

Document:	Mildenhall Hub Development Brief	Total Representations:	37	APPENDIX B
Current Stage:	Evidence gathering	Filter Count:	0	
ID	Stakeholder Group	Representation	How it was addressed	
1	Resident?	Absolute madness there is no need for a Hub and the choice of location by a school with the obvious issues shows a complete lack of intelligence. I have no intention of listing the flaws in this location choice as a 5 year old child would see them. This scheme is of no benefit to the Town at all.	It is a shame that the opportunity to explain the criticism of the proposal has not been taken. However, the benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016).	
2	Stakeholder	Great.	Thank you for your positive comment.	

Stakeholder

This allocation lies in an area of very high archaeological potential, recorded in the County Historic Environment Record. Field walking and metal detecting within and surrounding the proposed development area has detected substantial multi-period finds scatters, indicative of activity from the prehistoric to the medieval periods (MNL 141, 167, 220, 310, 421, 428). The development site is also located in an area which is topographically favourable for early occupation, overlooking the River Lark and on a south facing slope. On the opposite side of the river and in a similar landscape location, a significant Iron Age settlement site was revealed during archaeological investigations (BTM 040), along with associated Neolithic and Bronze Age settlement activity (MNL 710). A series of human burials were also uncovered during the excavations. As a result, this location has high potential for the discovery of important hitherto unknown archaeological sites and features from all periods in view of its proximity to known remains. The proposed works would cause significant ground disturbance that has potential to damage any archaeological deposits and below ground heritage assets that exist.

Given the high potential, lack of previous investigation and large size of the proposed development area, I recommend that, in order to establish the full archaeological implications of this area and the suitability of the site for the development, the applicant should be required to provide for an archaeological evaluation of the site before a Development Brief is finalised, to allow for preservation in situ of any sites of national importance that might be defined (and which are still currently unknown). This large area cannot be assessed or approved in our view until a full archaeological evaluation has been undertaken, and the results of this work will enable us to accurately quantify the archaeological resource (both in quality and extent). This is in accordance with paragraphs 128 and 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decisions on the suitability of the site, and also the need for, and scope of, any further work should there be any below-ground archaeological finds of significance, will be based upon the results of the evaluation.

Thank you for this advice. A full archaeological evaluation will be carried out.

4 Resident

1. It would be helpful for at least two display boards be made available at future events. It was very, very difficult for everyone to get close enough to study the information without being in the way of others, and everyone felt the need to "move on" before ready.
2. It is apparent that the existing Allotment site remains undisturbed. However, the entrance gates open outwards - effectively restricting the road width. At present, this is not too much of a problem as the traffic is minimal into the school area, particularly evenings and weekends. Once The Hub is built - this road will become the main thoroughfare, effectively a single-track road.
3. When Sheldrick Way Allotments were set out, plans were made available for an additional 15 Allotment plots on the opposite side of the road which is currently farmland. Mildenhall Parish Council has a waiting list of 40 applicants (which will increase with additional builds) and there is an immediate need for, not only the release of this additional land - but a commitment from SCC for further space allocated to Allotments. Provision of sufficient Allotments is a legal requirement (please advise how this can be achieved).
4. The Hub will be the focus for Local Government, Health and Education. The proposal is for it to be sited on Suffolk County Council land and would appear to all intents and purposes to be ideal. However, Mildenhall currently suffers from a very dangerous traffic situation - namely around the War Memorial and the Old Police Station Square.
 - a. At Police Station Square - there is a boxed (Give Way) to allow access/egress for vehicles onto/off Kingsway. It is sometimes acknowledged, although not always.
 - b. Once in Kingsway - vehicles are faced with parked cars on both sides and since the new housing development made no provision for the standard 2-car family - additional cars are now found parked on the main Kingsway road.
5. The Hub will lie directly opposite the housing site referred to as Comet Way - which has become a "rat run" for vehicles trying to avoid the town center. The Hub will ensure an unacceptable amount of traffic into and out of Sheldrick Way which is already a very, very busy junction.
6. Vehicles travelling from West Row do not always slow down at the 30mph sign. But effectively are travelling well into Kingsway (past Sheldrick Way) before they reach the legal speed. :-
 - a. There was no evidence that a roundabout would be installed at the proposed siting of Sheldrick Way, Kingsway/West Row Road, Boeing Way, despite being advised by the

Thank you for the comments relating to the display boards. We will take this on board for future events. The Hub project does not make provision for additional allotments, but any further housing growth arising from the Local Plan process will need to make provision for additional allotments. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed. This will also be subject to consideration as part of the traffic assessment.

Highways Department that a roundabout would be included.

7. Given the potential for an increased and hugely unacceptable traffic congestion at what is already a dangerous site (namely Old Police Station Square) -- I raise my strongest objections to the siting of The Hub.

Anyone wishing to avail themselves of the amenities The Hub seeks to offer - will be travelling across town

Emergency Services, Educationalist, Health professionals and users plus staff will all be travelling across town to reach the arterial routes

The opportunity to improve Mildenhall Town will be lost before the first spade has been dug.

This design will directly cause increased traffic flow, the unnecessarily criss-crossing of vehicles which will have one inevitable conclusion - several minor accidents, a few major accidents and (sadly) fatalities

The one consolation --- emergency services will be on hand to ferry the injured to hospital - provided they can get across Five Ways roundabout !

6 Resident

As Mildenhall Parish Council currently have 40 residents on the Allotment waiting list. What provision will be made at the new development to incorporate this legal requirement.?

The government and SCC are fully supportive of Well Being Initiatives.

A group is interested in starting The Shed project, which, along with additional Allotments - -- would be a venue for people with various issues, to come out and do some gardening, or socialise, or simply be at peace, working with nature. The Shed will utilise one or two standard plots and in close liaison with other charitable and national health agencies, will provide a much needed facility.

It was my understanding that additional Allotments were being provided alongside the existing Sheldrick's Way site.

Also - it was my understanding that The Hub layout plan would incorporate amenity space to embrace Allotments.

Please confirm these two requirements are incorporated in future plans

The Hub project does not make provision for additional allotments, but any further housing growth arising from the Local Plan process will need to make provision for additional allotments.

7	Resident	<p>Centralising everything has notorious record for not working, the congestion to all getting to the Hub will add to the already horrendous congestion, lorries delivering, people, children mingling around and all trying to reach the one place, the infrastructure work support this kind of central point. Mildenhall will die in other places because people will spend there time there sorting things out, building up tensions. The dream to centralise it seems good but well plotted out services around Mildenhall will elevate a lot of congestion, putting like minded services together is better.</p>	<p>The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016). However, the concerns about congestion will be addressed through a detailed traffic assessment.</p>
8	Resident	<p>Thank you for informing me of the plans for the new Hub. I live on Queensway, so this will have some impact. I see from the business plan that obviously road access will be and has been investigated. Improvements to the junction where Queensway meets Kingsway is obvious, and I would suggest we would need an additional road to access this end of town, which would not only benefit the hub, but also future housing development. I suggest a road access from Sheldrick way, or the West Row road across to the Worlington road. This would enable access to the site other than through the town centre and also access out towards the A11.</p>	<p>Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The Hub project would not warrant the suggested highway works to connect Sheldrick way with the Worlington Road.</p>
9	Resident	<p>I have not seen any marketing with regards this proposal which is probably one of the biggest in many years for the town. There will be many people who are unaware. Appears to be advancing without very little public consultation. Not easy to find on the web site. Have concerns about road infrastructures that struggle currently so goodness knows what they will be like if this goes ahead. Considering all major routes are in opposite direction to location would it not have made more sense to relocate Emg services as close to major routes. Proposed 1000 dwellings!!! Where are those people expected to work? Employment in this area is not booming. Loss of natural habitat for wildlife. Can you advise where next public meeting is going to be held and where it will be advertised.</p>	<p>These comments appear to relate to the local plan sites allocation consultation, as well as the Mildenhall Hub. The observations relating to the siting of emergency services are addressed elsewhere. An invitation to attend one of the Local Plan consultations has been sent to this correspondent.</p>

10	Stakeholder Group	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England does not consider that this Draft development brief for the proposed Public Service Hub in Mildenhall poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.</p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.</p> <p>If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p>	Thank you for your response.
11	Resident	<p>Visited Mildenhall Parish Council offices. Viewed the plans on display. No mention was made about parking on the Sheldrick Way site. Also, more importantly road access will be inadequate unless there is relief for the current Queensway and West Row roads. Go back to the 70's, when it was suggested a road should be built from the A11 across the Worlington road leading to the industrial estate. Nothing ever happened! Just my comments. Thanking you.</p>	<p>Parking will be required in accordance with adopted parking standards. This level of detail will be required at with any subsequent planning application and will be related to the development proposed at the time.</p>

Having attended the informal drop in on 6/4/16, I have the following comments.
The junction at police station square should be restructured before any work has commenced at the hub site.

Also the road from police station square to the site needs some thought on road width and on street parking.

Signage to the site should direct construction traffic and after completion people using the hub from all directions to go via Queensway so as not to encourage traffic to use other routes as a rat run.

Although I understand the idea about car sharing cycling etc, traveling past any council offices, schools, sports facilities, the number of cars in the staff car parks would indicate that the idea is good but in practice it does not work. So the amount of parking already planned needs to be increased. At least by half as much again.

And while construction is taking place sufficient parking on site for construction workers needs to be provided, to avoid local roads becoming car parks.

As the government has announced that education is to be taken from local authority control. I am not sure how this will affect the financing of the project.

Also with an announcement about the fate of RAF Mildenhall to be made soon, I think that the location and size of the Hub may need a complete rethink if housing development is the suggested option for the base. As some facilities on the base may be able to be incorporated into the local plan.

Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. Mildenhall Academy is not a local authority school and as such, receives funding from central government. The future of RAF Mildenhall will not be determined for a number of years yet, but the new facilities are required now. However, they may have a role to play in the future.

I attended the session in the Fenland Room.

My conclusions are:

1. There would definitely need to be a bypass ab initio. This would be at least 4 km long, crossing three roads, cutting through a housing estate, and passing through prohibited forestry to reach the A1065, or bridge the Lark and pass over a flood plain to a new junction on the A11, both extortionately expensive. This would be necessary both from the point of view of over-loading of the junction at Police Station Square and the necessity for services to reach the A11 promptly.
2. I can see no vital purpose in hubbing. A hub in this location would be further for most children to go to school than to their present location on the Bury Road, or to go to the swimming pool. If there is a need for a new pool, why not locate it, either in its present location, or at the school. Why move the Police, fire, health advice, job Centre, etc.- they would be further from homes on average, and from the A11, in the case of police and fire service.
3. The argument for a library is also weak, as most children will read books on the internet, certainly by the time it is built. The same would apply to meetings, which I said could take place by video-links with split screens etc. i.e. by the time it would be built a hub would be outdated and less convenient than are the dispersed units.
4. It would occupy good agricultural land. With the rise in the UK population and rapid rise in world population with climate change, the UK may be required to produce most of its food later this century - at present it produces less than half!
5. The cost of this project would not be justified.
6. if the US leaves the current Mildenhall air base there would be housing to spare over the next few years; but I am unclear on what is likely to happen- certainly Europe will be required to defend itself to a greater extent in the near future than it does at present. This could change the local scene in several ways!

The Hub project will largely redistribute existing traffic within the town, rather than introduce new traffic. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The Hub project is unlikely to require the suggested bypass. The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016). redevelopment of the existing sites was considered. As has been identified, the future of RAF Mildenhall will not be determined for a number of years yet, but the new facilities are required now. However, they may have a role to play in the future.

We are very much in need of a new swimming pool etc and as a family would greatly welcome this , we also understand about cost saving etc, but as a resident on the Comet Way junction with Oxford Close we are greatly concerned about the increase in traffic and what provision is in place to manage this.

With so many amenities all in one place and further plans for housing, the traffic concentration will be huge, there may be plans for access roads but the Comet Way estate will need to be protected from the cut through / rat run opportunity that many drivers will take to access the hub.

Also I know the police and fire service have signed up to the idea but the placing of these in our opinion is the wrong side of town, as you will be aware there is massive pressure on these services to meet response times, being this side of town means emergency vehicles will be responding to immediate grades right through town, and dispatching from a location where there will be a high concentration of children, the elderly and generally high pedestrian traffic – not the most sensible idea ?

A one site option might be the best financially but the impact of traffic and high level of professional and service users may be too great for one site, I don't feel there has been much public consultation at all on this idea.

I know we are not aware of many of the considerations that the council are dealing with, but we are not convinced this is the best plan,

Thank you for reading and I would appreciate any comments you have,

Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed and may address the Comet Way junction. This will also be subject to consideration as part of the traffic assessment. Whether the police and fire service sign up to the proposal is entirely their own decision, based on their operational requirements.

After seeing the plans for the Mildenhall Hub and discussing my concerns with you yesterday, I would like to put the following points forward for consideration:

1. Access: Queensway is accessed from the town centre either by New Street or the junction by the mini-roundabout in Police Station Square. This junction has a confusing layout as it is not really clear as who has the priority in the " Keep Clear " area. This needs attention as the roundabout is well-used and as the only route from High Street and North Terrace to the shopping area will the additional traffic to and from Queensway create delays and congestion? The Courthouse Veterinary Clinic has the exit from its car park on to Queensway. I am concerned that clients will find it difficult to emerge on to the road if there is increased traffic along Queensway.
2. Pedestrian crossings: It is quite difficult to cross Queensway as there are no pedestrian crossings from High Street and there is not a long view of approaching traffic. Residents from the Comet Way and Churchill Drive estates need safe crossing places to access the town centre, as do pupils attending the school in Sheldrick Way.
3. Parking: You mentioned that there would be about 400 parking spaces in the proposed site. Has the Council surveyed the number of parking spaces already used by Council staff, staff at the Upper School, staff at the Library, Health Clinic and Swimming Pool, and how the current car parks in these sites are occupied, especially in peak times? Residents who have appointments at the Health Clinic need to know that they will be able to find a parking space, particularly if they have health or mobility problems. This also applies to residents from communities surrounding Mildenhall who need to use services that are not available in their area. There certainly needs to be adequate parking to meet demand on weekdays. There is a case for the Health Clinic and Library to remain in their current location and have some of the car parking area from the Council Office site to meet the demand for parking at busy times.
4. Public Transport: There is very limited public transport to Queensway. If this development is to be accessible to those without cars, frequent bus services from all parts of Mildenhall to the new hub need to be provided.

Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed and may address the Comet Way junction. This will also be subject to consideration as part of the traffic assessment. Parking will be required in accordance with adopted parking standards. This level of detail will be required at with any subsequent planning application and will be related to the development proposed at the time. Public transport provision is an important consideration.

Whilst it is easy to agree the case for one area that incorporates many of the services that are available to Mildenhall residents, the proposed site, in our view, is not suitable for such an undertaking.

Firstly a project of such a size will create an enormous amount of traffic just from the people who will be employed to operate the facilities. (In the existing car park for the college I counted in the region of 40 cars) With the site set to accommodate Police, Fire, Ambulance, council offices, health facilities, pre-school, library, swimming pool and sports centre, Citizens advice centre and job centre the amount of staff parking could rise to as many as 200 hundred vehicles or more. Further to these numbers will be the numerous visitors to the site who will be a mixture of cyclists pedestrians motor cars delivery vehicles coaches and buses bringing people to and from the facilities. Sheldrick Way is a narrow road that feeds on to what can only be described as a narrow and restricted through road. Having a facility of such diverse nature and only having one way in and one way out seems to be ill considered. Some of the concerns that we have are to do with the people coming and going from the facilities in the proposed hub having to share road space in an area that may be being used by emergency vehicles on call. Some of the people using these facilities will be vulnerable IE young children and perhaps the elderly. I feel that this represents potential hazards that are unacceptable. Furthermore all emergency vehicles on call would have to go through Mildenhall town to reach almost anywhere. This would involve going via Police station Square which is a choke point at the best of times. In the event of a major incident on the A11 the possible hold ups for emergency vehicles not able to get through the town could very easily result in the loss of life. There is also a possibility that traffic leaving Sheldrick Way may be tempted to use the Comet way Estate as a rat run which would be very detrimental to the quality of life of the families that reside there.

Parking will be required in accordance with adopted parking standards. This level of detail will be required at with any subsequent planning application and will be related to the development proposed at the time. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. Sheldrick Way is not particularly narrow, being 6m wide, which is wider than parts of the A1101 in Mildenhall. However, its suitability for additional traffic will need to be fully assessed.

We live at Oxford Close, which sides on to the West Row Rd., near the access to Comet Way & The Riverside school, so we are particularly interested to understand the finer details of the proposed Public Service Hub;

Our initial thoughts therefore are:-

1. it seems the current road access to The Riverside school is very narrow & will need to be widened to accommodate more regular traffic flow
2. this is a good opportunity to create a roundabout at the junction with Comet Way, feeding to a larger access to The Hub development. This will not only facilitate traffic flow from all sides but also help contain vehicle speed in & out of Mildenhall; despite recent attempts to restrict vehicle speed in this area, traffic is still travelling too fast entering & leaving Mildenhall along the West Row road.
3. as part of the changes above, the existing pedestrian crossing should probably then also be relocated further up the Mildenhall side of the current access to The Riverside school.
4. the Hub scheme should prioritise seeding junior & senior football pitches for Mildenhall Teams, with good parking & pavilion facilities - e.g. Red Lodge & Isleham - we currently have very few such pitches/facilities in Mildenhall, forcing Teams to use facilities in neighbouring villages. We should use this scheme to promote sport & healthy living to all parts of the community going fwd.
5. the new swimming pool should include other extended leisure facilities - e.g. flume, wave pool aswell as a main pool for competitive galas - this will serve not only Mildenhall people well but also help attract others in from outside the Town
6. I understand Sainsburys are keen to buy the land where the existing swimming pool stands - we should secure maximum value for this site but at the same time revisit traffic flow to/from Sainsburys - maybe a new 1 traffic system through the town (passing Bussens & Parkins) & in to Sainsburys, exiting via the Jubilee Fields parking area & down St Andrews St
7. another 'wish list item', funds providing should be lighting for the new West Row cycle path - e.g. like the equivalent at Morton Hall BSE to encourage safe usage to/from the Hub & Mildenhall Town, all year round

With all the other changes facing Mildenhall over the coming years, the Hub scheme is a great opportunity to raise the town's profile as an attractive place to live/work in the future. I look forward to hearing more about the positive developments on this front over the coming months.

Sheldrick Way is not particularly narrow, being 6m wide, which is wider than parts of the A1101 in Mildenhall. However, its suitability for additional traffic will need to be fully assessed. Despite the signage, traffic speeds have been observed to be higher than the limit and junction amendments which address this would be beneficial, together with safe pedestrian crossing points. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed and may address the Comet Way junction. This will also be subject to consideration as part of the traffic assessment. The design and specification for the leisure facility and playing pitches will be addressed once the general principles of the hub have been established.

18	Resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Queensway (road) is too busy now. 2. Police and Fire need to exit fast on emergencies. 3. Council offices site is much better (+ library & clinic) – lots of land – more central for elderly etc., for some facilities (not schools). 4. 9 services on 1 site is ridiculous – need loads of parking etc. 5. No point in saving money, if creating loads of problems and spending a lot. 6. Appreciate many of these buildings need much work, but please consider above points. 7. Some services in hub, but not all 9/10 please. 	<p>Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Whether the police and fire service sign up to the proposal is entirely their own decision, based on their operational requirements. The College Heath Road site is not large enough to accommodate the Hub. This is fully considered in the 2014 Business case (updated in 2016).</p>
19	Resident	<p>Having attended the “consultation” I would make the following comments:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appreciate the economic sense of combining building use when many buildings currently require a large financial input on maintenance,. However:- 2. I chose to live on Kingsway (IP28 7HR) to be central without use of a car and be able to use the local facilities – library, health centre, schools, police, leisure facilities. The new location hub will necessitate increased bus services, but roadways are not suitable for increased traffic. Queensway is already a traffic congestion area! 3. The map shows possible increased housing:- far better to use the redundant Wamil Court and keep the ear-marked ‘pink housing’ area for parking. 4. What will happen to the redundant buildings? – police stn, library, upper school, health centre, swimming pool etc. More housing will result in yet more congestion as all the services at the hub. Mildenhall is a small market town - where will all the people work?? 5. Despite ‘approx’ quotations of money required to maintain existing buildings v. new build I cannot believe it would be a saving in cost of building – long term eco use yes but cost of infrastructure etc for hub will be lining someone’s pocket. 	<p>Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The proposed housing option has been amended to remove Option 3. The future use of any redundant sites is being considered through the Local Plan process (currently at Preferred Options consultation).</p>
20	Stakeholder Group	<p>I am the Chairman of the above Association (Mildenhall Allotments Association) and have been asked by several of our members to ascertain that the future of Sheldrick Way allotments is assured.</p> <p>On viewing the document it would appear so but would like a reply to this letter as to that fact for any future enquiries.</p> <p>As you may be aware this site is rented to full capacity and at this current time there is a waiting list for an allotment in Mildenhall of 30 persons.</p>	<p>The Hub Development Brief retains the existing allotments. The Hub project does not make provision for additional allotments, but any further housing growth arising from the Local Plan process will need to make provision for additional allotments.</p>

1. Would it not be cheaper to repair existing public buildings than build a hub?
2. The present Medical Centre, Council Offices, Library and Police Station are convenient for a large proportion of Mildenhall citizens, many of whom are not car owners.
3. A hub in theory is an excellent idea but having so many amenities in one place makes a hub very vulnerable to aircraft crashes, terror attacks, fire and floods.
4. The present road system is unsuitable and Queensway is far too narrow for more traffic. First plan and build suitable roads.
5. Regarding car parks, many of our Suffolk car parking spaces are too narrow and there are not enough of them. Think how many cars are likely to use the Hub car park at peak times and double the number. Will Hub car parking be free?
6. How will mothers with push chairs and small children reach the Hub medical centre from, say, College Heath Road? They could use public transport and pay which would be inconvenient.
7. How will mothers and toddlers attend the library craft activities on a Sunday morning with o bus service?
8. Necessary maintenance and repairs to any part of the Hub can inconvenience the whole complex i.e. parking lorries and machinery, work in progress, road repairs and blocked alley ways for pedestrians.
9. A new swimming pool and a school are acceptable.
10. At present we all benefit from the position of some amenities. A hub would be handy for only about half the population.
11. Any development of West Mildenhall will spoil the historic ambience of the neighbourhood which is not often found in modern towns and should be treasured.
12. I am against the Hub as spending so much public money cannot be justified during these hard financial times.

The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016). However, the concerns about congestion will be addressed through a detailed traffic assessment. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed and may address the Comet Way junction. This will also be subject to consideration as part of the traffic assessment. Parking will be required in accordance with adopted parking standards, which include wider spaces. This level of detail will be required at with any subsequent planning application and will be related to the development proposed at the time. Public transport provision is an important consideration. The concern about aircraft crashes and terrorist attacks is noted.

22	Resident	<p>As a long time resident of Mildenhall, I would like to make the following comments regarding the above. I cannot go to the Council Offices or recreation way as I am disabled. Wonder if I am alone with these thoughts?</p> <p>Your colour plan was difficult to decipher, very small print. The Bury Free Press coloured map much better and clearer.</p> <p>The Council Offices where situated now are convenient for the many people living in or near the College Heath Area of the town, for not everyone has a car and it is a long way to cycle or walk especially for the elderly. Likewise the Police Station/Clinic/Library. There will be more traffic through the town.</p> <p>The Fire Station is quite central now. Retained Fire-Fighters are on call 24/7. They are hard to recruit for extensive training/medical, as not all employers will release staff during working hours. Without a full crew they cannot attend therefore other stations have to respond. There are many accidents on the A11 and minutes saved count. I am familiar with this as my son served for 25 years.</p> <p>Along with Alconbury, Molesworth, Mildenhall Base is due to close in 2020, although Lakenheath extended. I am familiar with Mildenhall Base as I was employed there as a Clerical Officer, M.O.D, for 24 years. Plans for this area are housing. Will access be on West Row Road or Beck Row? Staff parking at the Hub will have to be very large for staff and public. More arable land lost, pity there is no brown site available.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the location of the Hub will not be so convenient for those people living on the eastern side of town. However, it is still reasonably accessible, being a short walk from the town centre. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this.</p>
23	Resident	<p>After reading the document available on the website, I am very much in favour of the developments going ahead, but would like to make a number of comments/suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the leisure facility, including the swimming pool, needs to allow easy access for the school and be large enough so that the facilities can be easily used during school time by both the school children and other users • A 8-lane pool, with electronic timing, spectator seating for around 300 and a hall close by (for swimmers between races) would allow the pool to be used for regional galas and would bring in more revenue; both Ipswich and Newmarket need to restrict spectators for larger gala • A 8-lane pool would also allow the pool to host both public swimming sessions and either pool lessons or the swimming club training • With a moveable floor in the learner pool, diving boards could also be provided (as in Cambridge), which would provide a much needed diving resource in Suffolk. 	<p>The design and specification for the leisure facility will be addressed once the general principles of the hub have been established.</p>

24	Stakeholder Group	<p>Mildenhall Sharks Swimming Club would like to be actively involved in the design and specification of the proposed Hub. Since the replacement of the existing Swimming Pool is high on the list of priorities, then it's disappointing that Mildenhall Swimming Club, as a major user of the current pool, have not received an invitation to participate in these discussions.</p> <p>In terms of a wish list, then it would be good to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an eight lane 50m pool, complete with learner pool (adjustable depth), • adequate seating (~500 seats) to be able to host major swimming events, such as Suffolk County Championships, Suffolk Masters, ASA East Region Championships, East Region Masters Championships. • It would be good to put all the Mildenhall Sports Cubs under "one roof" - Soccer, Rugby, Hockey, Cricket, Cycling etc. The current situation with clubs being spread out across Mildenhall and Red Lodge misses an opportunity for synergy, and is a very inefficient. 	<p>The design and specification for the Hub will come at a later date. However, your interest in this process has been recorded and will be followed up.</p>
25	Resident	<p>My wife & I attended the Open Forum regarding The Hub on 6th April at the Jubilee Centre, since when we have been away, so these comments may be rather belated.</p> <p>(1) Please pass on our congratulations to the FHDC representative being able to field so many negative comments during the time during which we were present.</p> <p>(2) "The Hub" is a good idea, (although due to our ages whether we will live long enough to see the fulfilment must be uncertain.)</p> <p>(3) The following Comments/Questions we would like to raise.</p> <p>(a) Queensway – as the main access road to the site from the town. For Emergency Services, (Fire & Ambulance), fast movement from the Hub is necessary. At a point approximately 40 yards East of Wamil Way there is a regular "bottleneck". Parking vehicles there regularly cause tailbacks in either direction. So unless some permanent 'No Parking' could be imposed or ultimately even a Compulsive Purchase Order on the two properties involved – this "bottleneck" could prove to be a real problem to the Emergency Services.</p> <p>(b) Wamil Way needs to have some form of restriction on it eg: "Access to Residents Only" to prevent another potential bottleneck. This used to be the case before Sheldrick Way was made the main Academy entrance.</p> <p>(4) A comment made to another member of the Public was that each of the present sites eg: Schools would be redeveloped.</p> <p>Approximately 8 years ago I had cause to look into the Archives & Records of the Bunbury family. I discovered that the Bury Road site was given to Mildenhall by the Bunburys to be retained for the youth of the town in perpetuity. Obviously an Academy fulfils that obligation, but has this matter been considered for any future redevelopment of that site?</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive comments. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. Your information relating to the potential for a restrictive covenant has been forwarded to Suffolk County Council for further investigation.</p>

26

Stakeholder
Group

Thank you for advising me of the Draft Development Brief for the proposed Public Service Hub in Mildenhall.

My only immediate interests would be around permeability in creating numerous “convenient through routes”. I appreciate 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. 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.

Consideration should also be given around the “gathering/meeting spaces with seating” ensuring that it could not lead to future ASB issues and that large car parking areas should be registered to the Safer Parking scheme to obtain the Park Mark accreditation.

I note that the application is considering BREEAM and would strongly recommend that this is applied, along with the requirements for SBD Commercial 2015v2 .

I or my colleague Phil Kemp would be happy to work with yourself and the planners throughout this process.

Thank you for your observations. The balance between accessibility for all and crime reduction can be a fine one, which will need to be fully considered at the detailed design stage. This will be carried out in close consultation with the Crime Reduction Officer.

I have several comments to make re the proposed hub

1. Traffic concerns along Queensway. Traffic is already bad at peak times. Exiting from Wamil Way is hazardous and action will be needed to slow traffic down and create a safer junction. When I mentioned this at the consultation at the Jubilee Centre I was told this was not part of the consultation. If this is so why not? Wamil Way is, in effect, a single track road with passing places and it provides the only vehicular access to the Cricket Club, Cycling Club, Bunbury rooms and the Church.
2. I also asked about the Wamil Court site and was received the same response. Again why not?
3. Should there be a Blue light call out at the same time as school buses are using Queensway it would be chaotic and any vehicles would have to cross town, via Police Station Square to get to the A11 the most likely site of a major accident.
4. The proposed site would create problems for young mums and elderly folk to get to. These groups are least likely to have access to a car and the distance would discourage use of the facilities. Currently all areas of Mildenhall are within reasonable walking distance for most residents. How many of the officers and councillors ever walk from St John's Close to Comet Way ?
5. Why does the school need to be with everything else? It could be united in Sheldrick Way and if the Wamil Court Site was incorporated into the site there would not be so much loss of good farm land which will be necessary to feed an increasing population.
6. Why is it considered necessary or helpful to put everything on the one site? It will create a traffic nightmare wherever it is. At least if the college was in Sheldrick Way and the rest on College Heath Road the traffic problem would be mitigated.

What seems so strange is that there seems to be no overall strategy for the future development of the town. The proposed closure of the base, the future of Wamil Court site, traffic issues were not to be questioned, they were not part of the discussion! This is not joined up thinking and reflects very badly on the decision making process.

I am very concerned about the whole so-called consultation process as I have met residents who are unaware of what is under discussion as they don't get a local paper, surely with such an important decision to be made it should be advertised. It suggests to me that the desire is that as few folk as possible get involved until it is too late, which makes one very suspicious. What vested interests are at work?

Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. Whether the police and fire service sign up to the proposal is entirely their own decision, based on their operational requirements. It is acknowledged that the location of the Hub will not be so convenient for those people living on the eastern side of town. However, it is still reasonably accessible, being a short walk from the town centre. The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016).

28

Stakeholder
Group

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Development Brief for the proposed Public Services Hub at Mildenhall.

We note there is a section on Utilities (3.7) that has not yet been completed that will need to confirm the provisions for water supply and foul drainage.

It is recommended consultation with Anglian Water in regard to water supply and foul drainage to serve the Hub. Anglian Water provide a pre planning service for developers and details can be found at: <http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-planning-service-.aspx>

There is a public sewer crossing through the site from east to west that will need to be considered in the layout; the sewer is protected by an easement strip either side of the pipe. If the layout cannot be arranged around this sewer and associated easement, then diversion may be considered under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (section 185).

Reference is made to the use of SUDS for the disposal of surface water so it is assumed the services of Anglian Water in this regard will not be required.

Thank you for this information.

Location of Hub : _____

a) Is this the best place ? The site is furthest away from better access roads We are aware that the council owns this land and will be more profitable to the council for hub use and possible housing development than leaving as agricultural land

b) Mildenhall will undoubtedly expand Reading the Eastern Daily Press the A11 corridor is now dubbed the Technology Corridor as expansion of technology will impact along that route to Norwich This will inevitably mean more houses Houses mean people who require health services schools and an increase in cars It seems that the Hub is the gateway for a lot more development along the West Row Road How will the infra-structure deal with this ?

c) Will children from West Row be in the catchment area for school coaches and if not what would be the plans to get to school?

b) What about the base ? It would be a better place to have a Hub
The government declared it was for building houses Why not use it ?

Traffic: _____

a) As you are well aware many changes would have to take place just to accommodate the hub traffic Big changes would be required at Police Station Square to keep a flow of traffic

b) Roadside parking on Queensway would have to come under review and then enforced

c) Exiting Wamil Way a clear view is needed and backing up of traffic to exit Wamil Way is a problem

d) If alternative parking was advised I e in the entrance of Riverside School This would be extra cost to the residents and safety to self and car Others may decide to park in a residents parking space Occasional parking would have to be considered for church occasions and the use of the Bunbury Rooms

e) There are plans for house building in West Row This would further compound problems with extra cars entering town via Queensway

Pedestrians: _____

Church Walk is envisaged the main footfall to get to the hub As we know Church Walk has been a very neglected road as far as repairs and general changes are concerned

Parking around the Bunbury rooms is chaotic with implications to the entry to the church

This area needs to be urgently reviewed

Although the intention is to get more people to walk to the hub what we know of human nature cars will always loom large in taking and picking up to a venue

Rubbish has always been a big problem in Church Walk

We would like the council to think very carefully This development will be very far reaching

It is acknowledged that the location of the Hub will not be so convenient for those people living on the eastern side of town. However, it is still reasonably accessible, being a short walk from the town centre. It is also the only site of sufficient size capable of accommodating the Hub. The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016). The future of RAF Mildenhall will not be determined for a number of years yet, but the new facilities are required now. However, they may have a role to play in the future. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. Parking options in Wamil Way have been given further consideration, following consultation and Section 6.1.4 amended accordingly. This may also help to address parking and traffic in Church Walk.

and needs to be right for Mildenhall We came from a Market town in Norfolk The town grew very fast, planning lacked thought hence the town has lost its character the traffic has to go through the centre of town which then becomes grid locked crossing the road is hazardous visitors are deterred to the town as they sit in traffic queues We would hate to see this happens in Mildenhall

As invited in the circular letter of 4th March 2016, my comments on the draft development brief are set out below. Crucially, the letter describes the proposed hub as an 'ambitious concept' but it doesn't explain the aims of such a concept. I would appreciate it if you would let me know why the proposed hub is considered necessary but in the absence of this information my comments are mainly concerned with the impact of such a hub on Mildenhall and its residents and guess work as to why this hub is being proposed.

Aims

- I have heard it mentioned at drop-ins that some of the present buildings, eg, school, swimming pool, have reached the end of their lives. Buildings do not die but they do need to be maintained and repaired - as in time will the new proposed buildings in the hub require upkeep.
- Closer working for services, etc., is already achieved with email, skype, etc. and there are existing venues in town which would accommodate shared training.
- It is not unreasonable to suggest that not all residents would relish such a public venue for accessing services eg. health centre

Choice of Site

- Mildenhall is an historic market town with its character developed over centuries. The proposed hub will endanger this heritage and is better suited to a 'new' town where grouping of services is a priority.
- One of Mildenhall's greatest charms is that open countryside and the River Lark are in close proximity to the historic town centre. This ease of access is a precious amenity for both residents and visitors. Using the proposed green field site for the hub would destroy the pleasure experienced by walkers and cyclists alike on the first section of the bridle path from Mildenhall to West Row.
- This green field site is currently used for agricultural production and is a favoured site for skylarks.
- This rural area is gradually being whittled away by a variety of proposals for development. I understand that these development plans, including the hub, are all treated as discrete applications but taken as a whole there is a great danger of ruining Mildenhall's rural assets. Although the future of the air base appears to be uncertain, there is a strong sense of frustration at the Council's unwillingness to wait for the outcome, continuing to consider the destruction of greenfield sites which will never be restored.

Traffic

- Having all services, etc. on one site to the west of town will do nothing to improve footfall through the town centre rather it will increase traffic along Kingsway.

The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016). This also explains what is meant by the 'end of life' for buildings. The setting of Sheldrick way and its relationship with the historic character of Mildenhall town centre and Conservation Area together with the natural character of the countryside and River Lark have been significant considerations and are fully addressed in the Development Brief. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. Parking options in Wamil Way have been given further consideration, following consultation and Section 6.1.4 amended accordingly.

- The roundabout at the start of Queensway is barely workable at present and would not sustain the extra traffic, including emergency vehicles, entering and exiting Queensway. Is it to be suggested that more buildings are to be demolished here?
- On street parking is essential for residents of Wamil Way where off street parking is limited. I am a pensioner and live in Wamil Way and I would find it extremely stressful and dangerous to park further away from my home after dark.
- Although school buses use Sheldrick Way to reach the 6th Form Centre, many cars use Wamil Way to ferry children using the footpath to and from school. This traffic would be exacerbated with more schools and extra service users at the hub.

Conclusion

Although the aims of the proposed hub are unclear, the disadvantages appear obvious.

- Destruction of green field site with associated loss of agricultural production, flora and fauna.
- The 'market' and historic nature of the town compromised.
- Numerous traffic problems.
- Service users' privacy affected by the public nature of the venue.

Thanking you for your kind attention and I look forward to your comments.

Thanks to Alex Wilson and Chris Rand for attending the meeting at the Cricket Club on Wednesday 20 April to explain about the Hub and for listening to points raised.

If a Hub is such a good idea why have no other small towns not adopted the scheme?

1) The theory is good but having so many amenities together makes a hub vulnerable to disasters i.e. aircraft crashes, terror attacks, fire and floods.

2) Would it not be cheaper in the end to repair existing public buildings, as and when the need arises?

3) The present Medical Centre, Council Offices, Library, Ambulance parking and Police Station are convenient for a large proportion of citizens, many of whom are not car owners, and also near bus stops. For car drivers the present locations allow for dispersal of traffic rather than concentration of vehicles into one entrance. This is a very important consideration for fire engines and ambulances.

4) How will mothers with push chairs and small children reach the Hub medical centre from the College Heath road area or attend Library Sunday morning craft activities? There are no buses on Sundays.

5) Repairs and maintenance to any part of the Hub will inconvenience the whole complex i.e. parked lorries, machinery, work in progress, road repairs and blocked path ways.

6) Parking seems adequate and accessible at the present Council Offices area.

Between 4.15 and 4.30 on a Thursday afternoon I counted roughly 130 spaces (not including area next to present gym.) There were roughly 75 parked cars including 2 ambulances. Would the Hub be able to allow for 130 wide spaces which would have to cope with traffic for the swimming pool, police station, fire station, school etc. plus deliveries to Medical Centre, Library etc.?

7) The proposed schools and swimming pool, gym are a sensible solution but not any more amenities.

8) Any further development of west Mildenhall with all the extra vehicles is unacceptable in this historic and attractive part of the town.

Rather keep it as it is and improve the roads first. Traffic control here and in Mildenhall surroundings needs urgent attention.

The hub idea is too piece-meal - putting the cart before the horse.

Any loss of agricultural land (included the allotments) should be avoided.

The benefits of the hub are clearly set out in the 2014 Business Case (as updated in 2016). However, the concerns about congestion will be addressed through a detailed traffic assessment. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed and may address the Comet Way junction. This will also be subject to consideration as part of the traffic assessment. Parking will be required in accordance with adopted parking standards, which include wider spaces. This level of detail will be required at with any subsequent planning application and will be related to the development proposed at the time. Public transport provision is an important consideration. It is acknowledged that the location of the Hub will not be so convenient for those people living on the eastern side of town. However, it is still reasonably accessible, being a short walk from the town centre. The concern about aircraft crashes and terrorist attacks is noted.

After attending the meeting last Wednesday at the Cricket Club, I would like to make some comments on the proposed Mildenhall Hub draft development brief, particularly about these specific areas:

1. Renewable energy design in relation to total cost of ownership. The refurbishment of the Jubilee Centre incorporated solar PV, underfloor heating, and upgraded insulation. Use of measures as close as possible to zero carbon Passivhaus standards will not only reduce the carbon footprint of any new buildings, but can save substantial amounts in energy costs over the life cycle of those buildings. Energy and environmental conservation should be a top design priority. An architect with experience in these areas and with a record of successfully completed projects should be chosen.
2. Allowance in design for future growth. The town lacks a public venue commensurate with its present population, as the Jubilee Centre and Dome are 1970s era relics built for a much smaller community. If growth occurs, the "hub" must be designed so the facilities can be expanded to accommodate the demands of higher usage. Only the clinic seems to have grasped this reality and allowed for it in its proposal. The ability of the proposed design to cope with growth in demand due to population growth over the expected life of the facilities
3. An alternative bicycle and pedestrian route from the town to the hub should be offered. Church Walk is a single lane cul de sac, with little room for pedestrians and cars to negotiate. In practice, it is not normally possible for cars and pedestrians or bicycles to pass each other in the narrow road width available, and one or more must give way, causing delay as one party must wait for others to pass by. The blind entrance from Wamil Way and the lack of suitable turning space at the church end of this passage mean it is now and could become an increasingly difficult bottleneck if traffic is increased due to relocation of vital services to the hub. The possibility of an alternative pedestrian and bicycle route exists, if a path were made from Wamil Way through the land outside the boundary wall bordering the land where a planning application has been submitted for 14 houses, and joining the High Street by going through the Mill Gardens site. Alternatively, a route which would start near the church end of the passage might be feasible if residents were willing to contribute some of their land to make it possible.
4. Provision of transport for people from areas which are convenient to existing facilities but will probably not be as convenient if those facilities are moved to the proposed new location. For many residents, including those who do not own cars or are disabled, getting to the new location may be a significant problem. A new bus service to the new location appears to be left up to private firms to decide. For some people, this transportation

The introduction of insulation and sustainable heating systems to improve energy efficiency is only one aspect in relation to the use of existing buildings as is explained in the Business case. It is agreed that that capacity needs to be retained to allow the hub to grow in the future to meet increased demands from the town. This has been addressed by an addition to Section 6.3.1. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. This would include the impact of development upon Church Walk and Wamil Way. It is acknowledged that the location of the Hub will not be so convenient for those people living on the eastern side of town. However, it is still reasonably accessible, being a short walk from the town centre. Public transport provision is an important consideration. The future of RAF Mildenhall will not be determined for a number of years yet, but the new facilities are required now. However, they may have a role to play in the future.

question may be a big issue, which needs to be addressed.

5. A coherent plan for the surrounding area. Less than one mile from the proposed site, a state of the art gym and sports fields lie just off the West Row road, right inside the perimeter of RAF Mildenhall. If some of the base is to be released by the MOD, and that gym were to be part of the area released, this would be a tremendous asset to the local community. I would offer an alternative to the facilities being planned, one which could help provide for future growth. Instead of a piecemeal approach in which individual developments such as the current planning application for 14 houses off Wamil Way and another for 1,000 houses off the West Row road are undertaken in seeming isolation, an articulated overall plan which addresses the combined impact of the closure of RAF Mildenhall, the additional housing construction, traffic and access issues, and this proposed development is needed.

Thank you for taking time to consider these comments.

I have reviewed the proposals for the hub and am generally supportive. I live on Boeing Way and am concerned about the effects on traffic onto Queensway from Police Station Square, especially if Emergency Services need to use this route – it becomes easily congested at busy times. This does not appear to have been considered in the report at this stage. The traffic entering Queensway from Mildenhall Town Centre also can be difficult because of the way the traffic has to cross the High Street as it leaves the Mini-roundabout.

As a Steward for Mildenhall Methodist Church, in the triangle between High Street, Queensway and New Road, I am concerned about the effects this may have on access to our church, and on the physical fabric of the building.

I enjoy swimming and am a Member of the Mildenhall Sharks Swimming Club where larger and improved facilities will be welcome most of our training sessions are full in the current pool.

It would be wonderful to have a 50m pool, but a 6 or 8 lane 25m ASA approved competition pool will improve our opportunities to teach and train young and adult swimmers to improve the standards of swimming.

The size of the pool is an obvious constraint, the size of the spectator area is also a significant constraint, we have to limit the numbers of competitors family at any event because of license limitations on the number of people allowed at the current pool.

I also swim in public sessions and the pool is often busy, making swimming at my own pace difficult.

I am surprised that the Academy does not prefer to bring the Sixth forms closer to the Bury Road site for better cohesion and economies for teaching staff.

What consideration is being made to account for the reported “partial closure” of RAF Mildenhall and the resultant reduction in USAF personnel?

Bringing all the services together will be beneficial, and I hope that the spaces freed up will be well used for the good of the community.

Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety, including crossing points. Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 will be amended to reflect this. The suggested road priority changes shown at Figure 6.1 should help address the current issue relating to traffic speed and may address the Comet Way junction. The design and scale of a replacement swimming pool will be a matter for detail design at a later stage. The choice of Sheldrick Way over Bury Road for Mildenhall Academy is addressed in the Business Case. The future of RAF Mildenhall will not be determined for a number of years yet, but the new facilities are required now. However, they may have a role to play in the future.

I recently attended a drop in session on the 7th April regarding the new hub that is proposed to be build in Mildenhall.

Following the discussion that took place and my following research, I have some concerns regarding the hub and wondered if you could rectify these for me. Please see my list below:

1) It was stated there will be public consultations between 7th March– 25th April. During my research your website specified that the key factor for the success of any proposals is linked to the chance for local people to comment through any future consultation on the LDF. Your “risk/opportunity assessment” also mentioned that failure to engage partners and local people in the project would be classed as “medium ”. The control measures were to incorporate strong communications and consultations in the project. I believe that one drop in session on the 7th April does not constitute strong communication and you have failed on this front.

Following the research I have conducted, I approached a considerable proportion of the public to ask them if they had received information regarding the new hub. The majority of people I spoke to had no idea of the proposal and were not informed of the drop in session on the 7th April. It was only by chance I found out about the session myself. Marketing and availability of public information was extremely low key. There were no advertisements to say what a wonderful opportunity for Mildenhall this was or information of how the tax payer will save money. The public were also not given the opportunity to voice any concerns. In order to overcome this, I would propose that further consultations take place in the near future, with more advertising given to the public. A adequate way to do this would be through posters at central areas or specific advertising at public places, councils and newspapers.

2) Would infrastructure be improved in order to accommodate the Hub. Planning and highways requirements would need to be adhered to and what are the proposals to alleviate traffic following this change?

3) Does the total proposed cost given include allowances for road improvement, procurement, VAT, removal and relocation of all facilities, architect fees and engineer surveys?

4) Have you had a full transport assessment from the WSP to get a full overview and detailed assessment of the impact of the Hub and also the cumulative impact of future growth to the west of Mildenhall.

5) Would the site require archaeological assessment prior to any planning application and if there were any items of interest to be found, would this need further investigating

The consultation process was carried out in full accordance with the adopted Statement of community Involvement and included direct letters to people living close to the site. The public engagement has been well supported and officers have attended an additional residents' meeting following their request for such. The Public Services Hub is a project to provide essential infrastructure for an expanding town. It will be required to make appropriate and proportionate improvements to highway infrastructure. The costs and fees are a matter for the business case, not the Development Brief. An archaeological assessment is required and will be carried out. There is no proposal to move the allotments. Wamil Court Care Home has nothing to do with the Hub project. All matters relating to funding are addressed by the Business case and fall outside the consideration of this Development Brief. A full ecological survey was undertaken in 2015 and forms Appendix 1 to the Development Brief.

and thus delay the project?

- 6) Will the allotments be relocated to make way for complementary housing?
- 7) Will the Wamil Court Care Home site be for private housing, social housing or both?
- 8) Are FHDC funding or borrowing the majority of the costs incurred? Will this still make a saving to the tax payer?
- 9) Is there potential to deliver commercial office space?
- 10) Are there plans for transport services to/from the Hub?
- 11) Queens Way and Wamil Way will be considerably busier. What will happen to the off street parking?
- 12) Most traffic will go to the mini roundabout at Police Station Square or use alternative routes such as Comet Way to avoid the town centre. What are your plans to ease considerable congestion?
- 13) For the local farmers whose land will be commandeered, would the council be offering alternative land or compensation in order to accommodate the considerable disruption caused?
- 14) Has a survey already been completed on the proposed land in order to identify and protected wildlife species?
- 15) Who would be the legal owners of the hub?
- 16) What would happen if the desired funding could not be acquired?

Thank you for your time in reading my email and answering my questions. I look forward to your response.

Sport England aims to ensure positive planning for sport, enabling the right facilities to be provided in the right places, based on robust and up-to-date assessments of need for all levels of sport and all sectors of the community. To achieve this our planning objectives are to seek to PROTECT sports facilities from loss as a result of redevelopment; to ENHANCE existing facilities through improving their quality, accessibility and management; and to PROVIDE new facilities that are fit for purpose to meet demands for participation now and in the future. Further information on Sport England's objectives and planning policies relating to sport can be found here:

<https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/>

Sport England is supportive of the principle for the proposal for a public service hub in Mildenhall (including new community indoor and outdoor sports facilities) for the following reasons:

- The scheme is supported in terms of an evidence base via the recent studies carried out by West Suffolk Council (Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy),
- The proposal will result in a qualitative improvement in terms of the sports offer for Mildenhall, replacing existing ageing facilities with new fit for purpose facilities,
- The proposal will offer significant improvements in terms of the management and maintenance of sports facilities, being concentrated onto one single 'hub' site, serving the whole town

We acknowledge that the project is only in draft form at the moment, therefore Sport England reserves the right to further comment with regard to the proposed facility mix on the site (which should reflect identified strategic priorities) and the design and layout of the site and facilities (which should meet Sport England technical guidance documents, which can be accessed here: <https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>)

Please note also that any support given by Sport England in terms of the planning proposals does not indicate that Sport England would support any proposal for funding towards this project, as this would be considered against separate criteria.

Thank you for the support and offer of further participation.

Thank you for consulting us on the draft development brief for the proposed Public Service Hub at Mildenhall.

We have reviewed the development brief and our advisory comments are set out below.

Contaminated Land

The site is located above a Principal Aquifer and within Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 3. Therefore, risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site should be addressed following the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination, which can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/managing-and-reducing-land-contamination>. The NPPF takes a precautionary approach to land contamination. Before the principle of development can be determined, land contamination should be investigated to see whether it could preclude certain development due to environmental risk or cost of clean up (remediation).

Where contamination is known or suspected a desk study, investigation, remediation and other works may be required to enable safe development (Paragraph 121 of the NPPF). Our minimum requirements for submission with a planning application where contamination is suspected are a desk study and preliminary risk assessment such as a site walkover or conceptual model.

Site Investigation and Remediation Strategy reports may be required for submission with a planning application for sensitive land use types or where significant contamination or uncertainty is found. The local council's Environmental Health team may hold records on locations of known / potential land contamination. If during site works contaminated material is suspected, you are advised to stop works and seek further guidance.

Remediation of contaminated land may require an authorisation under environmental permitting legislation.

Surface Water

The implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be carefully considered. These techniques can provide a method for reducing runoff that could otherwise lead to flooding. They can also minimise pollution impacts, improve biodiversity and provide amenity areas.

If infiltration drainage is proposed then it must be demonstrated that it will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. We consider any infiltration SuDS greater than 2.0 m below ground level to be a deep system and generally not acceptable. All infiltration SuDS require a minimum of 1.2 m clearance between the base and peak seasonal groundwater levels. All need to meet the criteria set out in our Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice

Thank you for your positive observations and advice.

(GP3) document1. In addition, they must not be constructed in ground affected by contamination.

Foul Drainage

The site is located in an area served by the public foul sewer. In accordance with the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance, new development should be connected to the public mains (with the prior written approval of the statutory undertaker) where possible. Proliferation of individual treatment plants can cause deterioration in local water quality (ground and surface water). This would be contrary to the principles of the EU Water Framework Directive². Some 'non mains' foul water drainage systems will require our prior written Consent. Consent is required irrespective of planning approval.

Works in proximity to Main Rivers

Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws, our prior written consent is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 9 metres of the top of the bank of the River Lark. Our consent may also be required for works more than 9 metres away which might affect the structural integrity of the bank, for example excavations. Please contact us at PSO-Brampton@environment-agency.gov.uk should you wish to discuss your proposals.

The references to existing public facilities spread across 8 separate sites is inaccurate and misleading. In practice there are 5 sites as the Mildenhall College Academy site in Bury Road also houses the Dome Sports Centre and the present Council Offices, library, clinic and police station are on adjacent sites and effectively form one complex, which is more central for a majority of residents and has better road connections. The site in Sheldrick Way would be less suitable than the current site for the fire station due to the poor road connections.

The proposed site for the Hub is NOT a central site, it is on the current edge of town and only convenient for a relatively small number of residents living on the western side of the town. Relocating facilities to this site will probably decrease pedestrian access to the facilities and increase vehicle use.

The site has poor road connections.

QUEENSWAY

Queensway is not a suitable access for the amount of development proposed by the Hub project and the housing that is being considered on sites to the west of the Hub site. Although Queensway is wide for part of the route there is much parking along it and there are pinch points where the road narrows. The junction with the High Street close to the mini roundabout at Police Station Square is totally unsuitable for an increased volume of traffic and the whole junction would need to be considerably improved before any development that increases traffic flow is permitted.

Consideration should be given to forming a roundabout at the junction of Queensway and Comet Way to slow down vehicles entering Mildenhall from the West Row direction and re-aligning Sheldrick Way to enter Queensway at this roundabout.

CHURCH WALK

Church Walk is a single track road with few passing places and extremely restricted visibility at the junction with Wamil Way. There have been minor accidents and near collisions at this junction and the increase in cycle and pedestrian use proposed by the hub will necessitate very careful management if accidents are to be prevented.

In addition to traffic associated with dwellings in Church Walk, the road also serves the Church (including wedding and funeral cars), the Almshouses, some properties in the Churchyard and the Bunbury Rooms, which is home to a dance school and various other groups, all of which generate vehicular traffic. It is not uncommon for traffic entering Church Walk to reverse into Wamil Way to allow traffic to exit.

The Road Safety Report commissioned by local residents in response to a recent planning application recommended improvements to this junction and these should be implemented

It is accepted that some facilities share a site and others are located in close proximity. However, none of the existing site except for the fire station could be regarded as central for the entire population of Mildenhall. There are no central sites available for a Hub, but Sheldrick Way is well located and close to the town centre. It is also well located to serve additional growth to the west of the town. Any development of the site will require further traffic assessment, including the impact of traffic on Queensway and any improvements required on the road network, both for traffic movement and pedestrian safety. This would include the impact of development upon Church Walk and Wamil Way. Parking will be required in accordance with adopted parking standards, which include wider spaces. This level of detail will be required at with any subsequent planning application and will be related to the development proposed at the time. The height of individual buildings will be the subject of individual impact studies as the appropriate time. Section 6.3.3 is amended to address this. Option 3 for the complementary housing has been removed and parking options in Wamil Way have been given further consideration, following consultation and Section 6.1.4 amended accordingly.

in full if any increase in use of Church Walk or Wamil Way is permitted. The opportunity could be taken to realign Wamil Way to include a “build-out” as suggested in the report at the same time as changes to the old school access are carried out.

CAR PARKING

P.23 states that “Proposals for a mixed use site will be expected to minimise provision of car parking where achievable”. The idea that car parking on the site could be minimised would be totally unrealistic and unachievable as the school and offices will be in use throughout the working day, when facilities such as library and swimming pool will presumably also be open.

P.40 refers to 10% of parking spaces in a preferential location being reserved for electric vehicles and also preferential parking being allocated for very small vehicles (under 3 metres) and car sharing. Electric and very small vehicles are more suited to urban areas and are uncommon in rural areas. The idea of preferential parking for such vehicles would seem to be idealistic and impractical.

WAMIL WAY

Re-development of the Wamil Court site will cause increased traffic in Wamil Way, as would the development proposed in the current planning application for land to the south of Wamil Way. Sites 2 and 3 shown as possible sites for complementary housing in the Hub Development Brief would also add to traffic in Wamil Way and are therefore not ideal sites for housing, however these sites would have a far safer access than the current application site to the south of Wamil Way.

While there would be a very small traffic reduction if the pre-school is moved to Sheldrick Way, this is unlikely to improve the already difficult traffic situation in Wamil Way. Site 3 proposes the removal of the off street parking area in the old school entrance. This parking area is frequently used overnight by residents who have no off street parking and by some residents of the Almshouses. It is also used for Church parking and by some users of the Bunbury Rooms.

The junction of Wamil Way and Queensway is a tight turn when entering Wamil Way from the east, causing many vehicles to encroach onto the west side of the road. The top end of Wamil Way has necessary on street parking where residents have nowhere else to park, but this reduces the road to a single lane which frequently causes traffic to reverse back into Queensway when faced with traffic turning out of the road, or to reverse down Wamil Way to Bridewell Close. Any increase in traffic flow along Queensway will have the effect of making it more difficult to exit Wamil Way, which will exacerbate the existing traffic problems in Wamil Way.

SCALE AND MASSING

Although the development brief states that most of the Hub development should be no more than 2 stories high it also suggests that 25% of buildings could be 3 or 4 stories high. We are concerned that 4 storey buildings would appear too dominant and would compromise the views of the Church tower which are an important feature of the flat landscape to the west.

OTHER ISSUES

We suggest that the following should be considered as part of the overall plan for this development and the town :

- If the Hub project is granted planning permission and new housing is being planned on the western side of town a western link road will be necessary, ideally from the Red Lodge junction on the A11, passing to the west of Worlington and linking with the West Row Road west of the town. This would help to relieve the otherwise unacceptable pressure on Queensway and Police Station Square. It could also link into the industrial estate, and possibly be made to join with the A1101 on the Littleport side of Beck Row, forming an effective western bypass for Mildenhall, Worlington and Beck Row.
- Improvements to the old school access from Wamil Way to include a more efficient parking layout, improved landscaping and lighting.
- A green buffer zone between the proposed Hub development and proposed new settlement boundary and the existing footpath / bridleway / cycle path to West Row to maintain the amenity value and rural nature of the path and riverside area.
- Extend pedestrian paving across High Street and King Street for the east-west link via Market Place and Church Walk, with traffic speed reduction platforms in both roads. This could have significant townscape benefits if done in a sensitive way similar to the pedestrian friendly area between Angel Hill and the Abbey Gardens in Bury St. Edmunds.
- Improvements to Police Station Square to improve traffic flows, enhance the townscape and facilitate pedestrian crossing routes. This would also benefit the setting of nearby listed buildings and the war memorial.
- Liaise with Mildenhall Cycling Club to ensure that a suitable location for the Mildenhall Cycle Rally is maintained in the town, as this is a national event which encourages tourism and as such should be encouraged.
- To encourage tourism in the town could consideration be given to the provision of a camp site, either on part of the old school site or associated with the Hub site.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

In addition to the “Hub Draft Development Brief” consultation is currently taking place on the “Site Allocation Local Plan : Preferred Options” which proposes an area to the west of the Hub site, extending to Wamil Road, for 1,250 new houses, presumably a population increase of approximately 4,000 – 4,500 persons. It is known that Wamil Court will be redeveloped, plus possible Hub related complementary housing being put forward in the Brief. There is also a planning application for housing to the south of Wamil Way (not a preferred option site in the Local Plan) and applications for significant housing in West Row, together with the possibility of MOD land being released between Mildenhall and West Row.

Taken together this will have a dramatic effect on the western side of Mildenhall and traffic volumes in Queensway and West Row Road. All of these suggested sites and applications should be considered as a whole, not piecemeal, so that housing can be built in the best suited locations and open areas retained where desirable, and that appropriate infrastructure improvements are made. It is critical that Planning Control should grasp the bigger picture to endeavour to deliver outcomes that are best for the current and future population, rather than the result of speculative applications by land owners and developers.

Thank you for inviting Suffolk County Council to review and respond to the draft Development Brief (the Brief). The County Council remains an active and supportive partner of the Hub. The One Public Estate (OPE) programme is important, not just for Government and the family of local government, but for all bodies delivering public services. It is particularly relevant to benefits reform, digitisation, as well as health and social care integration, which is of vital importance to Suffolk County Council. Alongside the new homes and jobs currently programmed in Forest Heath's adopted and emerging local plan, the delivery of the Mildenhall Hub is essential for the sustainable growth of the town. Given its role and location, the Hub is a keystone project for the future of Mildenhall and this Development Brief will be an important tool to help all partners work together to get the best development for the town.

The Brief is a welcome step forward and Suffolk County Council offers its resources to establish the right package to ensure the benefits are optimised and the impacts mitigated. The County Council has various roles and responsibilities that are directly linked to the development and to the preparation of the brief in general. Expertise within County Council can be used to shape the Brief if this would assist Forest Heath to progress the project.

Access and Movement

Transport matters are reviewed by the Brief. Further dialogue between county and district councils will help to optimise the opportunities to encourage more people to walk, cycle or use public transport. By way of example, the authors of the Brief highlight the need to improve pedestrian safety and that the site will need to be much more accessible with the development of the Hub.

A draft Transport Assessment was undertaken on the options for the Hub and for approximately 1,000 dwellings on West Row Road. An update to this assessment could help to reflect: Forest Heath's updated policy position on the distribution of new housing; the development of the Business Case, and what the resultant area of the Hub could be accounting for growth (e.g. the addition of the primary school).

Public Transport

The Hub concept would create a single destination for multiple journey requirements and, therefore, making services more viable. This is particularly relevant if services are to move away from subsidies. Further discussions are needed with the bus companies to work up

Thank you for the informative observations. In all respects, it is important that the Brief takes account of the need for flexibility in the delivery of facilities and allows for expansion within the site to meet future growth demands

an approach to the strategic future of local services that can then inform the final version of the Brief. Together with Forest Heath, the county will open a dialogue with bus operators to identify how services could adapt to the integration of the Hub with the Town.

Rights of Way

The use of the rights of way network is vital to promote walking and cycling, not only as a more sustainable mode of travel but as a way to improve health. In 2014, the County Council completed substantial improvements to encourage people to walk and cycle between West Row and Mildenhall. This improved route has enhanced the level of accessibility to the site. In developing the hub project with Forest Heath, the County Council is open to commissioning an analysis of the need for further improvements to help more people to walk and cycle within an enlarged Mildenhall.

Education

The focus of the Brief has been on addressing the needs arising from the Business Case for the Mildenhall Hub. Acknowledgement could also be made to the potential for further growth in the demand for education facilities. The current emerging strategy from Forest Heath is for the Town grow by over 1,500 dwellings between 2011 and 2031, 1,350 of these would be new allocations that could include the adjacent land to the west of the site. Most of the sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment are on the western side of the town surrounding this site.

Pre-school

The Brief recognises that the existing pre-school would be relocated to the Hub. This is an existing facility providing 28 places. With growth, at least a further 81 (full-time) pre-school places would be required. The Brief could reflect the potential for this use to increase in size to accommodate increased demand from the overall growth in the town. This might affect the location and access priorities for the pre-school element of the Hub and connections with the primary school (if one is proposed for the site).

Primary

There are two primary schools with Mildenhall - Great Heath Primary School and St Mary's

Church of England Academy. Both these schools are currently providing space for a maximum of 420 places and will soon reach capacity. For Great Health, a project will start on site later this year to increase the permanent capacity of the school to 630 by September 2017. A new primary school will be required at Mildenhall if the town is to grow at the level currently proposed. The Brief recognises that a new primary school could be part of the Hub. The stage at which the new primary school is needed will depend on the rate that new homes are built. Officers from both authorities could work together on testing scenarios.

Secondary

The provision of all Mildenhall College Academy's post-11 education facilities to the site is a major component of the project. The current business case is for the new building to be suitable for 1050 secondary pupils (the current sixth form centre remains), but that the shared spaces to be used by the academy, such as the school hall and kitchens, are large enough to support 1500 pupils.

For each 100 new homes built, approximately 18 secondary and four sixth-form pupils would need places within local schools. Using 1,350 new homes as a guide, this would mean that a further 243 secondary and 54 sixth-form more pupils would demand places. However, this does not include growth from elsewhere. In October last year, the Cabinet of Suffolk County Council acknowledged that there is an emerging case for a much larger or even an additional secondary school to serve the Mildenhall, Lakenheath and Red Lodge area. With the publication of Forest Heath's preferred strategy, further consideration will be given by the County Council to what could be the right approach and how this affects the Hub.

The potential for the secondary school to expand to accommodate this growth has been included in the Business Case but only insofar as the core facilities have been designed for the growth. Further expansion will be required to accommodate the future needs to the town and its surrounding area. Such extensions as may be required would be undertaken in phases and financial contributions from development would be necessary.

Surface Water

The Brief does review the fluvial flood zones and illustrates how Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) can be integrated into the landscape. As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Suffolk County Council will review the surface water drainage details and provide advice to Forest Heath as the planning authority. A flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with the planning application but, if the timetable allows, an illustrative drainage strategy could be a useful addition to inform the Brief. As partners to the project, the County Council will provide advice on the amount of open space likely to be required for open SuDS, which could be used in the Brief. The requirements of the Flood Risk Assessment can also be provided to inform any consultancy brief.

Archaeology

The Archaeological Service from Suffolk County Council has already provided advice for the formation of the Brief and highlighted the need for an archaeological evaluation. This allocation lies in an area of very high archaeological potential and, with regard to Policy DM4, there is not sufficient information available to confirm the archaeological impacts of the development proposed by the Brief. Without an evaluation being undertaken, the layout of buildings indicated by the Brief can only illustrate what may be possible.

Whilst such information might be made available prior to the determination of a planning application, a more appropriate strategy would be to undertake the necessary evaluation (e.g. metal detecting, geophysical and trial trenches) before finalising the location of buildings and other works. The Business Case does acknowledge the risk that, if anything of national importance is identified, the design of the development might need to change or the building work could be delayed.

To make progress and reduce the risk of delay to the project, the County Council will fund the archaeological evaluation. Given the areas outlined for development are currently arable or school grounds, the forthcoming summer period appears to be the most appropriate to undertake trial trenching.

Health and Wellbeing

The development of the Hub, with its focus on the provision of services, sport and education, will bring health-related benefits. A focus on health is particularly relevant to

Mildenhall. The Town has a lower life expectancy than other parts of Forest Heath, which is generally a healthy area, and higher – though not significantly higher - rates of premature mortality from heart disease than the national average. The role of the Hub in addressing health inequalities and promoting health and wellbeing could be incorporated further into the brief. This could, for example, emphasise the importance of walking and cycling to the site and access to the rights of way network. Evidence and expertise from Suffolk's public health team is available to assist Forest Heath District Council.

Minerals & Waste

Waste

The County Council promotes design approaches to waste minimisation (Waste Core Strategy Policy WDM17). Features could be incorporated in later stages that allow for effective sorting, recycling and composting. The waste team at the County Council are keen to promote such measures and is available to provide advice.

Minerals

The western edge of the site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area set out by the Proposals Map accompanying Suffolk's 2008 Minerals Core Strategy. There is limited encroachment of the Minerals Conservation Area into the site and the wider area for development. Furthermore, the likely resource, as identified by the British Geological Survey, is lower purity underlying Grey Chalk rather than sand and gravel deposits, which is the primary focus of the consultation areas.

Sustainable Energy

The brief provides a detailed account of the potential for low and zero-carbon technologies and recognises a fabric-first approach. The potential commercialisation of a district heating scheme could be possible if both elements are considered together. By way of a similar example, the County Council commissioned a report which identified marginal commercial potential for district heating. This could be improved with greater loads from, for example, a swimming pool. An application for the scheme (Chilton Woods) has been submitted and the report is available through Babergh's website.

Summary

The Mildenhall Hub is an important project for the County Council, which remains committed to its delivery. There are some positive elements in the Brief, particularly the recognition of the relationship between the Hub and the adjustment land that could be developed for new homes. Further information will help shape the Brief and the County Council will support Forest Health to collect further evidence and form the most appropriate strategic response.

I trust that this sets out the County Council's position on a range of factors to be considered in the Brief as well as its continued support for the proposal.
