p>	<p>Sites RL/03, RL/04, are allocated for residential development in Policy RL1.</p> <p>Site RL/13 is allocated for B1 and B2 employment uses in Policy EM1 of the SALP Preferred Options document.</p> <p>Sites RL/01, RL/02, RL/05, RL/07, RL/08, RL/09, RL/11, RL/18, and RL/19 are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: multiple ownership, designated as open space, SPA, equine policy, part of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3, is within the settlement boundary so would be windfall if all or part of the site came forward for development, protected species in the area, visually sensitive site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>Lodge can be provided.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/07 The White Star Stables, Warren Road The stated advantage, that the site adjoins the existing settlement boundary, weighs very little in the site's favour. In contrast, we consider that any one of the stated disadvantages should be sufficient to exclude this site from any further consideration; together, they weigh very heavily against the site.</p> <p>It is concluded that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/08 Land to rear 4 to 14b Turnpike Lane It is not clear from the consultation document how much of the site lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3. The site therefore does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 100 to 103. Since there are alternatives to accommodate the nominal capacity of the site of 98 dwellings, the Sequential Test is not passed and the Exception Test does not apply. The aerial photograph in the consultation document does make clear however the extent of mature tree cover. In combination with the flood risk constraint, this renders the site unsuitable for development.</p> <p>In addition, the description of the site refers to matters which could also be regarded as constraints: since part of this site consists of domestic gardens, there may well be problems arising from multiple ownership for site assembly, and the presence of an industrial unit may lead to an issue of relocation.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/09 Land at Greenhays Farm The fact that even a small part of the site lies with in the 1500 metre buffer zone the nesting of stone curlew strongly indicates that allocation of the site should be avoided. This is reinforced by the presence of an existing beneficial use in the form of the day nursery.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/11 Land east of Turnpike Road There may be some threats to the quality of the SSSI arising from its proximity to the lorry park forming the other half of the site, and the area of open space identified as Site RL/05. This would however not in any way justify its development for housing; the site's partial status as an SSSI should be regarded as an absolute and overriding constraint.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>It is therefore concluded that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL /12 Land East of Warren Road This site is a contained and natural southern extension to Red Lodge where the stated SPA disadvantage is capable of mitigation with land within the same ownership.</p> <p>It is considered that this site could be allocated.</p> <p>Site RL/13 Land west of Newmarket Road The site is already designated for employment use, and indeed is considered ideal for that purpose given its prominent and accessible location adjacent to the A11 but any loss of employment land should be compensated for by equivalent provision elsewhere. Replacing lost employment land should be a precondition to this site allocation.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site: RL/18 Land south of the Carrops It is difficult to see how 41 dwellings could be accommodated on this site, or even how residential development could satisfactorily take place at all. Its awkward shape, and the fact that some of it lies in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, are sufficient to exclude it from any further consideration.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site: RL/19 Land south of Green Lane Once again, the fact that the site lies within the settlement boundary is outweighed by three separate identified disadvantages relating to nature conservation. These are sufficient in our opinion to make the site unsuitable for development in a situation where sufficient land can be found to meet housing requirements which is not constrained in this way.</p> <p>It is considered that this site should not be allocated.</p>		

*Question RL4*

23298 - R J Upton 1987  
Settlement Trust [12681]

Comment No

Response noted

Noted. Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23371 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	No	Response noted	Noted. Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23285 - Jaynic Investments LLP [12521]	Comment	Jaynic Investments LLP are not aware of any other potential sites in Red Lodge that are available for development but which have not been identified in this document. They reserve the right to consider any further sites in Red Lodge, put forward by other third parties, and submit further comments in respect of these further sites if required.	Response noted	Noted. Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23825 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	see attached new site submission	Attached document supporting RL/11 noted	Omission site - SSSI
23302 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	No	Response noted	Noted. Policies RL1 and RL2 in the SALP Preferred Options document propose site allocations for growth in Red Lodge appropriate to its status as a Key Service Centre in line with Policy CS1.
23824 - Atelier-sm(architects)ltd (Mr Stephen Margett) [12661]	Comment	RL03 re-sized - see attached	Response noted	Site RL/03 is included for allocation in Policy RL1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<b>6. Primary Villages</b>				
<i>Question BR1</i>				
23557 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>Beck Row could accommodate low growth.</p> <p>Options 1 to 3 (low growth) through allocation of existing commitments (BR/03) should be adopted as Option 4 (medium growth of 320-350 dwellings) is nearing the high end of the infrastructure capacity of the village as identified in the IDP.</p> <p>There are other Primary Villages with significantly higher capacity and fewer constraints e.g. Exning that should accommodate a higher level of growth to deliver housing and bolster the sustainability of the settlement.</p> <p>Table 6.3 of the HRA (Screening of housing distributions for potential disturbance to Annex I birds) states that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out for any of the Options at Beck Row and recommends Appropriate Assessment.</p>	Response noted	<p>Beck Row is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1.</p> <p>Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.</p>
22866 - Mssrs N & P Aitkens [12640]	Comment	<p>Yes because policy CS13 confirms the release of land for development will be dependent on there being sufficient capacity in the existing local infrastructure to meet the additional requirements from development.</p>	Response noted	<p>Beck Row is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1.</p> <p>Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.</p>
23613 - Herringswell Parish Council (Su Field) [5165]	Comment	<p>We are aware that Beck Row contains site options for a total of 306 dwellings that already have council approval. There are another 4 sites awaiting permission for another 130 dwellings which might not be granted approval, but it can be seen from these figures that Beck Row has already "out-grown" the low growth option of 110-120 houses as presented in the 4 options. Knowing permission had been granted, we fail to see why the council offered a low growth option in 3 out of 4 scenarios?</p>	Response noted	<p>Beck Row is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1.</p> <p>Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23412 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Comment	We consider that the significant expansion of Beck Row will better realise the opportunity for infrastructure improvements and also the delivery of the associated community facilities.	Response noted	Beck Row is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1.  Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.
23018 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Beck Row has a high number of USAF personnel from RAF Mildenhall. Until it is known with certainty what is to occur with the site once vacated by the USAF no further growth should occur. The Village could become a ghost town.	Response noted	Beck Row is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1.  Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.
22969 - Orbit Homes [12652]	Support	This representation has been prepared on behalf of Orbit Homes in respect of land at Wilde Street, Beck Row. We consider the site to be a suitable location for additional growth.	Response noted	Beck Row is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1.  Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.
<i>BR/01 Lamble Close</i>				
23326 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1  Planning permission approved for 60 dwellings 2 September 2015 DC/15/0922/OUT

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23745 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site has been subject to geophysical survey and low level evaluation, which has defined some archaeological features. Further evaluation is required in the first instance.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1 Planning permission approved for 60 dwellings 2 September 2015 DC/15/0922/OUT

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>BR/02 Land adjacent to RAF Mildenhall</i>				
23321 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are within of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Remote from settlement boundary</p> <p>* Flood zones 2 and 3.</p>
<hr/>				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23746 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is close to the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Remote from settlement boundary</p> <p>* Flood zones 2 and 3.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>In addition to access and sustainable travel, upgrades are likely to be necessary to surrounding junctions onto Hurdle Drove and A1101 (Shippea Hill Road and Queensway roundabout).</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/03 Land adjacent to Smoke House Inn, Skeltons Drove</i>				
23747 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological site work has been carried out on this site. There is still some outstanding assessment and publication work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1</p> <p>Application DC/14/1206/FUL for 166 dwellings (with 30% affordable), not yet determined.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23327 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1 Application DC/14/1206/FUL for 166 dwellings (with 30% affordable), not yet determined.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/04 Land to the rear of 31-45 The Street</i>				
23748 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the edge of the historic core.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Multiple ownership/site not available.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23328 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Multiple ownership/site not available.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/05 Land off The Grove</i>				
23749 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the edge of the historic core.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>The Grove is not an adopted road and the junction with The Grove and the A1101 will require upgrading. Pedestrian facilities to link into the existing network are also required.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Not adjacent to settlement boundary and distant from the settlement centre.</p> <p>* Sequentially preferable sites available.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23324 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are within of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Not adjacent to settlement boundary and distant from the settlement centre. * Sequentially preferable sites available.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*BR/06 Land south of Rookery Drove*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23650 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Beck Row 6 and 17 - high potential, worth noting.</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is on higher ground over the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation, and is immediately adjacent to excavated remains of roman, prehistoric and later date.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is open meadow/grazing land.</li> <li>- Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Access to be achieved from the adoptable highway on the western side and provision made for sustainable travel.</p>		
23329 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site * This is open meadow/grazing land. * Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/09 Land at corner of Wilde Street/Aspal Lane</i>				
23750 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The proposed development lies within the historic settlement core of Beck Row, recorded on the County Historic Environment Record as MNL 675, and medieval features were found during recent archaeological investigations to the south (MNL 705).</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Visibility and access standards must be met and improvements made to cycle provision.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23330 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.
22989 - Orbit Homes [12652]	Support	This representation has been prepared on behalf of Orbit Homes in respect of land at Wilde Street, Beck Row to strongly support the allocation of the site.	Response noted	Omission site  * Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.
<i>BR/10 Land adjacent to and south of the caravan park on Aspal Lane</i>				
23331 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1  DC/13/0123/OUT - Planning permission for 117 dwellings June 2015 subject to S106.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23751 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site has been subject to geophysical survey and limited evaluation. Further evaluation is required in the first instance.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1</p> <p>DC/13/0123/OUT - Planning permission for 117 dwellings June 2015 subject to S106.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/11 Land between Aspal Lane and Wildmere Lane</i>				
23332 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Coalescence issues with Holywell Row

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23752 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is on higher ground over the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation, which gives it higher archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Will require cycle links to Beck Row and Mildenhall. Wildmere Lane; would require significant upgrading to its width and to pedestrian facilities. This site would require two accesses, bus provision and additional cycle links. St Johns Street also requires upgrading of street lights and footways to cycleways. Sustainable links into the neighbouring estates to access schools</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Omission site * Coalescence issues with Holywell Row



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		would also be required.		
<hr/>				
<i>BR/12 Land adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm, St John's Street</i>				
23333 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Not adjacent to settlement boundary * Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23753 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Assume access onto 60mph road, a long visibility required as will provision for sustainable travel.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Not adjacent to settlement boundary</p> <p>* Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/13 Land west of Aspal Hall Road</i>				
23334 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * County Wildlife Site * Local Nature Reserve

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23754 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine where access would be taken but Broom Walk has adequate footways. Will require sustainable links to amenities and bus stops.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* County Wildlife Site</p> <p>* Local Nature Reserve</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/17 Land east of Skeltons Drove</i>				
23335 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Unsustainable scale and location, (site on such a scale not required and no connectivity to other sites. * Not available.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23651 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>Beck Row 6 and 17 - high potential, worth noting.</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is on higher ground over the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation, and is immediately adjacent to excavated remains of roman, prehistoric and later date. A scatter of Anglo-Saxon remains is recorded from the site. The site is of high archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unsustainable scale and location, (site on such a scale not required and no connectivity to other sites).</li> <li>- Not available.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>The site is not bordered by adoptable highway and two accesses onto the adopted highway will be necessary. Sustainable links to local amenities also required.</p>		

*BR/18 Former Coal Yard, Wilde Street*

23336 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location, remote from the settlement.</p> <p>Application DC/15/0070/OUT for 8 dwellings - undetermined - even if permitted would not extend settlement boundary.</p>
---	---------	---	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23755 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Site is on the edge of the historic core; may require a condition relating to archaeological work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location, remote from the settlement.</p> <p>Application DC/15/0070/OUT for 8 dwellings - undetermined - even if permitted would not extend settlement boundary.</p>
23415 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Support	Brownfield (coal yard) site immediately to the south of New Site north of Wilde Street.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location, remote from the settlement.</p> <p>Application DC/15/0070/OUT for 8 dwellings - undetermined - even if permitted would not extend settlement boundary.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/19 Land adjacent to Moss Edge Farm and west of the A1101</i>				
23323 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are within of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Unsustainable scale and location * Site not known to be available

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23756 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is close to the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Access to be taken from the adopted highway and not from The Grove. Sustainable travel provision required. Visibility for junction access on A1101 and Hurdle to be maintained.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable scale and location</p> <p>* Site not known to be available</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/20 Land at the Yard, The Grove, Stock Corner</i>				
23322 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are within of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Unsustainable location - remote from the settlement boundary and distant from facilities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23757 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the edge of the historic core.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>The Grove is not an adopted road and the junction with the A1101 will require upgrading (access and visibility). Pedestrian facilities to link into the existing network are also required.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location - remote from the settlement boundary and distant from facilities.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/21 Aspal Nursery, Aspal Lane</i>				
23337 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Development for residential purposes would result in a loss of employment. The site currently comprises a tree nursery

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23758 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Evaluation to the north identified medieval features.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Access to meet standards set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainable travel provision required.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Development for residential purposes would result in a loss of employment. The site currently comprises a tree nursery</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/23 Land at White Gables, Stocke Corner</i>				
23759 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the edge of the historic core.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>The Grove is not an adopted road and the junction A1101 will require upgrading (access and visibility). Pedestrian facilities to link into the existing network are also required.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Site lies some distance from the village centre</p> <p>* Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row.</p> <p>* Access would be on a tight bend</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23325 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are within of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Site lies some distance from the village centre * Sufficient, sequentially preferable sites available in Beck Row. * Access would be on a tight bend
<hr/>				
<i>BR/24 Land between Wildmere Lane and Holmsey Green</i>				
23338 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Not adjacent to settlement boundary * Unsustainable location remote from the settlement.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23760 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is on higher ground over the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation, which gives it higher archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Not adjacent to settlement boundary</p> <p>* Unsustainable location remote from the settlement.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Wilde Street has limited pedestrian facilities, these will need to be upgraded to include cycle and bus facilities.</p>		
23416 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Support	Site immediately adjacent to the coal yard would provide defensible eastern boundary to Beck Row.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Not adjacent to settlement boundary</p> <p>* Unsustainable location remote from the settlement.</p>
<i>BR/26 Land east of Aspal Lane</i>				
23339 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1</p> <p>DC/15/0321/OUT for 5 dwellings - pp granted June 2015</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23761 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the edge of the historic core.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1</p> <p>DC/15/0321/OUT for 5 dwellings - pp granted June 2015</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/27 Land adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm</i>				
23762 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the edge of the historic core.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1</p> <p>DC/14/1745/OUT up to 24 dwellings pending decision</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23340 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1  DC/14/1745/OUT up to 24 dwellings pending decision
<hr/>				
<i>BR/28 Land at junction of Aspal Lane and St John's Street</i>				
23341 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Unsustainable location * Potential coalescence issues with Holywell Row.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23763 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation pre determination, at an appropriate stage in the development process, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is topographically favourable for early occupation and has high archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Access onto Aspal Lane to respect junction with St John's Lane and Parkside. Sustainable travel provision required.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Unsustainable location</p> <p>* Potential coalescence issues with Holywell Row.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>BR/29 Scrapyard, Skeltons Drove</i>				
23342 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1  DC/13/0144/FUL - Planning permission approved for mobile home site (permanent residential occupation) 1.6.15.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23764 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on higher ground over the fen edge and is topographically favourable for early occupation, and is in an area rich in multi-period finds and archaeological sites. A scatter of Anglo-Saxon remains is recorded from the site.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy BR1</p> <p>DC/13/0144/FUL - Planning permission approved for mobile home site (permanent residential occupation) 1.6.15.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question BR2</i>				
23372 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	BR/01, BR/02, BR/03, BR/04, BR/05, BR/06, BR/09, BR/10, BR/11, BR/12, BR/13, BR/17, BR/18, BR/19, BR/20, BR/21, BR/23, BR/24, BR/26, BR/27, BR/28, BR/29 - the NHG does not have any concerns about the suggested development at these sites.	Response noted	Sites BR/01, BR/03, BR/10, BR/26, BR/27 and BR/29 have wither been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106, and all have been included in Policy BR1 in the SALP Preferred Options document.  The other sites listed are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including: fragmented ownership/not available, unsustainable location remote from the settlement , coalescence issues with Holywell Row, loss of employment site.
23019 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23413 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Comment	We consider there is merit in supporting growth on the eastern side of Beck Row to include sites BR/18 and BR/24 together with the site north of Wilde Street we have put forward in the current Call for Sites exercise. The combined sites form a natural extension to the village whilst avoiding the coalescence of Beck Row with Holywell Row to the south.	Response noted	Sites BR/18 and BR/24 are considered unsuitable for development as these sites are in unsustainable locations remote from the settlement.
23558 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	BR/03 has an implemented consent for 150 dwellings to USAFE personnel. A new planning application (DC/14/1206/FUL) for 166 dwellings (with no occupancy restriction) is recommended for approval at Planning Committee. Persimmon Homes intend to begin construction as early as possible following issue of a consent.	Response noted	Site BR/03 is allocated for development as part of Policy BR1, and application DC/14/1206/FUL received a resolution to grant permission subject to a S106 in November 2015.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22867 - Mssrs N & P Aitkens [12640]	Comment	We consider that site BR/05 (land off The Grove) should be allocated because it is immediately available, is suitable and achievable. Ecological and land condition surveys demonstrate that the site is not constrained in terms of these matters. The site is not constrained in any other way. The site is close to the settlement boundary at approximately 6m. The site is currently vacant and would be readily available for development. It is unconstrained and has no site specific ecological interest	Response noted	Omission site  * Not adjacent to settlement boundary and distant from the settlement centre. * Sequentially preferable sites available.
<i>Question BR3</i>				
23020 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422] 23021 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC has no view on this	Response noted	
23292 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	We believe that the following site should not be allocated for development: * BR/13 - the site forms part of Aspal Park CWS and should not be allocated for development.  We believe that the following site should not be allocated until the ecological value has been fully assessed, any allocation should take account of this value: * BR/01 - populations of three rare plant species (corn spurrey; smooth cat's ear and grape hyacinth) have been recorded at this site as part of work to inform a currently undetermined planning application (Forest Heath DC reference: DC/15/0922/OUT). Any development at this site should include sufficient mitigation measures in order to protect and maintain the populations of these species.	Response noted - HRA Screening undertaken to inform site selection process.	Site BR/01 is allocate for residential development as part of Policy BR1 and is subject of a resolution to grant permission for 60 units.  BR/13 is not considered suitable for development as is a CWS and LNR.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question BR4</i>				
23818 - Mr & Mrs Nunn [12492]	Comment	BR32 Crowground Farm, Kenny Hill see attached	New site submission noted	Site is in the countryside where development is contrary to policy
23817 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Comment	BR31 - north of Wilde Street see attached	New site submission noted	Site discounted. This site lies in a relatively unsustainable location, remote from the existing settlement boundary of Beck Row. Further, the site is within a noise constraint zone around USAFE Mildenhall and Lakenheath air base flight paths

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23380 - Mr Paul Haylock [11234]	Comment	<p>I have previously written regarding the site in Holywell Row HR/07 Land behind Whitegates. I attach that previous letter and the map that shows the site in more detail. The site, which sits behind Whitegates and is bordered on the south side by the track, is currently outside the village boundary. I previously made a representation that the all the dwellings currently situated in Eldon Lane should be included within the village boundary. Dwellings have been situated in Eldon Lane since the 1800s and it seems a nonsense that this area has not been included within the village as inhabitants see themselves as part of the village and in fact all addresses in Eldon Lane include Holywell Row in them.</p> <p>I would like the land behind Whitegates to be included in the local plan for planning development. It is an area of land that would meet local criteria for housing as it is compact and does not extend beyond the current wider village envelope.</p> <p>All the reasons for development that were included in the attached previous letter still stand. I will not copy them again as they should be read in conjunction with this letter. However, since that response to the earlier consultation was written the current government has announced much more significant plans for housing. Over the life of this parliament the government has announced it wants to see 1 million new homes built, which far exceeds numbers built in previous years stretching back to the 1980s. This is in recognition of the chronic shortage of housing supply in this country. Even the targets referred to in the attached letter have not been achieved, but housing is now seen as a number one priority by all political parties and has also risen up the list of what the general population feel strongly about. This means that the desire to solve the problem of the lack of housing supply is gathering momentum and will be a key issue throughout the life of this parliament and beyond. It is the duty of all organisations and suppliers (councils, housing associations and builders) to help meet these targets. The piece of land in question, HR/07, is ideal in this regard as it has 4 old farm buildings on it which I believe may be eligible for permitted development as well as being virtually an infill site so has no detrimental impact on the green belt. The more houses that are constructed, within a controlled</p>	Response noted	Holywell Row is designated as a secondary village in Policy CS1. Secondary villages will provide only nominal housing and employment growth during the plan period where local capacity allows, and no urban expansion or allocations will be considered for these villages

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>planning environment that meets demands, the more affordable they become for the current and future generations. This is something that will never happen if the rate of house building continues at the present pace. Where land is available to meet this demand it should be seen as a valuable resource and used accordingly.</p> <p>Local communities need to be maintained and building houses which are both affordable and in the right places will enable this to happen.</p> <p>I believe the area of land, HR/07, will help to meet local needs without altering the character of the village, which is not true in my view of other proposed developments in the immediate area. I realise Holywell Row is not a primary village for planning purposes but small developments have been allowed there in the recent past so you will not be setting a precedent if this site is allowed for planning development.</p>		
23373 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	No	Response noted	Noted. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes site allocations for growth in Beck Row on sites which have recently been granted planning permission or which are the subject of a resolution to grant permission.
23414 - Mr & Mrs B Rolfe [12682]	Support	<p>The site we have submitted in the current Call for Sites Exercise located north of Wilde Street.</p> <p>Opposite proposed developed frontage on the south side of Wilde Street with defensible eastern boundary for Beck Row.</p>	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>6.2.3-6.2.8</i>				
22585 - Mr Simon Cole [12517]	Object	<p>Should Exning be a primary village still?            No Doctors, the post office is closing, only 1 shop, 2 hair dressers a tattoo parlour and 3 pubs. Call that infrastructure for 2,000 people ? I certainly don't. The roads are twisty and tight and gridlocked at rush hour every day. WE HAVE NO MORE CAPACITY FOR HOUSES. Exning is already so big that if 2 of the proposed sites were developed we would be annexed to Newmarket! Does that not tell you enough ? (E08 N09)</p> <p><i>Nothing we have 120 houses coming already over the next 5 years, thats plenty.</i></p>	Response noted	
<i>Question E1</i>				
22577 - Mrs Lenore Anderson [12568]	Comment	<p>I have no problem in increasing the housing stock within the village, but this increase should be aimed towards providing affordable two/three bedroom stock. As I have mobility problem considerations should be given to enabling people like me to access safely the centre of the village.</p>	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23559 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>The SIR Interim Sustainability Appraisal (paragraph 8.2.17) states that higher growth in Exning might be considered as an option given the sites that are available and that the IECA 2009 identification of an opportunity to accommodate a strategic extension to the west.</p> <p>The SIR HRA Screening ruled out a likely significant effect at Exning from the direct effects of build development (Table 6.2) and is only one of two settlements to be ruled out of a likely significant effect of disturbance to Annex 1 birds (Table 6.3). The IECA Opportunity Area Constraints Test (IECA Appendix 3) found Exning was the least constrained of the Primary Villages to accommodate additional development.</p> <p>The IECA 2009 states that Exning has a good network of existing infrastructure for a village of its size and it is also located nearby to further amenities in Newmarket. It is well served for green infrastructure, with a good level of sports pitch provision, open amenity space and a large allotment site. The Primary School has a reasonable level of capacity for new pupils and middle and upper schools are located nearby in Newmarket, where there are also places for new pupils. It concludes that the existing infrastructure could support circa 500 new homes. It also identifies an Opportunity Area to the west of Exning that could accommodate a strategic site extension of 1,240-2,170 dwellings; this is also the conclusion of the updated IDP 2015.</p> <p>Given the high infrastructure capacity of the village, its close proximity to Newmarket and its relative lack of constraints to the west of the settlement compared to other settlements, the Council should thoroughly assess whether Exning could accommodate "high" growth (up to 240 dwellings to 2021; with the potential to grow further up to 2031) to deliver housing and bolster the sustainability of the settlement with relatively low environmental impact when considered against other distribution options.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal has not assessed this level of growth as it states FHDC considered medium growth was the most appropriate level of growth for a</p>	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>High growth would not be appropriate for this Primary Village, and would be contrary to the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy CS1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Primary Village, and there was insufficient suitable, available land in the SHLAA. However, although the settlement is identified as a Primary Village by Policy CS1, this does not preclude the provision of additional housing and facilities where it is sustainable, such as at Exning, which has a significantly high level of environmental capacity and is in close proximity to the Town of Newmarket.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes have identified two sites to the west of Exning immediately to the south and west of E/02, which has planning permission for 120 dwellings. Site A to the south of E/02 has the capacity to accommodate an additional 100-120 dwellings, as a second phase to E/02 in the short-medium term (up to 2021). A viability assessment is being prepared, to refine the site's capacity and demonstrate how the site can be successfully delivered within landscape and highways constraints, including how additional opportunities for recreational facilities can be incorporated into a masterplan alongside site E/02.</p> <p>Should the Council ultimately adopt higher growth levels at Exning, Site B (to the west of Site A) could be made available to accommodate up to 180 dwellings (based on the Council's methodology for sites over 100 dwellings) as a third phase in the medium to long term or part of a strategic extension to the west of Exning as identified in the IECA 2009.</p> <p>Both sites have been submitted to FHDC as "new"</p>		



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23474 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [4986]	Comment	<p>Additional growth at Exning is very possible indeed given that it has acknowledged capacity to do so in the updated IECA, IDP and SA's (accompanying the SIR and site allocation consultations). Of course, necessary infrastructure improvements are required to mitigate any development proposal in accordance with the NPPF and PPG requirements where planning obligations should only be sought where they meet the necessary tests set down in paragraph 204 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Although there are a number of general constraints identified for each settlement, there will be specific sites within the listed settlements which will have relatively few or none of the identified constraints. These will be the sites which can be seen to be deliverable for housing purposes and beneficial for housing allocation. When comparing and contrasting the constraints within the primary villages, Exning is the least constrained in terms of the number of constraints to development.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Inspector's Report on the Examination into the Forest Heath Core Strategy Development Plan Document (13 April 2010) para 5.18 states:-</p> <p>"They [primary villages] are places which could relieve development pressures on the more constrained towns. This is most notably the case at Exning which the IECA indicates has most potential for further growth. This should not be ignored because it provides additional flexibility for the CS which I consider should be incorporated into the spatial strategy (IC/16)".</p> <p>Since the CS Inspector's Report, Charles Church Developments has secured planning permission for 120 dwellings at Burwell Road, Exning, which demonstrates that Exning is a sustainable settlement which can accommodate growth. Indeed, the IDP (August 2015) which supports the SIR of CS Policy CS7 (August 2015) states for Exning under header 'Opportunity Areas' that there is a potential range of 1240-2170 homes capable at Exning.</p> <p>It should be noted that any new housing allocations adopted for Exning and Newmarket will be contingent on the successful mitigation of any possible detriment to the Horse Racing Industry Operations.</p>	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23022 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23499 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment	yes - development in Exning can largely be achieved providing the same benefits as residential development in Newmarket without so significant an impact on the horseracing industry.	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  High growth would not be appropriate for this Primary Village, and would be contrary to the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy CS1.
23071 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	Please see attached report and masterplan.	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  High growth would not be appropriate for this Primary Village, and would be contrary to the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy CS1.
22539 - Miss Jenyth Cunningham [12522]	Object	Current roads (Exning village, A14 junction, junction with A142) totally insufficient as housing stands and noise, damage to cars / properties and danger to residents unacceptable; more housing exacerbates this and no provision is planned for assistance to villagers on this matter. All infrastructure insufficient to bear further development as it stands.  <i>Diversion of traffic away from village centre, traffic calming measures (such as in Fordham), speed cameras, alternative access and egress routes. Improvements in water / electric / broadband services.</i>	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  High growth would not be appropriate for this Primary Village, and would be contrary to the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy CS1.
<i>E/02 Land off The Drift/Burwell Road</i>				
22564 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Comment	It is obvious that this site will be further developed when complete in the remaining part of field, the extra house can be built here negating the need to build elsewhere.	Response noted	Site is the subject of an extant planning permission for 120 dwellings (resolution to approve April 2014, references F/2012/0552/OUT, and DC/14/0942/RM).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23765 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological work was carried out for application DC/14/0942. Archaeological remains, including an Anglo-Saxon cemetery, have been excavated. No further on-site constraints, although post-excavation work is still to be completed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Site is the subject of an extant planning permission for 120 dwellings (resolution to approve April 2014, references F/2012/0552/OUT, and DC/14/0942/RM).
22856 - Exning Parish Council (Mrs Cathy Whitaker) [5139]	Comment	This site has already been given outline planning approval for 120 houses.	Response noted. Application DC/14/0942/RM and F/2012/0552/OUT for 120 dwellings approved	Site is the subject of an extant planning permission for 120 dwellings (resolution to approve April 2014, references F/2012/0552/OUT, and DC/14/0942/RM).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22895 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Support	Very good location, however it would need a lot of improvements in terms of site access, given that Burwell road would not cope well with a sensible increase in the amount of traffic. There should be an alternative access to Burwell road in order to avoid Exning town centre, perhaps from the south side of the development.	Response noted. Check with SCC Highways. Application DC/14/0942/RM and F/2012/0552/OUT for 120 dwellings approved	Site is the subject of an extant planning permission for 120 dwellings (resolution to approve April 2014, references F/2012/0552/OUT, and DC/14/0942/RM).
<i>E/03 Land to rear of Laceys Lane (includes Frogmore)</i>				
23418 - Ms Jacqui Reggiani [12664]	Comment	The road structure is currently unsafe without the increased traffic. It will also annexe Exning to Newmarket town, so loss of village identity.	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22822 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site adjoins Exning Conservation Area (not mentioned in the site description) and forms part of its rural setting to the south-west. Development of this site could have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of the allotments and farmland. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22661 - Mr Paul Grover [12595]	Comment	If access is via Duck Lane and Chapel Street Exning then absolutely no development should be permitted. The roads are heavily congested at present and particularly by dangerous at the junctions by the church and post office.	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22656 - Mrs Rosemary Grover [12592]	Comment	Absolutely no safe access	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22857 - Exning Parish Council (Mrs Cathy Whitaker) [5139]	Comment	This development should be strongly opposed for the following reasons:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Loss of productive agricultural land</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* The close proximity of the A14 - noise and air pollution</li> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Access - a development of this size will put over 800 cars on to already heavily congested roads of the village: the area of the village adjacent to this site was largely built in Victorian times and consequently has little or no off street parking, making further access from the village to this site almost impossible</li> <li>* Further increase pressure on the A14/A142 junction</li> <li>* Increased pressure on the local school, which is already at capacity</li> <li>* There is only a private dentist in the village and no GP</li> <li>* There are doubts that this is a sustainable location</li> <li>* Possible damage to the Racing Industry in the village</li> <li>* The site is outside the village development boundary</li> </ul>	Response noted Highway to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22637 - Mr & Mrs G and E O'Neill [12588]	Comment	That Exning is a small village and should remain as such, it does not have the facilities for anything bigger!! It has one School and one shop How could it cope with anything more?? and the traffic any development would cause is not worth thinking of!! existing roads could not cope with increase in traffic	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
23566 - E Braybrooke [12665]	Comment	Laceys Lane and Frogmore are too narrow for potentially 600+ cars. We have studs at each end of the lane, and horse up and down the lane and along Frogmore under the 'horse' bridges. Again the infrastructure couldn't cope and why should potential children not expect to go to the village school	Response noted	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22600 - Mr Paul Shaves [12580]	Comment	I object on the grounds of increased traffic in an area of small narrow roads with parking issues as residents have to park on the road. Increasing the safety to both pedestrians of all ages ,cyclists and horse/horse riders due to the close proximity of local stud yards. As well as lack of schooling and doctors spaces.	Response noted	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
22627 - Mr R Rix [12585]	Comment	Poor accessibility, all road leading to this site are very narrow. Laceys Lane is already overcrowded. Traffic drawn to this development would cause adverse effect to the free flow of traffic on the main highway.	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22423 - J Braybrooke [12668]	Comment	Laceys Lane Frogmore the narrow track is used regularly by horses. The roads cannot cope with the minimum 300+ cars. Laceys Lane has stable at the top and bottom, horses using it most of the day, parking is limited now often someone has to give way, specially with heavy lorries	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22634 - C V Lines [12587]	Comment	would totally disrupt the movement of race horses	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22640 - Gillian Wiseman [12589]	Comment	The residents of Lacey's Lane have been told that when the houses are built they will not be allowed to park their cars in the lane, but at a car park at the rear which will be open to vandalism. They already have horses (there are stables at each end)large lorries and farm vehicles. The land and Frogmoor are unsuitable to cope with extra traffic and again how will the school cope with the extra children.	Response noted Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22669 - Mr R E Bye [12597]	Comment	Totally unsuitable - no access to site!! Chapel Street and Ducks Lane very narrow and always congested.	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23435 - T Pike [12667]	Comment	objection	Response noted	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22631 - S Lines [12586]	Comment	This area is far too small and difficult to access	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22675 - Mrs D Bright [12598]	Comment	Allotments need to be retained. Frogmore is a horse walk and would cause problems if used for access. Lacey's Lane has a large traffic/parking problem already. The A14 could in future be widened to a motorway	Response noted	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
23429 - EB & J Sugden [12666]	Comment	Any development in this area would cause major traffic problems and congestion along Chapel St due to existing car parking and large delivery vehicles to the stables. Also along Ducks Land due to existing car parking and queuing for access onto Church St (The main road from Exning to Newmarket) This would also exaggerate the current problems for vehicles exiting St Martins Close	Response noted Check with SCC Highways.	Alternative option rejected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22716 - Mr & Mrs H D Scott [12611]	Comment	<p>Due to width of existing road in this area, Ducks Lane, Chapel St. and Laceys Lane are only at minimum for two way traffic before parking they would not be suitable for the amount of traffic these houses will generate. Also as you and the Jockey Club are aware the horse from the Exning stables all use these roads to get to the training grounds as well as lorry deliveries to same blocking the roads.</p> <p>May we please add that we have lived in Beechwood Close Exning for 32 years and during that time due to the increase in traffic it now makes it almost impossible to drive out of our close early morning because of the volume of traffic that enter Newmarket via Cotton End Road from Turners roundabout. These extra houses will of course add to this.</p>	<p>Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23766 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. Finds from multiple periods are recorded across the site, including indications of Roman activity. The site has high archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Heath Road and Lacey's Lane are not suitable for this level of development in their current form. The site will require two accesses, bus provision and sustainable links.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>

E/03 Land to rear of Laceys Lane (includes Frogmore)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22686 - Ms Anna Wilks [12599]	Comment	The access too unsuitable The roads are too old and small We need the allotment and agricultural land	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22843 - Mrs Olivia Pitts [12639]	Comment	NO 1. Agricultural land 2. Inadequate infrastructure 3. Impossible vehicle access 4. Annexation to Newmarket 5. Air pollution from A14 for new residents 6. Building on racing industry land	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22650 - D Hitchcock [12590]	Comment	Access to this site would become a major problem due to width of roads and parking of vehicles by existing house owners	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22645 - Mr Oliver Stephenson [12591]	Comment	Exning already has an unwanted housing development (Burwell Road) Laceys Lane is already over-crowded Nearby horse racing stables would be disrupted local primary school is already over-subscribed insufficient local services (Shops etc) extra traffic burden on already dangerous roads an extension to town of Newmarket (no longer a village) no need for housing in the village change the nature of area, and lower people's quality of life	Response noted	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
22681 - Mr Paul Winter [12556]	Comment	<p>Exning has 4-5 race horse trainer in this village. All located around Laceys Lane, with access to the racecourse training grounds under the A14. This land was preserved for horse racing and should be remain so. Non-profit!!</p> <p>The road network connecting to this site is small, narrow and leads through the village of Exning. Not suitable for consistent traffic flow.</p> <p>Due to the lack of space or land, relocating of the allotments for locals, will be difficult too.</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22851 - Mr & Mrs TM & CA Gowing [12638]	Comment	<p>Totally against this.</p> <p>The access is very very poor and will lead to traffic issues. There is no space at village school already. Planned development at Burwell Road is more than enough for Exning.</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22666 - Ms Sarah King [12596]	Comment	<p>Against it.</p> <p>The access to this land is via Laceys Lane which is not wide enough to support the amount of traffic that this development would bring in. This land also has constant strings of horses travelling along it. The school is already stretched without the addition of 300+ houses and families</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>
22579 - Miss K Amanda Tanner [12572]	Object	<p>Lack of access</p> <p>Land is used for access to the Heath by trainers based in Exning - development would be against the local plan for equines</p> <p>Development of Exning is not required</p> <p>The infrastructure of Exning is not capable of taking such large scale development - school already full, roads narrow and twisty and already congested, access to major roads dangerous etc.</p> <p><i>No large scale development in Exning -</i></p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* More suitable and sustainable option available</li> <li>* Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues)</li> <li>* Existing allotments</li> <li>* Potential access issues</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22565 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Object	awfull site access via existing very busy small roads will be impossible. school is already full. the extra houses will use the a142/windmill hill junction which is a nightmare already. this land is adjacent to racing businesses on laceys lane, church street and chapel street and contrary to the councils/jockey clubs policy of not being so. this will increase the annexation of exning into Newmarket. loss of the very well used allotments.  <i>none, an absolutely awful place to put a large development.</i>	Response noted Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
22574 - Mr Neville Collinge [12562]	Object	Loss of village facilities. Very dangerous access routes.          <i>Direct access by slip road from A14</i>	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Alternative option rejected:  * More suitable and sustainable option available * Proximity to A14 (potential noise and air quality issues) * Existing allotments * Potential access issues
<i>E/08 Land to rear of York Villas, North End Road</i>				
22635 - C V Lines [12587]	Comment	Road far too small for development	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
23419 - Ms Jacqui Reggiani [12664]	Comment	Access will be a problem to an already severely congested road. Traffic is already a problem and we currently have building work underway for houses on Burwell Road. Traffic is a danger to the public	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22601 - Mr Paul Shaves [12580]	Comment	I object on the basis of major concerns over access to a already restricted land. The increased traffic to the area will cause concerns for public safefy and the safety to horse and riders alike	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22687 - Ms Anna Wilks [12599]	Comment	Exning cannot cope with more traffic	Response noted	Omission site  * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22844 - Mrs Olivia Pitts [12639]	Comment	NO 1. Agricultural land 2. Inadequate vehicle access 3. Inadequate infrastructure 4. Annexation to Newmarket	Response noted Check with SCC Highways	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22632 - S Lines [12586]	Comment	and the access roads?	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22858 - Exning Parish Council (Mrs Cathy Whitaker) [5139]	Comment	Historically, previous developments in the village have been of this 'in-fill' nature. However the Parish Council is opposed to the development: * It will increase the traffic that has to access on to Oxford Street and Burwell Road * Increase the pressure on the local primary school, which is already at capacity * There is only a private dentist in the village, and the village has no GP	Response noted Check with SCC Highways	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22717 - Mr & Mrs H D Scott [12611]	Comment	Although the number of houses is small permission for houses have already been given for a site near to North End Road on the Burwell Road so again this will only be adding to the traffic problems we have in the village especially near the school. The junction with Windmill Hill and Church St and of course getting onto the main road from Windmill Hill	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22662 - Mr Paul Grover [12595]	Comment	No objection. It must be recognised that parking on the road to Burwell is causing major problems now. The district council must recognise the planned developments in Burwell when considering development in Exning	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
23424 - J Braybrooke [12668]	Comment	The access is not viable extra traffic if planning is granted means a lot of traffic exiting/entering Burwell Road/Oxford Street	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
23567 - E Braybrooke [12665]	Comment	The site has no access at the present and where would it go? Again there will be 48 potential more cars in the village which is very busy. The infrastructure including drains, roads, school will have to be addressed	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23430 - EB & J Sugden [12666]	Comment	Depending on the number of proposed houses allocated this would be a problem with vehicles joining Swan Lane/Church Street	Response noted. Check with SCC Highways.	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22823 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site adjoins Exning Conservation Area (not mentioned in the site description) and forms part of its rural setting between Rose Hall and the Equine Hospital. Development of this site could have a considerable impact on the significance of the conservation area through the loss of open space. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22646 - Mr Oliver Stephenson [12591]	Comment	no access not required Exning already has an unwanted housing development (Burwell Road) Laceys Lane is already over-crowded Nearby horse racing stables would be disrupted local primary school is already over-subscribed insufficient local services (Shops etc) extra traffic burden on already dangerous roads an extension to town of Newmarket (no longer a village) no need for housing in the village change the nature of area, and lower people's quality of life	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22852 - Mr & Mrs TM & CA Gowing [12638]	Comment	No problems with this one but access is poor. Is a natural central infill	Response noted Check with SCC Highways	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22566 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Comment	I think there would be issues with getting access to this site however the lower numbers of homes proposed make it more suitable for the slow development of the village. the issues of extra traffic and lack of school and medical facilities still apply	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22638 - Mr & Mrs G and E O'Neill [12588]	Comment	That Exning is a small village and should remain as such, it does not have the facilities for anything bigger!! It has one School and one shop How could it cope with anything more?? and the traffic any development would cause is not worth thinking of!! existing roads could not cope with increase in traffic	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22667 - Ms Sarah King [12596]	Comment	Against it. This would involve a problem with traffic, especially a danger during the winter months.	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
23436 - T Pike [12667]	Comment	objection	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23767 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage. This site is within the historic core of Exning, as defined in the County Historic Environment Record. Overlooking a watercourse, it is in a location that is topographically favourable for early occupation.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle and links to facilities.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Potential 'backland' development</p> <p>* More suitable and sustainable option available</p>
22670 - Mr R E Bye [12597]	Comment	<p>Yes, although 24 houses seems a lot on this site. Problem with access</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>Highways to be consulted if site pursued</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Potential 'backland' development</p> <p>* More suitable and sustainable option available</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22651 - D Hitchcock [12590]	Comment	Impending development at Burwell Road is going to increase amount of traffic at the junction of North End	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22628 - Mr R Rix [12585]	Comment	Good site for natural village growth. Concerns shown about access to this site and also access onto main Burwell Road	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22676 - Mrs D Bright [12598]	Comment	Access - loss of grass where children play. Access is difficult in New Road due to parked cars on the road. How would it be accessed by a fire engine? Best accessed via North End only. The junction of North End and New Road has had sewer/flooding problems	Response noted Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22657 - Mrs Rosemary Grover [12592]	Comment	no objection	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22682 - Mr Paul Winter [12556]	Comment	This site is located in a estate with access via side streets and well developed housing. Again this small old village can't take anymore core housing and facilities in its heart. Stretching schools, using all it's backfill and green areas, do not support it ageing infrastructure and compact design. Also the lack of doctors, and village facilities can not be extended due to/the lack of core space.	Response noted Service providers and Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22641 - Gillian Wiseman [12589]	Comment	I understand that the only access is through an arch, and more traffic from Burwell Road corner would be dangerous.	Response noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22580 - Miss K Amanda Tanner [12572]	Object	Lack of access Owners currently not planning to sell  <i>No large scale development in Exning</i>	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available
22896 - Mr Michele Solazzi [12646]	Support	Nice and quiet location surrounded by green fields. Being close to convenience store is quite handy too. Town houses shall be avoided because they might please developers but not very practical for people living in them.	Response noted	Omission site * Potential 'backland' development * More suitable and sustainable option available

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question E2</i>				
22643 - Gillian Wiseman [12589]	Comment	The rest of the land behind Burwell Road	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
23569 - E Braybrooke [12665]	Comment	rest of the land behind Burwell Road	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22678 - Mrs D Bright [12598]	Comment	E/02 phase 1 only on Burwell Road - with enlargement of school	Response noted Service providers to be consulted if site pursued	Outline planning permission granted on this site. No need to allocate.
23560 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	E/02 has an existing consent for 120 dwellings with a resolution to grant reserved matters consent. Persimmon Homes intend to begin construction as early as possible following issue of the consent.	Response noted	Site E/02 Outline planning permission granted on this site. No need to allocate.
22653 - D Hitchcock [12590]	Comment	NONE insufficient educational facilities	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
22629 - Mr R Rix [12585]	Comment	E/08	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23438 - T Pike [12667]	Comment	none	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22648 - Mr Oliver Stephenson [12591]	Comment	none (North End Road is most sustainable due to its size)	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
22847 - Mrs Olivia Pitts [12639]	Comment	none	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
23426 - J Braybrooke [12668]	Comment	None	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
23374 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	E/02, E/03, E08 - the NHG does not have any concerns about the suggested development at these sites so long as they include appropriate on-site (or near site) supporting facilities.	Response noted	Site E/02 Outline planning permission granted on this site. No need to allocate. Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development: * Potential coalescence with Newmarket * Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues) * Potential loss of allotments * Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides * A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required * Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate. Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22684 - Mr Paul Winter [12556]	Comment	Forest Heath Core Strategy has already allocated 120 houses until 2031	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
23475 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [4986]	Comment	<p>Site E/03 should be allocated as it is a deliverable housing site for 150 dwellings (not 342 dwellings as stated under Site E/03 of the Site Allocations Plan) within the plan period to 2031. Exning is a sustainable location close to Newmarket. Any future development on the site is contingent on the successful mitigation of any possible detriment to Horse Racing Industry Operations. The revenues from the development will be re-invested back into the Horse Racing Industry. It should be noted that there will not be the loss of the existing allotments as the proposal for the site would include further allotment land to serve existing and future residents.</p> <p>There would be no coalescence issue (as incorrectly stated on page 197 of the Site Allocations Plan), due to the A14 constituting the southern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Site E/03 is not constrained by the numerous environmental designations such as habitat protection (HRA's) as are the other primary villages.</p> <p>We would question the robustness and accuracy of the SA of the Forest Heath Site Allocations Local Plan in that red traffic lights have been specified for site E/03 in terms of ALC and Conservation Area. The ALC for the site is grade 3 and the site would adjoin the western boundary of the conservation area where it meets with Frogmore. Appropriate masterplanning would seek to ensure that any development close to or adjoining the conservation area boundary is sensitively planned.</p> <p>My client will give consideration to the potential for a doctor's surgery to serve Exning, subject to viability testing.</p>	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul>
22719 - Mr & Mrs H D Scott [12611]	Comment	NONE	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23500 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment	E/02 and E/03 both look like sustainable development sites.	Response noted	<p>Site E/02 Outline planning permission granted on this site. No need to allocate.</p> <p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul>
23432 - EB & J Sugden [12666]	Comment	There should be no future developments in Exning until it is required by Exning people.	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>
22664 - Mr Paul Grover [12595]	Comment	E/08	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.</p>
22659 - Mrs Rosemary Grover [12592]	Comment	E/08	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.</p>
23023 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22854 - Mr & Mrs TM & CA Gowing [12638]	Comment	E/08	Response noted	Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
22567 - Mr John Gowing [12554]	Comment	only the north end site the laceys lane one is obviously a non starter and one hopes that the fact it belongs to the jockey club does not influence a decision!	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
22672 - Mr R E Bye [12597]	Comment	E/08	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
23421 - Ms Jacqui Reggiani [12664]	Comment	None we have a planned housing development already	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22689 - Ms Anna Wilks [12599]	Comment	Burwell Road	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22581 - Miss K Amanda Tanner [12572]	Object	No large scale development of Exning Lack of need Lack of facilities Lack of access to sites Unsuitable roads Probably annexation to Newmarket	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation (site E/12) for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.  Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
<i>No large scale development required in Exning</i>				
<i>Question E3</i>				
23570 - E Braybrooke [12665]	Comment	Rear of York Villa's North End Rear of Lacey's Lane	Response noted	Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development: * Potential coalescence with Newmarket * Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues) * Potential loss of allotments * Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides * A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required * Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate. Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
22644 - Gillian Wiseman [12589]	Comment	Laceys Land/York Terrace/Brickfields	Response noted	Site E/12 is allocated for residential development in Policy E1 in the SALP Preferred Options document. Other sites are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including loss of allotments, proximity to the A14, too large scale and not required, access difficult and potential coalescence with Newmarket.
22649 - Mr Oliver Stephenson [12591]	Comment	Laceys Lane	Response noted	Site E/12 is allocated for residential development in Policy E1 in the SALP Preferred Options document. Other sites are considered unsuitable for development for a number of reasons including loss of allotments, proximity to the A14, too large scale and not required, access difficult and potential coalescence with Newmarket.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22654 - D Hitchcock [12590]	Comment	E/03 and N/09	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Part of site N/09 is one of 6 sites in Newmarket allocated for residential development as part of Policy N1.</p>
23433 - EB & J Sugden [12666]	Comment	Site E/03 (rear of Laceys Lane)	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul>
22848 - Mrs Olivia Pitts [12639]	Comment	none	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23878 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	We do not consider that Site E/03 should be allocated as it is located close to the A14 and development will be heavily constrained by the need to consider noise and air pollution matters, a matter which is highlighted by the Newmarket AQMA designation. Site E/08 is situated to the rear of existing dwellings and it is a parcel of land which does not provide for a streetscene connection.	Response noted	Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development: * Potential coalescence with Newmarket * Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues) * Potential loss of allotments * Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides * A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required * Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate. Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.
22630 - Mr R Rix [12585]	Comment	E/03	Response noted	Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development: * Potential coalescence with Newmarket * Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues) * Potential loss of allotments * Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides * A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required * Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.
22720 - Mr & Mrs H D Scott [12611]	Comment	ALL	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22855 - Mr & Mrs TM & CA Gowing [12638]	Comment	E/03	Response noted	Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development: * Potential coalescence with Newmarket * Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues) * Potential loss of allotments * Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides * A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required * Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23422 - Ms Jacqui Reggiani [12664]	Comment	Laceys Lane already has a congestion/access problem	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul>
22673 - Mr R E Bye [12597]	Comment	E/03 & N/09	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Part of site N/09 is one of 6 sites in Newmarket allocated for residential development as part of Policy N1.</p>
22685 - Mr Paul Winter [12556]	Comment	Any further development would over kill the village and environment. It is already planned a 15% increase in housing	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22660 - Mrs Rosemary Grover [12592]	Comment	E/03 & N/09	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Part of site N/09 is one of 6 sites in Newmarket allocated for residential development as part of Policy N1.</p>
23427 - J Braybrooke [12668]	Comment	Rear of Laceys Lane	Response noted	<p>Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.</p>
23024 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23439 - T Pike [12667]	Comment	all three	Response noted	<p>E/02 is the subject of planning permission for 120 dwellings.</p> <p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22665 - Mr Paul Grover [12595]	Comment	E/03 and N/09	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Part of site N/09 is one of 6 sites in Newmarket allocated for residential development as part of Policy N1.</p>
22679 - Mrs D Bright [12598]	Comment	E/03 & E/08	Response noted	<p>Site E/03 is not considered suitable for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Potential coalescence with Newmarket</li> <li>* Proximity of A14 (noise and potential air quality issues)</li> <li>* Potential loss of allotments</li> <li>* Road particularly narrow with parking on both sides</li> <li>* A very large site and development on this scale is not likely to be required</li> <li>* Access via Frogmore appears inappropriate.</li> </ul> <p>Site E/08 is not considered suitable for development as it is 'backland' development.</p>
<i>Question E4</i>				
22721 - Mr & Mrs H D Scott [12611]	Comment	Exning village does not have the capacity to take yet more houses.	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>
22849 - Mrs Olivia Pitts [12639]	Comment	none	Response noted	<p>Noted. Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23821 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	<p>We are proposing through this submission the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Land to the north of Lacey's Lane to be allocated for community development to accommodate a medical practice with associated parking.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Land to the north of Lacey's Lane to provide for residents off road parking or;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Highway improvements on Lacey's Lane to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movements.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Relocation of the Lacey's Lane football club to a new facility on land to the north west of Cotton End Road, Exning.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Provision of green infrastructure of approximately 20ha on land to the north east of the village; to include public open space.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Development of up to 150 dwellings on land to the north of Windmill Hill</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Highway improvement works at the Windmill Hill / A142 (Fordham Road) junction</li> </ul>	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p> <p>Further land/sites of this scale are not required, and the preferred site continues development adjacent to site E/02 that has planning permission for 120 dwellings, and it has a good relationship with the built form of the settlement.</p>
23571 - E Braybrooke [12665]	Comment	no	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>
22674 - Mr R E Bye [12597]	Comment	NO	Response noted	<p>Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.</p>
23428 - J Braybrooke [12668]	Comment	Has drainage water electricity and congestion on roads been taken into account	Response noted	<p>Infrastructure requirements, including transport and highways, water and electricity are being assessed for the level and locations of growth proposed. Improvements will be linked to the level and timing of development proposed.</p>
23025 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23440 - T Pike [12667]	Comment	none available	Response noted	Noted. Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22680 - Mrs D Bright [12598]	Comment	NO E/02	Response noted	Site E/02 Outline planning permission granted on this site. No need to allocate.
23820 - Carter Jonas LLP (Ms Kate Wood) [12718]	Comment	E14 - Glenmore, Windmill Hill see attached	New site submission noted	Site discounted. This site lies in a relatively unsustainable location, remote from the existing settlement boundary of Exning. There are more suitable/sustainable options available to the Council for this settlement. Further, the site lies, in its entirety, within flood zone 2.
23819 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	E12 - site A only - West of Exning  E13 - red only - west of Exning see attached	New site submission noted	Part of this new site is one of the council's preferred options - see Policy E1a.
23434 - EB & J Sugden [12666]	Comment	NO	Response noted	Noted. Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22859 - Exning Parish Council (Mrs Cathy Whitaker) [5139]	Comment	Exning Parish Council is not aware of any further potential sites in the village that could be available for development.	Response noted	Noted. Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
22655 - D Hitchcock [12590]	Comment	NO. The village is full	Response noted	Exning is designated a Primary Village in Policy CS1. The SALP Preferred Options document proposes a site allocation for growth in Exning appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1.
23561 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	Please see submitted new Site A and B to the west of Exning (on new sites submission form).	Response noted	Further land/sites of this scale are not required, and the preferred site continues development adjacent to site E/02 that has planning permission for 120 dwellings, and it has a good relationship with the built form of the settlement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>6.3.3-6.3.8</i>				
22594 - Kentford Parish Council (Mr Malcolm Baker) [12577]	Comment	It is the unanimous opinion of the Parish Council, that no further planning decisions must be made before we are all in a position to assess what the impact of the already approved sites will have on the existing infrastructure of the village. This would include a close look at road conditions and village facilities. The village is in the process of absorbing an enormous change, from c.200 houses in 2007 to potentially c429 in the near future. Villagers feel strongly that infrastructure needs to reflect this already planned growth, before further decisions can be made.	Response noted	The Council agrees that Kentford has accommodated a relatively high level of growth in recent years, and is only proposing to allocate sites that already have planning permission (K/10 and K/16).
<i>Question K1</i>				
23026 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23543 - Meddler Properties Ltd [6654]	Comment	<p>The SIR states that the Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Appraisal (IECA, 2009), considered the environmental capacity of market towns, key service centres and primary villages and the need for and means of providing and maintaining social, physical and Environmental infrastructure to support growth in Forest Heath for the periods to 2021. A fundamental outcome of the 2009 study is that the IECA identified that there were no capacity issues that could not be overcome through appropriate mitigation measures. Similarly, the AECOM transport study (2009) found that the broad locations of growth as defined at the time the Core Strategy was adopted were all feasible, that is there were no 'show-stoppers' identified.</p> <p>The site allocations consultation document highlights a potential yield of 2000+ units in Kentford, as a minimum FHDC should plan to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements commensurate with a Primary Village. Site K/02 would provide much needed open space/green infrastructure (highlighted as a deficiency in both the 2009 IECA and 2015 IDP update). FHDC, in preparing and testing reasonable alternatives, should consider much higher levels of growth for Kentford. This could include consideration of infrastructure provision that would be capable of upgrading Kentford to a Key Service Centre (if further viability testing and IDP updates indicate services can be provided to support closer to 2000 units).</p>	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23530 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Comment	<p>Kentford has been developing as a ribbon along the B1506 and has left the community with no heart. As a Council we have opposed the large scale development of this village as it lacks the infrastructure to form a sustainable community, with the construction of Farriers Grange and Lambert Grove, and the granting of permission for the rear of Kentford Lodge the dynamics have changed. It is more important than ever to achieve the necessary improvements to infrastructure therefore we support the development of sites K2 (Meddler Stud) and K16 (land to the Rear of Cock Public House) as these would give a centre to the village and allow the provision of links of paths or roads away from the main thoroughfare and 106 monies could be sought to provide a footpath from Kentford to Moulton school. K04 (Land North of Bury Road) and K17 (Land between Bury Road and A14) should be designated for commercial use. K01 (Land east of Moulton Road - Boat Meadow) is largely in the flood plain and we would object to its development for this reason.</p>	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.
23562 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>High growth is identified for all options reflecting the existing commitments, and a potential appeal. The village has so far been subject to piecemeal development and failed to secure the necessary infrastructure needed to improve the sustainability of the village. Persimmon Homes support an approach for allowing additional growth within the Kentford on the basis that the necessary infrastructure and improvements are also brought forward.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes has engaged with the Parish Council and understands that the village is intending to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. Persimmon Homes are committed to working with the Parish in order to establish whether the community may choose some additional development in the village if it could enable the provision of community facilities to meet a local need.</p> <p>Therefore, Kentford could be identified for up to 200 dwellings to enable Site K/14 to come forward for up to 60 dwellings with community facilities, should it be supported by the village.</p>	Response noted	The council disagrees with this view. Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23303 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	AHT considers that additional growth should indeed take place at Kentford accompanied by the necessary infrastructure, at least at the level proposed by the Council in all four options in the Single Issue Review. Kentford is the only settlement defined as a primary village in this part of the District, and is located only about 7.4 km from Newmarket, where employment and higher order services may be obtained. However, for reasons given in response to Question K3, most of the sites put forward as having potential for development are subject to various constraints, reducing the range of choice in meeting requirements in the village.	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.
23061 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	Please see attached report and masterplan.	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.
22723 - Mr and Mrs R & S Cade [12613]	Comment	We would ask that the following be addressed before any further development is considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Time is granted to allow planned and in-progress developments to be completed, and the subsequent impact of these developments properly assessed</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of infrastructure improvements required due to the massive increase in homes in recent years</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Parish and settlement boundary issues resolved</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Provision of green, recreational space (including play area(s))</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Resolution of local issues relating to school places</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of traffic calming/speed moderation measures</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Alternative HGV route signs (to reduce the number of HGVs using the Bell crossroads)</li> </ul>	Response noted	The Council agrees that Kentford has accommodated a relatively high level of growth in recent years, and is only proposing to allocate sites that already have planning permission (K/10 and K/16).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22595 - Kentford Parish Council (Mr Malcolm Baker) [12577]	Object	<p>The village needs to absorb the already planned developments before the question can be considered and further growth approved. In addition, Kentford has virtually met its high growth of 130-140 houses request, so additional development would be beyond the scope of each option.</p> <p><i>it needs to be recognised that Kentford has virtually already taken its development quota for all 4 options - 117 in large developments plus 9 individual houses making 126. There is the potential to add small scale ( less than 10) housing developments to reach the upper end of the 130-140 quota.</i></p>	Response noted	The Council agrees that Kentford has accommodated a relatively high level of growth in recent years, and is only proposing to allocate sites that already have planning permission (K/10 and K/16).
<i>K/01 Land east of Moulton Road</i>				
23868 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>This site, as the SALP document acknowledges lies in Flood Risk Zone (FRZ) 3. It does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 100 to 103. There are many other sites in Kentford not located in FRZ 3, meaning that this site does not pass the Sequential Test, and that as a result, the Exception Test cannot be applied.</p> <p>The site should not be allocated, for this reason alone.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- flood zone 3</li> <li>- currently in equine use</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23768 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown), and to enable archaeological strategies to be developed. This large site lies in an area of archaeological potential, on the edge of the River Kennett in an area topographically favourable for early occupation</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known fluvial flood risk and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	Omission site * Flood zone 3 * Currently in equine use

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved. Edgeborough Close is not a desirable route for vehicles without upgrading.</p>		
23537 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Object	K01 (Land east of Moulton Road - Boat Meadow) is largely in the flood plain and we would object to its development for this reason.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Flood zone 3</p> <p>* Currently in equine use</p>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*K/02 Meddler Stud*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23632 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>The following comments identify constraints on sites and the potential for archaeological preservation and investigation requirements that might pose a barrier to delivery.</p> <p>The following sites may present particular challenges and may not be deliverable:</p> <p>Kentford 2 - Allocation includes an area which was previously agreed for in situ preservation of earthworks.</p> <p>The site allocation area should be modified to secure preservation in situ where appropriate of earthworks in the South-western part of the site, as identified through the planning process for previous applications (DC/14/0585). Development of the rest of the site should be subject to a condition relating to archaeological works. A first stage of evaluation revealed particular potential for prehistoric remains. There is a need to complete the programme of archaeological trial trenching to further refine archaeological strategies. Earthwork survey revealed surviving earthworks relating to early cultivation (rare for East Anglia). Previous planning recommendations were to secure preservation of these earthworks in situ.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently in equine use</li> <li>- Flood zone 3 covers much of the western part of the site</li> <li>- SPA buffer zone but screened by existing development</li> <li>- Development of the site in this strategic gap would represent a loss in terms of visual amenity and the contribution it makes to the character of the village.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT known fluvial flood risk (Flood Zone 3) and pluvial flooding within the flood zone.</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>		
23869 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	The current position set out in the consultation document is noted, in particular that an appeal was lodged in June 2015. In the event of the appeal being dismissed, it is considered that the site should be given no further consideration in the SALP process.	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- currently in equine use</li> <li>- flood zone 3 covers much of the western part of the site</li> <li>- SPA buffer zone but screened by existing development</li> <li>- development of the site in this strategic gap would represent a loss in terms of visual amenity and the contribution it makes to the character of the village</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23533 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Support	It is more important than ever to achieve the necessary improvements to infrastructure therefore we support the development of sites K2 (Meddler Stud) and K16 (land to the Rear of Cock Public House) as these would give a centre to the village and allow the provision of links of paths or roads away from the main thoroughfare and 106 monies could be sought to provide a footpath from Kentford to Moulton school.	noted	Omission site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Currently in equine use</li> <li>* Flood zone 3 covers much of the western part of site</li> <li>* SPA buffer zone but screened by existing development</li> <li>* Development of the site in this strategic gap would represent a loss in terms of visual amenity and the contribution it makes to the character of the village.</li> </ul>
<i>K/03 Land north of the A14</i>				
23870 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	The only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements. AHT considers that all the stated disadvantages are significant, and together more than sufficient to warrant giving this site no further consideration.  For these reasons, the site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer zone</li> <li>- the site would require significant new green infrastructure</li> <li>- short term impacts of the Brecks countryside</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23769 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown), and to enable archaeological strategies to be developed. This large area includes a known ring ditch (prehistoric funerary monument) towards its eastern edge.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Access will be close to the rail bridge and achieving the necessary level of visibility will be difficult to achieve. Consideration will need to be given to an emergency access.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* The site would require significant new green infrastructure</li> <li>* Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/04 Land north of Bury Road</i>				
23770 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. A prehistoric ring ditch is recorded on the southern site edge. The site has high archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Village entry treatment will need to be enhanced; dwellings likely to front onto highway. Sustainable travel provision required.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Potential noise and pollution issues from proximity to A14</li> <li>* The site would require significant new green infrastructure</li> <li>* Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23871 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	In this case, given the shape and orientation of the site, the fact that the western boundary of the site is adjacent to the settlement boundary is a very limited advantage. It is certainly not sufficient to overcome the stated disadvantages, which are significant, or the additional point that development of this site would involve a disproportionate eastward extension to the village in relation to the capacity of the site.  For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - SPA buffer zone - potential noise and pollution issues from proximity to A14 - the site would require significant new green infrastructure - short term impacts on the Brecks countryside
23535 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Support	K04 (Land North of Bury Road) and K17 (Land between Bury Road and A14) should be designated for commercial use.	Response noted	Omission site  * SPA buffer zone * Potential noise and pollution issues from proximity to A14 * The site would require significant new green infrastructure * Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside

K/05 South and east of Flint House, Bury Road (near village hall)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/05 South and east of Flint House, Bury Road (near village hall)</i>				
23771 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage to establish impacts of past Land-use. Ring ditches are present to the north and south of the site.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission withdrawn.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Potential gas risk associated with adjacent landfill site to the south</li> <li>* Development would be ribbon development</li> </ul>

K/05 South and east of Flint House, Bury Road (near village hall)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23872 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	The point made about the extent of the shared settlement and site boundary in relation to Site K/04 applies even more strongly here. The site would be extremely difficult to develop economically, especially if a single access point from the B1506 were required. The second stated disadvantage is probably sufficient to rule it out altogether, and like Site K/04, would represent a disproportionate eastward extension to the village.  For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Omission site - SPA buffer zone - potential gas risk associated with adjacent landfill site to the south - development would be ribbon development

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/06 Site opposite 1 to 4 Bury Road</i>				
23772 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>This large option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Many trees will need to be removed in order to achieve the required visibility, traffic calming measures need to be provided along with bus, cycle and pedestrian provision.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Greenfield wooded site that contributes to the sylvan character on the eastern gateway to the village.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23873 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>As with site K/03, the only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements.</p> <p>Turning to the disadvantages, the first bullet point understates the case: the site is not merely not adjacent to the settlement boundary, it is the furthest of all sites from the village. In locational terms, the only possible justification for its development would be in conjunction with the sites to the west including K/04 and K/05, whose own shortcomings have been summarised above. This critical disadvantage is strongly reinforced by the other two bullet points - the removal of 2.9 hectares of woodland could not be justified in these circumstances, and the widespread applicability of the buffer zone has already been referred to in the third paragraph of the response to this question.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer zone</li> <li>- not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>- greenfield wooded site that contributes to the sylvan character on the eastern gateway to the village</li> </ul>
22824 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	<p>This site is just to the west of three scheduled bowl barrows (not mentioned by the site description) and comprises woodland that helps to screen the scheduled monument from the west along Bury Road. Development of the site could impact on the significance of the monument, but this would be lessened if adequate screening remained. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.</p>	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Greenfield wooded site that contributes to the sylvan character on the eastern gateway to the village.</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/09 Fothergills, Gazeley Road</i>				
23773 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle to development but it will require a condition relating to archaeological investigation attached to any planning consent.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Pedestrian links into the village as well as junction improvements for Gazeley Road onto Bury Road.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* May constrain future expansion of adjoining employment site</li> <li>* Tree screen to the south that may be a constraint as mature trees would affect amenity (light to gardens and windows) of any residential development.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23874 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>First of all, the capacity of the site has been overestimated. If its area is indeed 1.5 hectares, then its capacity would be 45 dwellings at 30 dwellings per hectare, not 86 dwellings.</p> <p>Any development which could be inimical to sustaining economic activity in the village should be avoided, whether in relation to Fothergills or any other business.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPA buffer zone</li> <li>- may constrain future expansion of adjoining employment site</li> <li>- tree screen to the south that may be a constraint as mature trees would affect amenity (light to gardens and windows) of any residential development</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/10 Land west of Herringswell Road</i>				
23774 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle -site is being excavated under current consent, and an Anglo-Saxon settlement is being revealed. There may be outstanding post-excavation work for the current scheme</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy K1</p> <p>F/2013/0061/HYB planning permission for 60 dwellings 2015.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/13 Land to rear of Flint House</i>				
23775 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological desk-based assessment to establish the extent of previous quarrying/tipping would be required as a first stage. Two ring ditches were excavated prior to quarrying in 1973.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved without being linked to site ref: K/14. If accessed from Bury Road, would require traffic calming, trees clear of visibility and sustainable travel provision.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Former landfill site with potential gas risk</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* No existing trees or hedges - development would be visible from the B1506 and from the countryside immediately to the south.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23875 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>Like some other sites, the only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements.</p> <p>The first stated disadvantage is considered sufficient to rule this site out of any further consideration. At the same time, the other two are also important, and in particular, the site has a very poor relationship with the existing form of the village, and its development would represent a wholly disproportionate extension into the open countryside.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Former landfill site with potential gas risk</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* No existing trees or hedges - development would be visible from the B1506 and from the countryside immediately to the south.</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*K/14 Land east of Gazeley Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23565 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>The analysis contained within the appendices and comments contained within this report demonstrate the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The proposed site (Land of Gazeley Road) is located in a sustainable location that would enable residents/occupiers to walk safely (subject to upgrades to footpath links in the immediate vicinity of the site) safely to Kentford Village Centre, Bus Stops and Train Station.</li> <li>* The scale of growth proposed from the site will not impact upon the local highway network, but will provide the opportunity for further upgrades to highways infrastructure to the village of Kentford as well as providing direct upgrades to mitigate against the development itself.</li> <li>* The site is subject to the necessary assessments that have identified no impact upon the Stone Curlew SPA buffer would arise from the development.</li> <li>* The Environmental Assessment has identified that other than a small strip of land running along the eastern boundary of the site (Zone 2), the site will not pose a risk to residential development.</li> <li>* The promoted site deliverable providing the security of supporting housing supply numbers in the district, whilst also providing opportunities to bring forward some identified infrastructure that other developments have failed to and in doing so making up for a shortfall in overall infrastructure within the village.</li> </ul> <p>To conclude; Question K1 of the Site Allocations Local Plan, Further issues and options consultation asks; Question K1: Do you consider additional growth should take place with necessary infrastructure improvements?</p> <p>As concluded in the Single Issue Review Representations Kentford could be identified for up to 200 dwellings to enable to site to come forward should it be supported by the community. Persimmon Homes supports an approach for allowing additional growth with in the Village of Kentford on the basis that the necessary infrastructure and improvements are also brought forward. The village has so far been subject to piecemeal development and failed to secure the necessary infrastructure. Much of this has been down to the challenging task of providing enough identifiable</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Former landfill site with potential gas risk</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* The form of development on this site would be in conflict with the linear character of the village.</li> <li>* The site is defined by the strong tree belts to the north and south and the hedge to the western side.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>housing land to meet the demand for housing in the district and has subsequently allowed some proposals to be approved with out a Site Allocations Local Plan in place. Persimmon Homes has engaged with the Parish council on several occasions to date in order to establish the local needs for the village and build a working relationship with the council so that all parties can be included within the planning process. Our site provides the opportunity to meet demands of both local and national planning requirements but also those of the Parish and Local Residents, therefore site K/14 should be allocated for residential development in the Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p>		
23876 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>Once again, the only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements.</p> <p>The fact that the site is adjacent to Site K/13 weighs heavily against it, in our opinion. Furthermore, any development would be detached from the village unless Site K/10 were also developed, which we consider for the reasons given above should not go ahead.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p>	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Former landfill site with potential gas risk</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* The form of development on this site would be in conflict with the linear character of the village.</li> <li>* The site is defined by the strong tree belts to the north and south and the hedge to the western side.</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23776 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological evaluation has been undertaken in advance of previous consent. No further works required - although developments with substantial and deep impacts in areas of palaeochannels may require a condition for further work</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Links into village along with junction improvements for Gazeley Road onto Bury Road required as well as traffic calming and sustainable travel provision.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* SPA buffer zone</li> <li>* Former landfill site with potential gas risk</li> <li>* Not adjacent to the settlement boundary</li> <li>* The form of development on this site would be in conflict with the linear character of the village.</li> <li>* The site is defined by the strong tree belts to the north and south and the hedge to the western side.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>K/16 Land to the rear Cock Public House</i>				
23777 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Archaeological evaluation would be required as a first stage.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Statement (TS) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation as part of Policy K1</p> <p>DC/14/2203/OUT planning permission for 34 dwellings November 2015 (subject to a Section 106 agreement).</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23877 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	As suggested above in our general comments, any site constrained by its location in the 1500 metre buffer zone of the Breckland SPA should not be allocated in a situation where there are suitable sites not affected in this way. In addition, development of the site could result in a significant loss of trees.  For these reasons, the site should not be allocated.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy K1  DC/14/2203/OUT planning permission for 34 dwellings November 2015 (subject to a Section 106 agreement).
23534 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Support	It is more important than ever to achieve the necessary improvements to infrastructure therefore we support the development of sites K2 (Meddler Stud) and K16 (land to the Rear of Cock Public House) as these would give a centre to the village and allow the provision of links of paths or roads away from the main thoroughfare and 106 monies could be sought to provide a footpath from Kentford to Moulton school.	Response noted	Proposed site allocation as part of Policy K1  DC/14/2203/OUT planning permission for 34 dwellings November 2015 (subject to a Section 106 agreement).
<i>K/17 Site land between Bury Road and A14</i>				
23278 - Stockton Green Ltd (Mr J Gredley) [12693]	Comment	This representation addresses the "pros and cons" enumerated in the draft document and comments on further work to be undertaken to properly assess this potential site allocation. This is the only site identified for potential employment use of the 17 site identified in Kentford.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Site not adjacent to settlement boundary * Development of the site for employment uses would represent ribbon development and would have a potential effect on the amenity of the village. * Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23778 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development process, prior to decisions on site layout, to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown), and to enable archaeological strategies to be developed. This site occupies higher ground which formerly overlooked Slade Bottom to the north, and it is in the vicinity of three prehistoric ring ditches which, as a group, are a scheduled monument (31110). The site has topographic potential for early activity and has not been systematically investigated. Geophysical survey would be required in the first instance</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Access to meet standards set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainable travel provision required and travel plan adopted.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Site not adjacent to settlement boundary</li> <li>* Development of the site for employment uses would represent ribbon development and would have a potential effect on the amenity of the village.</li> <li>* Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22825 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	This site is just to the north of three scheduled bowl barrows. The existing depot is largely obscured from the scheduled monument by the woodland to the west and trees along Bury Road. However, development of the whole site for employment could result in the expansion of large buildings eastwards and intruding on the setting of the scheduled monument. The significance of the heritage asset could therefore be affected. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts.	Response noted. Consider references as suggested in 'preferred options' and potential impact of development on heritage asset(s).	Omission site * Site not adjacent to settlement boundary * Development of the site for employment uses would represent ribbon development and would have a potential effect on the amenity of the village. * Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside.
23536 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Support	K04 (Land North of Bury Road) and K17 (Land between Bury Road and A14) should be designated for commercial use.	noted	Omission site * Site not adjacent to settlement boundary * Development of the site for employment uses would represent ribbon development and would have a potential effect on the amenity of the village. * Short term impacts on the Brecks countryside.
<i>Question K2</i>				
23375 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	K/01, K/03, K/04, K/05, K/06, K/09, K/10, K/13, K/14, K/16, K/17 - the NHG does not have any concerns about the suggested development at these sites.	Response noted	Only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22724 - Mr and Mrs R & S Cade [12613]	Comment	<p>Notwithstanding our answer to K1</p> <p>1) K/03 No specific opposition subject to satisfactory HRA Would require significant improvements to Herringswell/Gazeley Road junction in addition to traffic control, and noise and speed mitigation measures.</p> <p>2) K/04 Minimal impact on existing junctions (The Bell, and Herringswell/Gazeley Road) Good visibility of traffic using B1506 Minimal impact of existing residents Minimal impact regarding flood risk issues Extended speed restriction zone Opportunity to improve A14 with slip road access westbound (towards Cambridge)</p> <p>3) K/09 No specific opposition subject to satisfactory HRA Would require significant improvements to Herringswell/Gazeley Road junction in addition to traffic control, and noise and speed mitigation measures.</p> <p>4) K/13 No specific opposition subject to satisfactory HRA Brownfield site? Currently in agricultural use? Minimal impact of existing residents Extended speed restriction zone</p> <p>5) K/14 Minimal impact on existing residents Distributes development 'around' village Would require significant improvements to Herringswell/Gazeley Road junction in addition to traffic control, and noise and speed mitigation measures.</p> <p>K09, K13 and K14 could be considered together with suitable access provided through all three sites to Bury Road. This would alleviate any traffic issues at the Herringswell/Gazeley Road junction.</p>	Response noted	Only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document. None of the sites listed here are included for allocation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23544 - Meddler Properties Ltd [6654]	Comment	<p>Notwithstanding the outcome of the outstanding planning appeal, Site K/02 should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>The site is located in the very centre of the settlement and residential development on the site would link the east and western parts and consolidate the form of the village. It is also capable of providing public open space in a central location, highly accessible to existing and future residents of the village which would help to address existing deficiencies.</p> <p>The site is currently in agricultural use and the equine constraint policies do not apply to this site. Only the western edge (approximately 20%) of the site is within the flood zone. Illustrative masterplans submitted with previous planning applications have demonstrated how the site can be developed for housing (up to 133 dwellings) without being unduly constrained by the flood zone.</p> <p>Natural England has previously accepted that that residential development of 133 dwellings would not adversely impact the SPA due to screening provided by existing development in the settlement.</p> <p>Having regard to the above, there are no constraints to residential development of the site.</p>	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.
23027 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23563 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	The Site Allocations representation (October 2014) is attached for Site K/14, which provides more information on the deliverability of the site, including how constraints have been successfully addressed.	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23304 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>AHT considers that land east of its existing premises, and south of the Bloor Homes development under construction, referenced as Site K/11 in the 2015 SHLAA, which has an estimated capacity of 30 to 50 dwellings, should be allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Local Plan.</p> <p>The reasons are set out in detail in the Development Framework Document submitted at the same time as these representations. In summary, the reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> It is a sustainable site, and would help to round off and consolidate development in a part of the village where housing is currently under construction;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The site does not suffer from the constraints and disadvantages which apply to most of the other sites in Kentford under consideration;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> It will be economical in its demands on existing infrastructure; and</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> It is fully compliant, or can be made compliant, with all applicable policies of the Forest Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD.</li> </ul>	Site K/11 was granted planning permission in November 2014 (reference DC/14/0692/FUL) and as development commenced in March 2015 is not appropriate as an allocation.	Site K/11 was granted planning permission in November 2014 (reference DC/14/0692/FUL) and as development commenced in March 2015 is not appropriate as an allocation. This is noted in a table in the SALP Further Issues & Options document.
23879 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	<p>Our client has confirmed that Site: K/05 South and East of Flint House, Bury Road (Near Village Hall), Site: K/06 Site Opposite 1 to 4 Bury Road and Site: K/13 Land to Rear Flint House Site: can be considered as one land parcel. Through this representation we are also introducing a site to the south of K/13 and K/6 for consideration.</p> <p>Site K/14 is not within the control of our client, however we recognise that by providing development at K/5, K/6 and K/13 we can provide access to K/14 which would not impact on Gazeley Road. We view Site K/14 as a reserve site which, subject to market demands, could be delivered as a phase of development beyond 2025.</p>	Response noted	Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.
<i>Question K3</i>				
23470 - Racehorse Owners Association (Mr Richard Wayman) [12670]	Comment	K/03 should be retained for the benefit of the horse racing industry	Response noted.	Only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23028 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23305 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>The consultation document, perhaps necessarily, makes no judgment about the weight to be attached to the specific pros and cons set out for each site, nor to their overall balance. This response attempts to make such judgments, for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>First of all, however, the advantage that sites, depending on their size, would make a contribution to meeting housing requirements can be set aside, simply because it applies to all of them.</p> <p>Secondly, many of the sites lie within the 1500 metre buffer zone of the Breckland SPA and require a project level Habitat Regulations Assessment to demonstrate that the development of the site in question would not have an adverse impact.</p> <p>As in the case of flood risk (see below in respect of site K/01) it would be appropriate to avoid the allocation of sites so constrained if there are others, as in the case of Kentford, which are not affected by these constraints. There may be circumstances elsewhere in the District where such sites do need to be allocated, along with appropriate mitigation measures, but not here.</p> <p>Site K/01 Land East of Moulton Road This site, as the SALP document acknowledges lies in Flood Risk Zone (FRZ) 3. It does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraphs 100 to 103. There are many other sites in Kentford not located in FRZ 3, meaning that this site does not pass the Sequential Test, and that as a result, the Exception Test cannot be applied.</p> <p>The site should not be allocated, for this reason alone.</p> <p>Site: K/02 Meddler Stud The current position set out in the consultation document is noted, in particular that an appeal was lodged in June 2015. In the event of the appeal being dismissed, it is considered that the site should be given no further consideration in the SALP process.</p> <p>Site K/03 Land north of the A14 The only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements. AHT considers that all the stated disadvantages are significant, and together more than sufficient to warrant giving this site no further consideration.</p> <p>For these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/04 Land north of Bury Road In this case, given the shape and orientation of the</p>	Responses noted - these will inform further assessments of these sites.	One of the sites listed, K/16 has planning permission and is one of the two sites allocated in Policy K1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>site, the fact that the western boundary of the site is adjacent to the settlement boundary is a very limited advantage. It is certainly not sufficient to overcome the stated disadvantages, which are significant, or the additional point that development of this site would involve a disproportionate eastward extension to the village in relation to the capacity of the site.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/05 South and east of Flint House, Bury Road (near village hall) The point made about the extent of the shared settlement and site boundary in relation to Site K/04</p> <p>applies even more strongly here. The site would be extremely difficult to develop economically, especially if a single access point from the B1506 were required. The second stated disadvantage is probably sufficient to rule it out altogether, and like Site K/04, would represent a disproportionate eastward extension to the village.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/06 Site opposite 1 to 4 Bury Road</p> <p>As with site K/03, the only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements. Turning to the disadvantages, the first bullet point understates the case: the site is not merely not adjacent to the settlement boundary, it is the furthest of all sites from the village. In locational terms, the only possible justification for its development would be in conjunction with the sites to the west including K/04 and K/05, whose own shortcomings have been summarised above. This critical disadvantage is strongly reinforced by the other two bullet points - the removal of 2.9 hectares of woodland could not be justified in these circumstances, and the widespread applicability of the buffer zone has already been referred to in the third paragraph of the response to this question.</p> <p>For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/09 Fothergills, Gazeley Road</p> <p>First of all, the capacity of the site has been overestimated. If its area is indeed 1.5 hectares, then its</p> <p>capacity would be 45 dwellings at 30 dwellings per hectare, not 86 dwellings. Any development which could be inimical to sustaining economic activity in the village should be</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>avoided, whether in relation to Fothergills or any other business.</p> <p>For this reason, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/13 Land to rear Flint House</p> <p>Like some other sites, the only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements. The first stated disadvantage is considered sufficient to rule this site out of any further consideration. At the same time, the other two are also important, and in particular, the site has a very poor relationship with the existing form of the village, and its development would represent a wholly disproportionate extension into the open countryside. For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/14 Land east of Gazeley Road</p> <p>Once again, the only stated advantage of this site is that it could make a contribution to meeting housing requirements. The fact that the site is adjacent to Site K/13 weighs heavily against it, in our opinion. Furthermore, any development would be detached from the village unless Site K/10 were also developed, which we consider for the reasons given above should not go ahead. For all these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p> <p>Site K/16 Land to the rear Cock Public House</p> <p>As suggested above in our general comments, any site constrained by its location in the 1500 metre buffer zone of the Breckland SPA should not be allocated in a situation where there are suitable sites not affected in this way. In addition, development of the site could result in a significant loss of trees. For these reasons, the site should not be allocated.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22725 - Mr and Mrs R & S Cade [12613]	Comment	<p>Answer K3:</p> <p>1) K/01 No additional development should be considered on any site that is within flood zone 2 or 3 No development should be considered on land that is, or was, associated with the RTE</p> <p>2) K/02 No development should be considered on land that is, or was, associated with the RTE The conversion of this site to 'agricultural use' is a deliberate tactic to overcome policy DM49. Although the site was 'ploughed' earlier this year, no crops have been planted. The loss of horses and green paddocks is of great detriment to the village.</p> <p>3) K/05 No 'buffer' between development and B1506 (i.e. the development would be directly adjacent to the main road).</p> <p>4) K/06 Loss of natural, wooded land which acts as a screen (sight and sound) to the A14</p> <p>5) K/16 Loss of parking at the Cock public house Would feed commuters directly onto an already busy section of Bury Road Impact directly on existing residents Loss of trees and 'natural' space</p> <p>6) K/17 Assessment needed to determine 'attractiveness' of site to businesses No westbound access to A14 Commercial traffic would be required to travel along already busy Bury Road to access A11 and A14 westbound.</p>	Response noted	One of the sites listed, K/16 has planning permission and is one of the two sites allocated in Policy K1.
23376 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	<p>K/02 - The NHG objects to the loss of this existing horse-racing facility. The NHG considers that the owner's recent decision to plough the site and let it to an agricultural tenant does not mean that it is no longer suitable for horse-racing uses.</p>	Response noted - Appeal decision awaited.	Only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23545 - Meddler Properties Ltd [6654]	Comment	Depending on the overall housing requirements and distribution to Kentford, there may be a need to allocate various sites within Kentford, but none of these should be preferred over Site K/02 as this site is: * the most centrally and sustainably located site in the settlement; and * capable of addressing existing infrastructure deficiencies, particularly open space; and unconstrained for residential development.	Response noted	Only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.  Site K/02 - appeal decision awaited.
23501 - Newmarket Racecourses (Ms Amy Starkey ) [6377]	Comment	K/02 - this is an existing horseracing site and should not be developed for non racing related uses.	Response noted	Only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.  Site K/02 - appeal decision awaited.
22873 - Mr Justin Wadham [12641]	Comment	The K/02 site is already horseracing related and should be retained for the benefit of the industry.	Response noted	Planning permission has been refused by the Council on Site K/02, and the appeal decision is awaited.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23880 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	<p>Site: K/01 Land East of Moulton Road should not be allocated as it is heavily constrained by Flood Zone 3 status and is used for horse racing industry purposes. Access from this site to the main commuter routes would result in further traffic movements through the B1506 (Bury Road) and Moulton Road junction which at peak times is currently operating at capacity.</p> <p>Sites K/03, K/04 and K/17 are all adjacent the A14 and would be heavily constrained by noise and air pollution. K/17 and K/3 are also not adjacent the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The development of site K/09 for residential purposes could restrict the ability of the adjoining employment site to expand. The development of K/09 and the associated loss of employment land would not be considered to be a sustainable action; therefore site K/09 should not be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>Site K/02 is not considered to be suitable for allocation as it is in equestrian use. The details submitted with the planning application do not provide sufficient detail to overcome this matter and therefore its allocation would be contrary to the Councils adopted Development Management policies.</p> <p>The application which has been submitted for the development of Site K/16 has been examined and we consider that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site which does not provide any benefits to the wider community in terms of recreational open space. We consider that the planning application should be refused and therefore not allocated within the Local Plan.</p> <p>We note that planning approval for development at site K/10 has previously been granted and therefore it is a committed site which should not be included in the allocations.</p> <p>Site K/14 would result in significant pressures being placed on the Bury Road/Gazeley Road junction and should only be allocated as a 'Reserve Site' to be accessed through the delivery of the sites promoted</p>	Response noted	One of the sites listed, K/16 has planning permission and is one of the two sites allocated in Policy K1.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		through this representation.		
<i>Question K4</i>				
23029 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23822 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Comment	We have included a site to the south of K/13 and K/06 within our representation.	Response noted	Noted, however Kentford has accommodated a relatively high amount of growth in recent years, and consequently only sites that already have planning permission are proposed as allocations (K/10 and K/16) in the SALP Preferred Options document.
23377 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	No	Response noted	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23823 - Moulton Parish Council (Mrs L Stone) [5222]	Comment	<p>Moulton Parish Council was advised in 2011 that the review of the out of date settlement boundary could only be addressed through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document process, when all other development sites and potential settlement boundary amendments within the District were consulted upon. Whilst it is acknowledged that the settlement boundaries are not subject to the August 2015 Forest Heath Local Plan consultation, the Chairman of Moulton Parish Council was advised by Marie Smith, the Planning Services Manager, that these concerns should be raised at this point in time, so that the issues could be considered for inclusion in the next round of consultations.</p> <p>Moulton Parish Council requests that the current out of date settlement boundary for Moulton village should be extended to reflect the houses which form part of the village of Moulton and include the dwellings around the Playing Field and Village Green, Brookside, and properties on Gazeley Hill and Griffiths Yard. The boundary should also be revised to include the triangle of land on which Moulton School is located, extending to the piece of land which borders the footpath.</p> <p>In addition the dwellings which adjoin the settlement boundary behind The Street should be included within the boundary.</p> <p>Finally it is noted that the land currently being developed at Moulton End, but included within the consultation document for Kentford and referred to as K/11 Land at the Animal Health Trust is outside the settlement boundary for Kentford. Opportunity should be taken to amend the boundary to reflect the Bloor Homes Lambert Grove development within the Kentford Settlement Boundary.</p>	Response noted	The settlement boundaries for the secondary villages have been reviewed and no revisions are proposed for Moulton, with the exception of a site for school expansion
23306 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	Please see the response to Question K2; otherwise	Response noted	
22726 - Mr and Mrs R & S Cade [12613]	Comment	NO	Response noted	noted

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>6.4.1-6.4.2</i>				
22743 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	Although we agree that West Row should be a Prime Village we disagree that our infrastructure should be considered to be linked with Mildenhall any more than any other village in the area . If anything we are more self contained than many others and only joined by a very poor road network .  <i>We obviously need our own community council in order to be considered separate .</i>	Response noted. Infrastructure issues to be considered within the context of the emerging IDP.	Noted. The final bullet point of paragraph 6.4.2 reflects the proximity and relationship of West Row as a Primary Village with the nearest town, Mildenhall, in the settlement hierarchy and is a matter of fact.
<i>Planning constraints map</i>				
22744 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Support	We believe the settlement boundary to be correct .There is scope for development within the boundary and most of what is outside is prime agricultural land .	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured form development to be maximised. These will include strategic landscaping, recreational open space, enhancement and promotion of walking routes, and will contribute to expanding the primary school.
<i>6.4.3-6.4.7</i>				
22745 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Support	Absolutely small scale and to meet local needs .	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured form development to be maximised. These will include strategic landscaping, recreational open space, enhancement and promotion of walking routes, and will contribute to expanding the primary school.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question WR1</i>				
23564 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Comment	<p>West Row could accommodate low growth.</p> <p>Options 1 to 3 (low growth) should be adopted as Option 4 (high growth of 290-320 dwellings) is in excess of the infrastructure capacity of the village as identified in the IDP.</p> <p>There are other Primary Villages with significantly higher capacity and fewer constraints e.g. Exning that should accommodate a higher level of growth to deliver housing and bolster the sustainability of the settlement.</p> <p>Table 6.3 of the HRA (Screening of housing distributions for potential disturbance to Annex I birds) states that likely significant effects cannot be ruled out for any of the Options at West Row and recommends Appropriate Assessment.</p>	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07, on a scale appropriate to its status as a Primary Village in line with Policy CS1. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured form development to be maximised.
23503 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	<p>West Row should be allocated additional housing growth in the period to 2031. The adopted Core Strategy identifies West Row as a sustainable location for development.</p> <p>Given the constraints to development across the rest of the District sustainable locations for development should receive allocations in the plan period in order to deliver the housing that is needed</p>	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured form development to be maximised.
23030 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
22746 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Comment	At the moment growth is limited by the infrastructure . Any small scale growth will require infrastructure improvements .	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured form development to be maximised.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22611 - Mrs Alana Stevens [5469]	Comment	<p>we have a lot of rented property, when Mildenhall closes there will be a lot of housing available, also the base offers opportunity to build housing without filling all the smaller villages up.</p> <p>Affordable housing is in need, I believe with the large number of houses being suggested in Millennial and its new hub being towards West Row that we should have a moderate level of new development not a high one.</p> <p>I believe access and amenities are of great importance for any development</p> <p>there are plots towards Pollards lane extra that would be spread development and bit more evenly.</p> <p>Road improvements that would a great difference a mini roundabout at the junction of Mildenhall Rd and Jarmans Lane.</p>	Response noted.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the government will be selling off RAF Mildenhall for housing once the United States Air Force vacates the base in 2022. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Core Strategy Single Issue Review. Should this position change during the plan period, the Council will immediately commence a review of the Local Plan.
<hr/>				
<b>6.4.8-6.4.12</b>				
22826 - Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge) [12636]	Comment	There are a number of listed buildings in West Row, all listed at Grade II. Sites WR/01, WR/04, WR/07, WR/15, WR/27 and WR/33 have the potential to affect the significance of specific listed buildings through development within their setting. Further assessment of potential impacts is necessary and any site allocation will need to be justified in terms of its heritage impacts. If sites are taken forward for allocation, appropriate development criteria would need to be set.	Response noted	It is only proposed to allocate one site in West Row, WR/07. A planning application (DC/14/2047/HYB) for 138 dwellings is currently under consideration. The heritage impacts of development will be fully considered.
<hr/>				
22747 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Comment	No site should be included that is so far outside of the future plan that it has no hope of being developed .	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured from development to be maximised. These will include strategic landscaping, recreational open space, enhancement and promotion of walking routes, and will contribute to expanding the primary school.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/01 Land south of Chapel Road</i>				
23344 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Alternative option rejected:  * Planning permission for 7 dwellings granted February 2015 (DC/14/2407/OUT). * Capacity of the site is likely to be reduced by the need to respect the setting of the listed buildings to the north west and east of the site. * Development at a larger scale would be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23779 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Dwellings likely to have frontages. Sustainable travel provision to include a crossing point to access village amenities.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <p>* Planning permission for 7 dwellings granted February 2015 (DC/14/2407/OUT).</p> <p>* Capacity of the site is likely to be reduced by the need to respect the setting of the listed buildings to the north west and east of the site.</p> <p>* Development at a larger scale would be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22748 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	If we remain as a prime village this site contains our entire quota until 2031 .Chapel Road is not even a C road and prone to flooding at this point . This is completely out of scale for a small community village with poor road and transport links .	Response noted. Infrastructure issues to be considered within the context of the emerging IDP.	Alternative option rejected: * Planning permission for 7 dwellings granted February 2015 (DC/14/2407/OUT). * Capacity of the site is likely to be reduced by the need to respect th setting of the listed buildings to the north west and east of the site. * Development at a larger scale would be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.
		<i>This site should be taken out .</i>		
23082 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	This is historically the green heart of the village to which to which most of us are attached .The loss of this amenity would damage the village . This is a villge asset that once lost cannot be regained .	Noted	Alternative option rejected: * Planning permission for 7 dwellings granted February 2015 (DC/14/2407/OUT). * Capacity of the site is likely to be reduced by the need to respect th setting of the listed buildings to the north west and east of the site. * Development at a larger scale would be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.
		<i>Must be removed from the plan .</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/02 Land off Pott Hall Road</i>				
23780 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is on the settlement edge in a location topographically favourable for early occupation</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Dwellings likely to have frontages. Sustainable travel provision required to access village amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* This small site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row.</p> <p>* Trees and hedgerows on/close to the southern boundary should be retained.</p> <p>* It is within the settlement boundary and could come forward as windfall - no need to allocate.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/04 Land at the junction of Jarman's Lane and Beeches Road</i>				
23781 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Dwellings likely to have frontages. Sustainable travel provision required to access village amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Rural edge of village site outside the settlement boundary.</li> <li>* Potential impact on the setting of a listed building adjoining the site boundary.</li> <li>* Loss of vegetation would potentially have a significant effect on the intimate landscape character of the area.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/06 Land north of Mildenhall Road</i>				
23782 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>The archaeological condition has been fulfilled on a previous consent, so no need for further work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Outline planning permission for up to 26 dwellings (DC/14/0632/OUT) December 2014.</p> <p>Site proposed to be included in revised settlement boundary.</p>
22749 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	<p>The road at this point is dangerous and this development will just make it worse . It is in it's latest form out of character for a small village .It is out side the envelope and too large .</p> <p><i>Revert to the original plan .</i></p>	<p>Response noted. Check with Suffolk CC Highways</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/07 Land east of Beeches Road</i>				
23343 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Proposed site allocation Policy WR1  Proposed allocation forms part of a larger site, DC/14/2047/HYB (full application for 131 dwellings, and outline for 7 dwellings) not yet determined.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23783 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. Fieldwork for archaeological evaluation has identified Roman remains on the site, and there will be a need for archaeological excavation.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Proposed site allocation Policy WR1</p> <p>Proposed allocation forms part of a larger site, DC/14/2047/HYB (full application for 131 dwellings, and outline for 7 dwellings) not yet determined.</p>

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
22750 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	<p>This huge development cannot be justified on any criteria . Housing need ,Sustainability or Infrastructure . It doesn` t work on any level and has the potential to ruin our small historic village .It would also be built on some of the best prime farmland in Suffolk that was entrusted to Count Farms for the next generations .</p> <p><i>There is little hope in a fair world that this can succeed so we would like it not to remain in the plan .</i></p>	Response noted	<p>Proposed site allocation Policy WR1</p> <p>Proposed allocation forms part of a larger site, DC/14/2047/HYB (full application for 131 dwellings, and outline for 7 dwellings) not yet determined.</p>
23506 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	<p>We consider that site WR/07 has advantages over the other sites identified as Potential Site Options. Other sites are not in as close proximity to the services and facilities in the village. Other sites do not relate as well as site WR/07 to the built up area of the village. Other sites cannot take the level of development proposed for West Row in one location which would reduce the benefits that can be achieved by a comprehensive development. These benefits include the amount and quality of open space and other infrastructure that could be provided.</p>	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/10 Land off Chapel Road</i>				
23784 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Dwellings likely to have frontages. Sustainable travel provision required to access village amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Part of a large field adjoining but outside the settlement boundary.</li> <li>* The site does not benefit from an existing boundary to provide screening and development would have a visual impact on the surrounding countryside, particularly in the short term. Rural edge of village site outside the settlement boundary.</li> <li>* Potential impact on the setting of a listed building adjoining the site boundary.</li> <li>* Loss of vegetation would potentially have a significant effect on the intimate landscape character of the area.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23345 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Part of a large field adjoining but outside the settlement boundary. * The site does not benefit from an existing boundary to provide screening and development would have a visual impact on the surrounding countryside, particularly in the short term. Rural edge of village site outside the settlement boundary. * Potential impact on the setting of a listed building adjoining the site boundary. * Loss of vegetation would potentially have a significant effect on the intimate landscape character of the area.
<i>WR/11 Land off Parker's Drove</i>				
23348 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary. Below size threshold for allocation. * Development on site WR/11 would inevitably lead to the removal of vegetation and the creation of access onto Parker's Drove and Shop Drove which would have an impact on the amenity provided by these rural routes, and be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area detrimental to the character of the area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23785 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Parkers Drove is not suitable for any more development without significant upgrading of the access onto Friday Street. Sustainable links required to access amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary. Below size threshold for allocation.</p> <p>* Development on site WR/11 would inevitably lead to the removal of vegetation and the creation of access onto Parker's Drove and Shop Drove which would have an impact on the amenity provided by these rural routes, and be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area detrimental to the character of the area.</p>



WR/12 Land adjacent to Park Garden, Friday Street

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/12 Land adjacent to Park Garden, Friday Street</i>				
23349 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	DC/14/2407/OUT - Outline planning permission for 7 dwellings approved in 2015.  Site proposed to be included in revised settlement boundary.
23089 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Comment	There are ongoing problems with this site in terms of access and traffic to the village .	Noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	DC/14/2407/OUT - Outline planning permission for 7 dwellings approved in 2015.  Site proposed to be included in revised settlement boundary.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23786 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological investigation was carried out for previous consents. No further work required.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>DC/14/2407/OUT - Outline planning permission for 7 dwellings approved in 2015.</p> <p>Site proposed to be included in revised settlement boundary.</p>

### *WR/13 Land behind St Peter's Church, Church Lane*

23347 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted</p> <p>- this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>* Development on site WR/13 would be a visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.</p>
---	---------	---	--	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23787 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is close to the church, and in an area topographically favourable for early occupation.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>If accessed from Church Lane, visibility will be required to Manual for Streets standards and be within control (or ownership_ of the applicant/promoter. Church Lane would also require upgrading to provide (at least) a footway.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>* Development on site WR/13 would be a visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23058 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	This site exits onto a small and particularly tricky section of road .The road past the church is in real terms single track .This is too many houses for this road and so close to the church .  <i>Reduce the number of houses .</i>	Noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued and setting of LB if church listed	Omission site  * Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary. * Development on site WR/13 would be a visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area that would be detrimental to the character of the area.
<i>WR/14 Off Friday Street, behind Williams Way</i>				
23350 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site  * Site is outside the settlement boundary * Grade 2 agricultural land. * Eastern part of site relates poorly to the form and character of the settlement. * The site does not benefit from an existing boundary to provide screening and development would have a visual impact on the surrounding countryside, particularly in the short term.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23788 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need cycle links to town facilities and separate access to industrial area.</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Site is outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Eastern part of site relates poorly to the form and character of the settlement.</li> <li>* The site does not benefit from an existing boundary to provide screening and development would have a visual impact on the surrounding countryside, particularly in the short term.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22751 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	It is already a poor entrance and this is too large an extension and creates an estate .	Response notes. Check with SSC Highways	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Site is outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Eastern part of site relates poorly to the form and character of the settlement.</li> <li>* The site does not benefit from an existing boundary to provide screening and development would have a visual impact on the surrounding countryside, particularly in the short term.</li> </ul>
		<i>Reduce the size .</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/15 Popes Farm, Church Lane</i>				
23789 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Sustainable travel provision required to access village amenities.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <p>* This small site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row.</p> <p>* Rural edge of village site outside the settlement boundary. Listed building adjoins site boundary.</p> <p>* Loss of vegetation would potentially have a significant effect on the intimate landscape character of the area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22752 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	Once again a too large development on Horse fields that are more needed than the houses in this village .	Response noted	Omission site * This small site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row. * Rural edge of village site outside the settlement boundary. Listed building adjoins site boundary. * Loss of vegetation would potentially have a significant effect on the intimate landscape character of the area.
		<i>Reduce the size .</i>		



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*WR/16 Land to north of Ferry Lane*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23652 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>West Row 16 and 33 - area of high archaeological potential. See note on early evaluation for WR33.</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is topographically favourable for early occupation close to the crossing point at Jude's Ferry and in the vicinity of archaeological finds from a range of dates. It is of high archaeological potential.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row.</li> <li>- Development would require demolition of tow new dwellings to form access</li> <li>- Grade 2 agricultural land</li> <li>- Development of this large greenfield site would have the potential to impact on the wider countryside, in particular the River Lark corridor to the south.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Transport Assessment (TA) required  Access onto Ferry Lane will require upgrading to estate road specification . Sustainable travel provision required to access village amenities.		
22753 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	Again horse fields in a pretty part or the village .Out of scale not sustainable . The roads leaving the village that end struggle to cope as it is .	Response noted. Check with SCC Highways	Omission site * This site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row. * Development would require demolition of two new dwellings to form access. * Grade 2 agricultural land. * Development of this large greenfield site would have the potential to impact on the wider countryside, in particular the River Lark corridor to the south.
		<i>Reduce the scale to what the village can cope with .</i>		

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*WR/17 Access between 114 & 118 Eldo Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23790 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* This small site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row.</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Would require demolition of a dwelling to create access.</li> <li>* Part of the site is prone to surface water flooding.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		modes of travel). Unable to determine how access can be achieved, provision for sustainable travel also required.		
23074 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	This part of Eldo road has particularly tight bends and is very narrow .To exit the site you would not have a long enough view down what at times is a busy road .  <i>A smaller number of houses on part of the site could possibly work .</i>	Noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site * This small site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row. * Grade 2 agricultural land. * Would require demolition of a dwelling to create access. * Part of the site is prone to surface water flooding.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/19 Land at junction of Mildenhall Road and Jarman's Lane</i>				
23791 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Small site outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Rural character</li> <li>* Development would require removal of existing vegetation and buildings.</li> <li>* Potential for significant detrimental effect on the landscape and rural character</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23079 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	<p>This is directly on top of the most dangerous junction in the village .During the morning school rush and the traffic for the Base there would be no safe way to leave the site . There is also no footpath into the village .</p> <p><i>This site has so many traffic issues that we can see no safe way to make it work .</i></p>	Noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Small site outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Rural character</li> <li>* Development would require removal of existing vegetation and buildings.</li> <li>* Potential for significant detrimental effect on the landscape and rural character</li> </ul>
<hr/>				
<i>WR/23 Land off Friday Street</i>				
23792 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Residential access should be separate from the industrial/commercial access</p>	The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Existing employment site</li> </ul>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23351 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.	Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.	Omission site * Existing employment site

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*WR/25 Land off Pott Hall Road*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23793 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS)</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <p>Although within the settlement boundary this site contributes to the character of the village and is further from the main services and facilities than the preferred site. The site also has a known pluvial flooding issue.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved, will need sustainable travel links to town facilities within the site and in the immediate area.</p>		
22754 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	<p>If the village were to grow this is not an unreasonable site . But this proposal is just too large .</p> <p><i>Reduce to a sustainable size .</i></p>	Response noted	<p>Alternative option rejected:</p> <p>Although within the settlement boundary this site contributes to the character of the village and is further from the main services and facilities than the preferred site. The site also has a known pluvial flooding issue.</p>
<i>WR/26 Land off Parkers Drove</i>				
23346 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Teresa Reed) [12695]	Comment	<p>The above sites are outside of the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but in areas that drain into the District. The Board's surface water receiving system has no residual capacity to accept increased rates of surface water run-off from newly created impermeable areas in connection with development proposals. Forest Heath District Council must ensure that a scheme for surface water accommodation is incorporated into any development of the sites. This will need to be provided at the developers' expense to protect the District. Any scheme must be adopted and maintained by a competent authority.</p>	<p>Response noted - this will inform further assessment of this site.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary.</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Development on site WR/26 would inevitably lead to the removal of vegetation and the creation of access onto Parker's Drove and Shop Drove which would have an impact on the amenity provided by these rural routes, and be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area detrimental to the character of the area.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23794 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>No objection in principle but in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, any permission granted should be the subject of planning condition to secure a programme of archaeological work. The site is in the historic settlement core of West Row</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The following is a brief commentary on surface water constraints currently recognised at the sites listed. Known fluvial (rivers and streams) and pluvial (surface water) flooding concerns have been identified but conditions might change over time. Where sites do not have any constraints listed, this does not negate the need to carry out assessment of flood risk in line with statutory requirements. Equally, constraints do not necessarily mean that sites cannot come forward for development.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>known pluvial flooding issue, which would need to be assessed and managed through the planning process</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary.</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Development on site WR/26 would inevitably lead to the removal of vegetation and the creation of access onto Parker's Drove and Shop Drove which would have an impact on the amenity provided by these rural routes, and be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area detrimental to the character of the area.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).		
		Parkers Drove is not suitable for any more development without significant upgrading of the access onto Friday Street. Sustainable links required to access amenities.		
23084 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	The only way to join Friday Street is at a very tight bend .This is a development in a very attractive historic part of the village . More would be lost than gained in allowing this development .	Noted Highways to be consulted if site pursued	Omission site  * Small site adjoining but outside the settlement boundary. * Grade 2 agricultural land. * Development on site WR/26 would inevitably lead to the removal of vegetation and the creation of access onto Parker's Drove and Shop Drove which would have an impact on the amenity provided by these rural routes, and be a significant visual intrusion and encroachment into the rural area detrimental to the character of the area.
		<i>A much smaller development may be possible .</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>WR/27 Land South-west of Jarman's Lane</i>				
23795 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Application for planning permission submitted.</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Small site outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>* Rural character</li> <li>* Development would require removal of existing vegetation and buildings.</li> <li>* Potential impact on the setting of a listed building.</li> <li>* Potential for significant detrimental effect on the landscape and rural character</li> </ul>

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*WR/33 Land at Popes Farm*



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23653 - Suffolk County Council (Mr James Cutting) [11903]	Comment	<p>ARCHAEOLOGY</p> <p>Archaeological requirements could be a consideration in assessing viability (NPPF para.182). The following sites have challenging archaeological constraints:</p> <p>West Row 16 and 33 - area of high archaeological potential. See note on early evaluation for WR33.</p> <p>This option should be subject to pre-determination archaeological evaluation at an appropriate stage in the development management process to allow for preservation in situ where appropriate of any sites of importance that might be defined (and which are currently unknown) and to allow archaeological strategies to be designed. The site is immediately to the north of a dense record of finds of prehistoric, Roman and Saxon date from the higher ground overlooking the River Lark where it meets the fen, close to the crossing point at Jude's Ferry Bridge. It is possible that a saxon cemetery is in the area. The site is of high archaeological potential and the historical landscape setting should be considered.</p> <p>EDUCATION</p> <p>The following table provides an indication of the minimum number of school places required as a result of development, per site. Clearly, cumulative impacts must be considered in determining an appropriate strategy for providing places.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE TABLE ON PAGES 42-48 OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT</p> <p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>The table below (SEE PAGES 60-70 ON THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT) is a brief review of the main aspects pertaining to transport including sustainable travel, which is a universal consideration. The table also indicates whether the impacts are likely to be considered through a Transport Statement (TS) or a Transport Assessment (TA) - a thorough review of transport impacts including a Travel Plan (an</p>	<p>The composite response from SCC has informed the selection of preferred sites and infrastructure requirements for future development.</p>	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* This site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row.</li> <li>* Unable to determine how access can be achieved, Church Lane is not suitable for this level of development in its current form without upgrading the width and (at least) the provision of a footway.</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Development of this large greenfield site would have the potential to impact on the wider countryside, in particular the River Lark corridor to the south.</li> <li>* The preferred site, WR/07, has the potential to provide a strategic expansion of the village with sufficient space and links to ensure new vegetation, hedges and green boundaries are provided together with strategic accessible natural green space as part of a strategic mitigation strategy for recreational impacts.</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>integrated strategy that promotes more sustainable modes of travel).</p> <p>Transport Assessment (TA) required</p> <p>Unable to determine how access can be achieved, Church lane is not suitable for this level of development in its current form without upgrading the width and (at least) the provision of a footway. Sustainable links required to access amenities.</p>		
22755 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	Another not sustainable large development on farm land .A small village couldn't cope with this type of development .	Response noted	<p>Omission site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* This site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row.</li> <li>* Unable to determine how access can be achieved, Church Lane is not suitable for this level of development in its current form without upgrading the width and (at least) the provision of a footway.</li> <li>* Grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>* Development of this large greenfield site would have the potential to impact on the wider countryside, in particular the River Lark corridor to the south.</li> <li>* The preferred site, WR/07, has the potential to provide a strategic expansion of the village with sufficient space and links to ensure new vegetation, hedges and green boundaries are provided together with strategic accessible natural green space as part of a strategic mitigation strategy for recreational impacts.</li> </ul>
		<i>Reduce the scale .</i>		
<i>Question WR2</i>				
23031 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23378 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	WR/01, WR/02, WR/04, WR/06, WR/07, WR/10, WR/11, WR/12, WR/13, WR/14, WR/15, WR/16, WR/17, WR/19, WR/23, WR/25, WR/26, WR/27, WR/33 - the NHG does not have any concerns about the suggested development at these sites.	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured from development to be maximised.
23504 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	We consider that developing the site with housing meets the requirements of planning policy at a national and local level. The development of the site can be designed to respect the local character and environment. The development could provide a range of local benefits with well-located public open space, and pedestrian crossings over Beeches Road to the school and other community facilities. We therefore conclude that the development of the site with housing accords with local and national requirements, and is sustainable development.	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured from development to be maximised.
22757 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Support	WR/23 It removes heavy agricultural lorries from the village and is of a sensible scale for the site .	Response noted	WR/23 is not a preferred option for development because it is an existing employment site.
<i>Question WR3</i>				
23032 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
23505 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	We consider that site WR/07 has advantages over the other sites identified as Potential Site Options. Other sites are not in as close proximity to the services and facilities in the village. Other sites do not relate as well as site WR/07 to the built up area of the village. Other sites cannot take the level of development proposed for West Row in one location which would reduce the benefits that can be achieved by a comprehensive development. These benefits include the amount and quality of open space and other infrastructure that could be provided.	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured from development to be maximised.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22756 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Object	WR/07	Response noted	The SALP Preferred Options document proposes allocating one site in West Row WR/07. The site has relatively few constraints and is well related to existing services and facilities. Concentrating the bulk of growth on one site will allow the benefits secured from development to be maximised.
<i>Not to be allocated</i>				
<i>Question WR4</i>				
23828 - S J Bedwell [12723]	Comment	WR17 resized Eldo Road - see attached	Response noted	Omission site - this small site is on the south side of the village which is a less sustainable location than other sites as it is further from the main services and facilities in West Row - grade 2 agricultural land - would require demolition of a dwelling to create access - part of the site is prone to surface water flooding
23033 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	LPC does not have a specific view on this	Response noted	
22758 - West Row Action Group (Mr John Smith) [12494]	Comment	Sorry no .	Response noted	
23379 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	No	Response noted	Noted