

Site Allocations Local Plan - Preferred Options (Regulation 18 Stage)

Public Participation Report

What is the Preferred Options consultation?

What is the Preferred Options consultation?

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

What is the Preferred Options consultation?

What is the Preferred Options consultation?

23883 - Mr John Bridges [5750]

Support

I agree with all your plans

comments noted

no action required

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action*****1. Introduction and Background to this consultation******1. Introduction and Background to this consultation***

24501 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]

Object

- The NHG has reviewed the evidence base that supports both this document and the SIR and has raised significant concerns about the adequacy of the work undertaken. It does not believe that the impacts have been properly evaluated and as such does not consider that it is appropriate to propose site allocations until such time as this work has been carried out.

The NHG's main area of concern is the Council's lack of understanding about the transportation and highway issues in Newmarket and the consequential impact of this on the horse-racing industry. The Council considers that a town-wide strategy is required that incorporates measures to facilitate the safe movement of horses around the town and limit the conflict with traffic. Failure to undertake this exercise will mean that the proposals for Newmarket in this document raise significant and adverse consequence for the horse-racing industry.

Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.

No action required

What happens next?

24089 - Suffolk Constabulary (Ms Jackie Norton) [12810]

Comment

I would be pleased to work with any agent and/or a developer to ensure any future proposed development incorporates the required security elements. This is the most efficient way to proceed with residential and commercial developments and is a useful partnership approach to reduce the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime.

noted

no action required

Representations

Nature

Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan

Council's Assessment

Action

2. Planning policy context

Housing growth and distribution

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24357 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	<p>2.6-2.12 - we support the general approach to distributing housing numbers between settlements and prefer distribution option 1 over option 2. However, we do not support the overall decision made in respect of the numbers the SALP seeks to deliver. Our main concern is that the plan does not make adequate provision in terms of flexibility, in that it relies (apart from one exception) for every site in the plan to be delivered. As the Council's old Local Plan allocations demonstrate and those of many authorities elsewhere, whilst every effort can be made to select sites which are considered to be deliverable, they may not always deliver. For example, the Council is allocating a site at Newmarket (N1d), which was a 1995 Local Plan allocation for residential development tied to the needs of those in the racing industry. The current proposal is for the same use and relates to the provision of 44 dwellings. The site has clearly not delivered housing despite being allocated in a plan for over 20 years. Whilst the Council may be satisfied that there remains an intention to develop the site during the SALP period, it is clear that should the site not do so, or indeed any of the others, that the plan will fail to meet its full OAN. We do not therefore support a plan which could very easily fail to deliver its OAN.</p> <p>In addition to the above, whilst our main argument in respect of the overall level of housing being allocated relates to a lack of flexibility, we also do not understand the basis of a decision by the Council not to deliver the additional 10% in order to increase the delivery of affordable housing. Whilst the potential increase in environmental impacts is listed as a potential concern, there is certainly no prove or testing which indicates that there would be an impact which would outweigh the clear social and economic positive impacts associated with such a decision. Therefore, it remains the case that the option to deliver the additional 10% is the more sustainable option and it is not clear why the plan is not therefore using that option. We consider this to be an important issue to address before moving ahead with the plan and advocate the matter to be looked not only at a strategic level but also tested in terms of which additional sites of the alternatives could be delivered</p>	<p>Noted, and welcome support for the distribution of housing.</p> <p>The council believes that the plan includes sufficient sites to provide the flexibility required to deliver the housing numbers set out in the SIR.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		without environmental harm.		
24149 - Hastoe Housing Association [12914]	Comment	Why is it that no sites are being considered within secondary villages where they are adjacent to existing settlement boundaries and can be demonstrated that the development would be a sustainable and appropriate extension to the villages providing further amenities and vitality addressing local housing need also. Is there not a risk that without well considered small scale development of secondary villages they will become dormant and with local amenities further jeopardized, surely small scale development/growth in these villages can assist in their future prosperity, create sustainable mixed communities and maintain and enhance the services in these rural areas.	Core Strategy Policy CS1 sets out the settlement hierarchy for Forest Heath. Secondary villages are small, rural settlements that do not have the level of services and facilities necessary to support sustainable growth. Policy CS1 makes clear that secondary villages will provide nominal housing growth, no urban expansion will be considered, and development outside settlement boundaries will be restricted to development that supports the rural economy, meets affordable housing needs (rural exception sites), or provides renewable energy. The council believes that the plan includes sufficient sites to provide the flexibility required to deliver the housing numbers set out in the SIR without the need to allocate sites in Secondary Villages.	no action required
24049 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Comment	Although I agree with the general policy of Housing growth and distribution, I consider 2.9,the exclusion of site allocations for the secondary villages to be unfair. An upgrade of the 1995 settlement boundaries, may be insufficient in detail. As development in most villages has increased since 1995, perhaps reconsideration of the designation - secondary/primary should be considered.	Core Strategy Policy CS1 sets out the settlement hierarchy for Forest Heath. Secondary villages are small, rural settlements that do not have the level of services and facilities necessary to support sustainable growth. Policy CS1 makes clear that secondary villages will provide nominal housing growth, no urban expansion will be considered, and development outside settlement boundaries will be restricted to development that supports the rural economy, meets affordable housing needs (rural exception sites), or provides renewable energy. The council believes that the plan includes sufficient sites to provide the flexibility required to deliver the housing numbers set out in the SIR without the need to allocate sites in Secondary Villages.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24396 - The Exning Estate [12928]	Support	<p>Housing and Distribution (page 8) - Distribution Option 1Table</p> <p>We support the Councils preferred option 'Distribution Option 1: Higher growth at Mildenhall and Red Lodge and Primary Villages, and lower growth at Newmarket'.</p> <p>The Site Allocations Local Plan Preferred Options consultation document categorises Exning as a Primary Village in Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy . The Housing an Distribution table displayed on page 13 details the Councils preferred Housing Distribution Option and proposes that Primary villages can accommodate an additional 750 dwellings over the Plan Period to 2031. Residential development in Primary villages will help the Council to reach this development target and we support Exning as a location for residential development to help meet this identified need.</p>	noted	no action required
<i>The built and natural environment</i>				
24395 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Built, natural and historic environment? Forest Heath also has scheduled monuments.	noted	no action required

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

3. How have the potential housing sites been selected

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

24358 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	<p>3.1-3.4 - we note reference to the selection process which has arisen as a result of findings contained within the SHLAA and also in terms of the Issues and Options consultation 2015. Paragraph 3.4 highlights that sites which have not been selected as preferred options are known as omission sites and are listed in Appendix B of the SALP with the reasons they were rejected. Our client's site (M/30) is listed on page 163, with the following reasons: unsustainable location, potential coalescence with Barton Mills and potential landscape impact. These arguments appear to flow directly through from the SHLAA which appears to have tarnished the site with these arguments from the start. It is also clear when reviewing the information put forward to the public in the Issues and Options consultation that all the key positives of the site were not set out.</p> <p>The omitted positives of allocating Site M/30 is set out in our response to Questions 4 and 5 below, in the absence of a question within the consultation document which invites views on omitted sites.</p>	<p>Noted. Site M/30 (the Old Railway Station site, Mildenhall) has been re-examined, and rejected as set out in Appendix B of the Preferred Options consultation document, April 2016; an unsustainable location, with potential landscape impact, and potential coalescence with Barton Mills. This assessment has been re-examined, and has been rejected on all the grounds set out in Appendix B of the Preferred Options document.</p>	<p>no action required</p>
---------------------------------	---------	---	---	---------------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Responses to the Site Allocations Local Plan Further Issues and Options consultation 2015</i>				
24359 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	3.1-3.4 - we note reference to the selection process which has arisen as a result of findings contained within the SHLAA and also in terms of the Issues and Options consultation 2015. Paragraph 3.4 highlights that sites which have not been selected as preferred options are known as omission sites and are listed in Appendix B of the SALP with the reasons they were rejected. Our client's site (M/30) is listed on page 163, with the following reasons: unsustainable location, potential coalescence with Barton Mills and potential landscape impact. These arguments appear to flow directly through from the SHLAA which appears to have tarnished the site with these arguments from the start. It is also clear when reviewing the information put forward to the public in the Issues and Options consultation that all the key positives of the site were not set out. The omitted positives of allocating Site M/30 is set out in our response to Questions 4 and 5 below, in the absence of a question within the consultation document which invites views on omitted sites.	There is no additional evidence to suggest that the reasons for omitting the site should change.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Closure of RAF Mildenhall</i>				
23904 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	<p>The MODs principle concern relates to ensuring that tall structures especially tall buildings do not cause an obstruction to air traffic movements at MOD aerodromes or compromise the operation of air navigational transmitter/receiver facilities located in the area.</p> <p>The district is also covered by statutory birdstrike safeguarding consultation zones for RAF Lakenheath and RAF Mildenhall. The MODs principle concern relates to the creation of open water bodies and drainage management ponds would be a concern due to their potential to attract and or host large flocking bird species.</p> <p>The MOD advises Forest Heath District Council to consider air traffic noise emissions from RAF Lakenheath and Mildenhall when allocating sites for new housing taking into account the noise contours published by the MOD (which may be updated from time to time) and to engage with the RAF Commanders of RAF Mildenhall and RAF Lakenheath to obtain their input on current flight paths and military activities.</p>	<p>The most up to date information available has been used to assess noise constraints in developing the Local Plan. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development. In accordance with current safeguarding procedures.</p>	<p>Include noise contour map in SALP and highlight the need for development proposals to incorporate appropriate noise mitigation measures in relevant policies. See paragraph 3.9 and map.</p>
24110 - Mrs Jan Schick [12871]	Object	<p>While there is the possibility of Mildenhall Airbase, an already 'built up' area, being able to provide housing etc. in 5 years' time, I strongly object to the irrevocable destruction of these green field sites. These fields, used for arable farming, provide nesting sites for skylarks and hedgerows for a wide variety of other wildlife. It is a rural area highly valued by Mildenhall residents.</p>	<p>It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24502 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	both paragraphs refer to uncertainty over Mildenhall preventing the Council from considering this as a development option at this time. The NHG considers that the Council has sufficient information to hand to know that this is a potential development site that has the potential to significantly alter the development strategy for the district. It considers that this is a matter of such significance that it should be taken into account when preparing this document . The NHG does not agree that there is sufficient uncertainty in this matter to obviate the need for the Council to take this into account now.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.	no action required
24068 - Lord Derby [5831]	Support	Paragraph 3.7 Whilst Raf Mildenhall may become a potential development site at a later point in the local plan period, the comments about it in paragraph 3.7 are supported. At the current time the future of the site is too uncertain to meet the tests of availability and deliverability in the NPPF. Even in the most favourable conditions, RAF Mildenhall is not expected to become available before 2022 which makes it unlikely that the site could produce any dwellings prior to 2026.	noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
4. The settlements and preferred site options				
<i>Residential site options</i>				
24150 - Hastoe Housing Association [12914]	Comment	Section 4 - The criteria used to inform site selection states that only sites in or adjacent to towns, key service centres and primary villages would be considered. Bearing this in mind why was there a call to submit sites in secondary villages during the process as this would automatically exclude them irrespective of the proposed use and/or mix.	The August 2015 Further Issues and Options version of the SALP included a general call for sites (paragraph 1.19). this included the advice that "each site will need to be evaluated, in due course, in terms of its sustainability". The local policy context is set out in section 2. The settlement hierarchy in Policy CS1 is noted, and paragraph 2.9 goes on to advise "the council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages or small settlements," Secondary villages are small, rural settlements that do not have the level of services and facilities necessary to support sustainable growth. Policy CS1 makes clear that secondary villages will provide nominal housing growth, no urban expansion will be considered, and development outside settlement boundaries will be restricted to development that supports the rural economy, meets affordable housing needs (rural exception sites), or provides renewable energy.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24346 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	<p>We have no major concerns with the site allocations document but wish to make the following comments</p> <p>Flood Risk The flood zones within Forest Heath DC have been updated since the supporting Strategic Flood Risk Appraisal (SFRA) was produced. This could have implications for any allocations in close proximity to the previous floodplain. The Site Allocations plan should make reference to the latest guidance on climate change allowances in order to determine the future flood risk. Again, this could add some significant constraints to those towns and potentially allocated sites in and around the present day flood zone 2. We are happy to arrange a meeting to discuss the implications of both the updated flood models and the climate change allowance guidance.</p> <p>Water Framework Directive Assessment The Water Framework Directive (WFD) requires that new developments that have the potential to cause deterioration assess their impact on ecological quality (as set out in Article 4 of the WFD). The Anglian River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) requires the restoration and enhancement of water bodies to prevent deterioration and promote recovery of water bodies. Therefore, where appropriate, developers should identify measures set out in the RBMP to restore the ecological value of the main rivers. New proposals must not prevent implementation measures in the RBMP to achieve "good". The following sites are close to the main river (River Lark, Cut Off Channel). Therefore, developers should assess the impacts on new development on these sites in terms of the WFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Site M1(a) - Land West of Mildenhall <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(b) - Land West of Eriswell Road <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(b) - Land at North Lakenheath <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(d) - Land North of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way <p>Developers should demonstrate compliance with the following WFD aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration of the chemical or ecological condition of surface waters and/or the chemical or quantitative condition of groundwater; and 	<p>Noted. The Water Cycle Study has been updated (evidence base document available on our website) and finalised following consideration of the sites identified as Preferred Options. In preparing both documents consultants engaged with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water Services.</p> <p>Specific advice on sites close to the River Lark and Cut Off Channel is noted and included in supporting text in the appropriate settlement section of the plan.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p><input type="checkbox"/> Achieve overall good status on all waterbodies by 2021 or 2027 as appropriate for that waterbody.</p>		
24154 - Gladman (Mr Russell Spencer) [6673]	Comment	<p>It is unclear what level of housing the site allocations are designed to meet but it is presumed it is 6,800 as set out in the SIR of CS7 consultation. Gladman query the soundness of consulting on a range of site allocations when the final OAN and housing distribution is still to be decided and found sound. Gladman have no specific comments to make on the individual allocations within the plan except to note that many of the allocation policies place additional requirements on the delivery of sites, for example by requiring Development Briefs to be agreed or certain infrastructure to be provided before development can come forward. To ensure confidence and transparency over the deliverability of the allocations, a clear housing trajectory and supporting table should be included within the proposed submission draft. There should be a mechanism to allow other sustainable sites to come forward should the allocations fail to deliver in the timescales expected or fail to deliver the anticipated number of units to ensure the Council can maintain a robust housing land supply.</p>	<p>The council consulted on a range of site allocations to ensure sufficient land is available and deliverable across the district to meet its growth needs and aspirations.</p> <p>A housing trajectory is included in the submission draft of the SALP.</p> <p>The plan will be monitored, and a review undertaken if sites fail to come forward and delivery is compromised. The Council has resolved to produce a joint local plan for West Suffolk with St Edmundsbury Borough Council commencing at the beginning of 2018.</p>	no action required

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action*****Preferred sites for allocation in the towns******The local area - Brandon***

24380 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere
[6677]

Comment

TRANSPORT
There has been argued a need for Brandon to have a relief road to relieve congestion in Brandon and that this would be partly paid for by building houses in particular on the western edge of Brandon. I note that the Transport document has identified little change on traffic flow in Brandon over the two periods, but anecdotally, I suggest that it seems to have reduced overall. The dualling of the A11 from 5-ways roundabout to Thetford has taken a significant volume of traffic from the A1065.
Traffic which proceeds on the A1065 to Brandon and beyond has been hindered by additional traffic lights on the A1065.
The real constraint for free flowing traffic is the level crossing in Brandon and this would be most improved by building a bridge in the town.
The relief road proposed is not of an adequate design, being single carriage way with several roundabouts and would be mostly used as an access road for any new housing - thus increasing the volume

Noted. Further traffic evidence would be needed to justify the need for a relief road and the effect of the A11 improvements. Any scheme would need the participation and support of Breckland District and Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils.

no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24007 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Comment	<p>The things that concern me are.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The very small number of dwelling listed as acceptable is far too small . about approx.80-100 up to year 2031. Brandon has always been number 3 on the housing for development list for the Local Plan. In year the number was 791 units and in year 2012 790 units. 2. The population growth is continuing to rise Year 2001 8256 Year 2014 9425 an increase of 150 per Year so in Year2031 Brandon could have extra 1650 on the Electoral Role plus the fact that Brandon Has a Large Migration Intake 3. There is in Brandon. A large increase in Pupils numbers. Glade School has just added 4 new classrooms and needs more. A Planning for 4 new Classrooms is in place with FHDC now. Breckland School is currently ready to submit an application for extra Classrooms. The number of Pupils attending the 3 schools is over 1000 Pupils 4. FHDC were very good in helping a Company named OMAR HOMES to enlarge their Buisness. As a result there will be an increase in the Staff of at least 100 which will require extra accomdation.. 5. The Mildenhall Air Base will be closing down soon and many of the Staff will be working at The Lakenheath Base and will be looking for accommodation in Brandon. 6. Whilst I am a great supporter of Bird Life I have not Ever seen any evidence that all the Site . if built on, would result in harm to the Birds such as The Stone Curlew. 7. Some of the Sites, Shown in Brandon would not be suitable but there are others that should be considered the Site on the Road A1065 leading into Brandon from the direction of Mildenhall on the left had side could well be the answer for most of the shortage The Green Road has an Airflight Line from USAF Lakenheath and should not be considered 	<p>Concerns noted. Core Strategy Policy CS2: Natural Environment sets out the criteria for development in or within buffer areas of the protected habitats. Higher growth in Brandon could only be considered if it can be demonstrated that there are no adverse effects on the SPA, or where adverse impacts are identified that mitigation can be provided to overcome the impacts, and no evidence has been presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development. However, the council remains committed to working towards achieving a sustainable level of development in Brandon, which will be explored further with partner organisations during the production of the West Suffolk Local Plan (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury working together) which is due to commence at the beginning of 2018.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>What you told us - Brandon</i>				
24370 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	5.5 - I strongly support the first 3 bullet points raising the concerns of Breckland District Council, Natural England and Historic England.	noted	no action required
<i>Development Issues - Brandon</i>				
24372 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	The conclusions in paragraph 5.8 regarding the constraints around Brandon also have my strong support.	noted	no action required
<i>Brandon planning constraints map</i>				
24468 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Comment	From the 'Brandon Planning Constraints' plan on page 18 of the SIR it is obvious that any future substantial expansion and development of Brandon, to fulfil its market town status and allocation in the settlement hierarchy, must be built out towards the west of the town where there are fewer constraints. As discussed in the Introduction to these Representations, a planning application has already been submitted to provide comprehensive development to the west of Brandon and is at a considerably advanced stage as such that a decision is anticipated prior to the adoption of the SALP. Development to the west of Brandon would also locate development closer to the main transport routes, town centre and other services which are paramount to ensuring the sustainability of this market town and is in accordance with the justifications for adopting the settlement hierarchy of Policy CS1.	The planning application has yet to be determined, and proposes development across the boundary, and includes a relief road. To date no evidence has been presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development than is allocated in the plan. In addition, there is no evidence that the proposal is viable and deliverable, and therefore cannot be included in the plan at this time. However, the council remains committed to working towards achieving a sustainable level of development in Brandon, which will be explored further with partner organisations during the production of the West Suffolk Local Plan (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury working together) which is due to commence at the beginning of 2018.	no action required
<i>Brandon site allocations map</i>				
24170 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently spare capacity at the receiving Brandon Water Recycling Centre to accommodate growth at the scale suggested for Brandon.	noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site B1(a) - Land at Fengate Drove (formerly B/01)</i>				
24243 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites B1(a) (previously B/01) and B2 (previously part of B/12) were assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. In particular, site B2, which was previously part of a larger site (B/12), was recorded as containing acid grassland (a Priority habitat) and having the potential to support a range of protected and/or Priority species. The proposed cemetery use should therefore ensure that this habitat and any protected and/or Priority species present are appropriately protected.	<p>Site SA2(a) Land at Fengate Drove (previously B1(a)) has planning permission and development has commenced on site so is a commitment in the SALP Submission draft rather than an allocation. The wildlife audit assessment of the site concluded that the biodiversity value of the existing features is considered to be low. Because of its location close to Breckland SPA the policy wording requires that if the current planning permission or development proposals on site SA2a are not implemented or are varied, a project level HRA would be required for any new planning application on the site</p> <p>Site SA3 Cemetery site (previously B2) also has planning permission for a cemetery however the layout and landscaping of the site has not yet been determined. Wording could be included to require that if the current planning permission or development proposals on site SA3 are not implemented or are varied proposals should have regard to any protected and priority species present which should be managed onsite.</p>	no action required
24171 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	In response to the planning application we confirmed there is treatment and foul network capacity within the existing sewerage system without the need for infrastructure upgrades.	noted	no action required
23905 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. This constraint will be triggered when an application is submitted and the MOD consulted.	no action required
24404 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Current application - DC/14/2219/FUL	noted	no action required
24397 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	will require a condition for archaeology, no reference in the site sheet but the site sheets are short - mention here or in the policy?	Noted. Planning application reference DC/14/2219/FUL was granted planning permission (subject to a S106 agreement) in June 2016. A condition for archaeology was included.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23900 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Object	Taking them in order The Fengate Site which has had Planning Permission for some 5 years is to be found in FHDC Site allocations Local Plan Further Issues and Options dated August 2015, The numbers I have quoted are the result of the Site being partly in FHDC and Breckland District Council which added together will total approx. 80 dwelling which should be counted as the Brandon Population.	The council can only count dwellings built, committed or within the district boundary.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23899 - Mr William Bishop [5524]	Object	<p>The purpose of this email is to express my great concern about the very low numbers of Homes proposed for Brandon for the next years up to 2031. Which totals 70.</p> <p>These 70 homes have planning permission and are about to be built at Fengate Drove(the other side of the most terrible Railway Crossing in the World. The Site was at one time the Best industrial Site in Brandon.</p> <p>If you check your Census figures you will find the Brandon has always has a continuous increase in Population over the last 15 years and this, of course, does not include the high number of Immigrants living here</p> <p>Brandon has always been number 3 in line for Housing in Forest Heath Now it is bottem of the List. The reason appears to be that The Stone Curlew and other Wild Birds would be affected. To my very good knowledge 99% Of the Population of Brandon have NEVER seem these birds. It is also possible to encourage these Birds onto another Site. This also begs the question why has this problem only just appeared ?</p> <p>Of course I agree that the majority of the Sites listed in Brandon are not suitable for Housing (Aircraft Noise Flood Plains) But it would be possible to locate Sites which have been selected by FHDC before to allow so sort of Housing Development in Brandon.</p> <p>Looking at Brandon Compered with other Sites it has much going for it. A direct Railway Link to London/Norwich. A RoadA1065/A11 to East Anglia. It certainly does want considering when it comes to the Future of The Brandon Town and all the Residents</p>	<p>Higher growth in Brandon could only be considered if it can be demonstrated that there are no adverse effects on the SPA, or where adverse impacts are identified that mitigation can be provided to overcome the impacts, and no evidence has been presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development. However, the council remains committed to working towards achieving a sustainable level of development in Brandon, which will be explored further with partner organisations during the production of the West Suffolk Local Plan (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury working together) which is due to commence at the beginning of 2018.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site B1(b) - Land at Warren Close</i>				
24405 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	The potential access from Beavor Lane is not adopted highway, it is a cycle/pedestrian link only. The alternative access from Heath Road/Warren Close is through a narrow residential street with frequent reversing vehicles, due to garages. There are substantial trees which may be protected by TPO, if they can't be removed they could cause potential visibility issues	noted	no action required
23906 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. This constraint will be triggered when an application is submitted and the MOD consulted.	no action required
24172 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	noted	no action required
24244 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites B1(b) and B1(c) were not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If they contain habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, they should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development.	<p>Site SA2(b) Land at Warren Close (previously B1(b)) is an existing development being considered for redevelopment. There are a number of existing trees that have been protected. Whilst any application will need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey, the risks to biodiversity and to delivery of the site are assessed as low.</p> <p>Site SA2(c) Land off Gas House Drove (previously B1(c)) is a small brownfield site in the existing settlement boundary; the site has recently undergone remediation. There is a current planning application which includes an ecological survey by a respected ecologist and therefore the risks to biodiversity can be assessed and are considered low; risks to the delivery of the site are considered low.</p>	no action required
24398 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	depending on development details, will require a condition for archaeology (no reference on site sheet, but the site sheets are short)	Noted. This constraint will be triggered when an application is submitted and Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service will be consulted and given the opportunity to recommend appropriate condition(s).	no action required
		<i>Works required to Heath Road / Warren Close to make it suitable for increased traffic</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site B1(c) - Land of Gas House Drove</i>				
23907 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. This constraint will be triggered when an application is submitted and the MOD consulted.	no action required
24406 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Gas House Drove is a non-adopted road / track, which is very narrow, and has an overrun area for pedestrians, but no footways. Beyond the immediate access, Lode St is a narrow link to the one way system. There is a potential pedestrian access to Theftord Road. There may also be the potential for limited access to St Benedict's Road. <i>Development would require an upgrade to Gas House Drove, but there appears to be restricted scope to do much work</i>	noted	no action required
24173 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	noted	no action required
23892 - Mr C J Preston [12834]	Object	I understand there are plans to build ten dwellings on the site, I object to this as it will be out of character with Gas House Drove.	This is a former gas works site in a mainly residential area. Details of character and appearance will be dealt with through the planning application process.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Policy B1: Housing in Brandon</i>				
24463 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Object	Housing in Brandon given that the limited housing allocations do not accord with the capacity for growth in Brandon as a market town as per the IDP and in accordance with Policy CS1, smaller allocations will exacerbate existing infrastructure issues rather than contribute to their much needed expansion. We also object on grounds relating to FHDC's 5 YHLS.	Higher growth in Brandon could only be considered if it can be demonstrated that there are no adverse effects on the SPA, or where adverse impacts are identified that mitigation can be provided to overcome the impacts, and no evidence has been presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development. However, the council remains committed to working towards achieving a sustainable and viable level of development in Brandon, which will be explored further with partner organisations during the production of the West Suffolk Local Plan (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury working together) which is due to commence at the beginning of 2018. The council is satisfied that sufficient land is allocated in the plan to meet the 5 year housing land supply figure.	no action required
24594 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	We agree with Policy B1 on the Fengate Drove application as, following extensive discussions and further information from the applicant, we were able to conclude that this site would not have an effect on the integrity of Breckland SPA.	Comment noted. This site has commenced and therefore it will not appear as an allocation in the SALP	no action required
<i>Question 1 - Brandon</i>				
24462 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Object	We do not agree with draft Policy B1: Housing in Brandon. As discussed in the Introduction to these Representations, a planning application for the development of up to 1,650 homes including associated infrastructure was submitted in May 2015 and is due to be determined in autumn 2016 prior to the adoption of the SALP. Despite both the USAFE Mildenhall and the pending Hatchfield Farm sites being considered in the SALP which represent scales of development at either end of the spectrum, with the Mildenhall being a speculative proposal in the period post 2022 and the latter currently awaiting determination at appeal, it is unclear why the pending application on land to the west of Brandon has not been mentioned, considered or discussed in either the SALP or the SIR.	The planning application has yet to be determined, and proposes development across the boundary, and includes a relief road. To date no evidence has been presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development than is allocated in the plan. In addition, there is no evidence that the proposal is viable and deliverable, and therefore cannot be included in the plan at this time. However, the council remains committed to working towards achieving a sustainable level of development in Brandon, which will be explored further with partner organisations during the production of the West Suffolk Local Plan (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury working together) which is due to commence at the beginning of 2018.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24374 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	In answer to Question 1 on page 23, I do strongly agree with the overall approach, which is to contain development within the built fabric of the settlement	noted	no action required
<i>New cemetery site - Brandon</i>				
24597 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	site B2, which was previously part of a larger site (B/12), was recorded as containing acid grassland (a Priority habitat) and having the potential to support a range of protected and/or Priority species. The proposed cemetery use should therefore ensure that this habitat and any protected and/or Priority species present are appropriately protected.	Site SA3 Brandon Cemetery (previously B2) also has planning permission for a cemetery however the layout and landscaping of the site has not yet been determined. Wording could be included to require that if the current planning permission or development proposals on site SA3 are not implemented or are varied, proposals should include measures for the management on site of any protected and priority species present.	Add policy text: If the current planning permission or development proposals on site SA3 are not implemented or are varied, proposals should include measures for the management on site of any protected and priority species present.
<i>Policy B2: Cemetery</i>				
24407 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Submitted application with access from Manor Road and emergency access only off Small Fen Lane	noted	no action required
24466 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Object	We SUPPORT Policy B2: Cemetery but OBJECT to the requirement for archaeological investigations to take place prior to the granting of planning permission. The scope and requirement for archaeological investigations could be secured via a suitably worded Condition.	Planning permission reference DC/15/1198/FUL was granted on 29 February 2016 subject to a number of conditions including condition 11 which requires implementation of an approved Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological evaluation and, where necessary excavation, on the site before any development takes place.	no action required
24595 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	We also have no concerns with the allocation of a cemetery within the 1500m constraints zone as in our opinion cemeteries are usually beneficial in terms of biodiversity and would be unlikely to have the same effect as housing on the qualifying species of Breckland SPA.	comment noted	no action required
24375 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	In answer to Question 2 on page 25, I do agree there is a need for an extension of the cemetery, subject to completing a full archaeological investigation.	noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 2 - Brandon</i>				
24399 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	the site has been subject to archaeological evaluation, and will require excavation to mitigate for impacts on medieval and earlier archaeological remains.	Noted. Planning permission reference DC/15/1198/FUL was granted on 29 February 2016 subject to a number of conditions including condition 11 which requires implementation of an approved Written Scheme of Investigation for evaluation and, where necessary excavation, on the site before any development takes place.	no action required
24465 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Object	We SUPPORT Policy B2: Cemetery but OBJECT to the requirement for archaeological investigations to take place prior to the granting of planning permission. The scope and requirement for archaeological investigations could be secured via a suitably worded Condition.	Planning permission reference DC/15/1198/FUL was granted on 29 February 2016 subject to a number of conditions including condition 11 which requires implementation of an approved Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological evaluation and, where necessary excavation, on the site before any development takes place.	no action required
<i>Settlement boundary changes - Brandon</i>				
24215 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	5.18 We welcome the change in settlement boundary in Brandon to remove areas of forest and open land. We agree with Policy B1 on the Fengate Drove application as, following extensive discussions and further information from the applicant, we were able to conclude that this site would not have an effect on the integrity of Breckland SPA. We also have no concerns with the allocation of a cemetery within the 1500m constraints zone as in our opinion cemeteries are usually beneficial in terms of biodiversity and would be unlikely to have the same effect as housing on the qualifying species of Breckland SPA.	Comments noted Development at Fengate Drove has commenced and therefore it will not appear as an allocation in the SALP	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 3</i>				
24467 - Talavera Estates Ltd [12704]	Comment	<p>We support the proposed changes to the settlement boundary which excludes land to the south of Brandon that is constrained by a significant number of designations.</p> <p>We agree with the proposed changes to the settlement boundary to the south of Brandon but OBJECT to the omission of the land to the west of Brandon (the subject of the current planning application) from within the revised settlement boundary. We advocate that the settlement boundary should be relocated westwards to be contiguous with the proposed settlement boundary of the submitted planning application for land west of Brandon.</p>	The planning application has yet to be determined, and proposes development across the boundary, and includes a relief road. To date no evidence has been presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development than is allocated in the plan. In addition, there is no evidence that the proposal is viable and deliverable, and therefore cannot be included in the plan at this time. However, the council remains committed to working towards achieving a sustainable level of development in Brandon, which will be explored further with partner organisations during the production of the West Suffolk Local Plan (Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury working together) which is due to commence at the beginning of 2018.	no action required
24378 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	In answer Question 3 on page 26, I do agree with the proposed changes to the settlement boundary and in light of the identified constraints, I see no need to change the existing Brandon settlement boundary.	noted	no action required
<i>The local area - Mildenhall</i>				
24122 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Support	Barton Mills Parish Council welcomes the statement on p 27 that coalescence between Mildenhall and surrounding settlements (including Barton Mills) ought to be avoided and also that the development of The Old Railway Station Site has been rejected. (p37). We agree that developing this site would have a detrimental impact on Barton Mills and the landscape south of Mildenhall	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>What you told us - Mildenhall</i>				
24360 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	Paragraph 6.5 of the SALP document, the Council sets out what they have previously learnt from consultation responses in respect of Mildenhall. None of these key issues would be adversely affected as a result of our client's site, M/30. Paragraph 6.8 meanwhile states that "higher growth in Mildenhall could only be considered if it can be demonstrated that there are no adverse effects of the development on the integrity of the SPA through the Habitats Regulations Assessment process, as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS2. During the 2015 consultation, no evidence was presented to suggest that the SPA constraints could be overcome to allow a higher level of development".	Noted	No action required
<i>Development issues - Mildenhall</i>				
23934 - Mr B Keane and Mrs L Planas [12852]	Comment	6.7 - major strategic growth to be accommodated in Mildenhall must be directed to appropriate sites with no planning constraints, immediately available - see attached notes	Noted	No action required
24361 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	6.9 then states that the Council undertook further investigations into the available sites to ascertain whether they could be delivered without adverse impact. It is clear that site M/30 was not due to its position outside of the SPA buffers considered to result in any adverse impact. No doubt, this is why the site is included within Section 6 of the SALP as an alternative option. In fact, our view is that it is an additional rather than alternative option which evidence confirms should be included within the SALP, irrespective of the positions of other proposed allocations.	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24503 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	both paragraphs refer to uncertainty over Mildenhall preventing the Council from considering this as a development option at this time. The NHG considers that the Council has sufficient information to hand to know that this is a potential development site that has the potential to significantly alter the development strategy for the district. It considers that this is a matter of such significance that it should be taken into account when preparing this document. The NHG does not agree that there is sufficient uncertainty in this matter to obviate the need for the Council to take this into account now.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required
23981 - C J Murfitt Ltd (Mr Colin Murfitt) [12870]	Object	6.13 OBJECT to non-allocation of land off Lark Road, Mildenhall as identified as M15, M18 and M22 in the issues and options document (August 2015)	These sites are all located within flood zone 3, adjacent to the SPA and are unsuitable for development.	No action required
<i>Mildenhall planning constraints map</i>				
23885 - Mildenhall Parish Charities (Mr Vince Coomber) [5591]	Support	confirm site remains viable for inclusion within the document.	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Mildenhall site allocations map</i>				
24011 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Simon Cartmell) [11972]	Comment	<p>We would like to make a submission to the Local Plan consultation concerning land owned by Suffolk County Council situated to the west of Fred Dannatt Road and north of West Row Road as shown on the attached plan. The land amounts to approximately 42 acres of land currently in agricultural use. The land abuts the Mildenhall Industrial Estate. Historically, part of this field was disposed of to RPV Valves who had an urgent requirement for land to enable the expansion of their business, and planning consent was granted for a new warehouse in the north east corner of the field. Suffolk County Council have been approached by several local businesses, all seeking light industrial/commercial land for expansion/re-location of their existing enterprises.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council would like to promote this land for light industrial commercial purposes to meet local and proven demand. Following discussions with interested parties, we are confident that access issues can be resolved, with a new access being created via Fred Dannatt Road.</p>	Noted. The proposed allocation at M1 is proposed for mixed use to include employment use, compatible with this representation.	Policy SA4 in submission draft
24219 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	<p>There is currently capacity at the receiving Mildenhall Water Recycling Centre to accommodate all levels of growth indicated in the options for Mildenhall.</p> <p>Note: Mildenhall WRC serves West Row, Beck Row and Mildenhall. If growth in all three areas were all on the highest scale indicated in the options and all came forward, currently there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the foul flows.</p>	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24367 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	<p>In conclusion, we consider that Site M/30 highlighted within the SALP as an alternative option should be included as an additional allocation irrespective of the positions of other sites on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The site is located in a sustainable location, sitting directly adjacent to sites recently determined as sustainable and also given the Council's own recognition within the Issues and Options document that the site lies within a reasonable walking distance of the town centre <input type="checkbox"/> The closure of the munitions activities on the site would have a positive impact on the long term protection of the historical station building in addition to significant improvements in terms of noise impact associated with the use which is not compatible with surrounding residential development. Additionally, the use also poses a significant safety risk, which could be removed through the redevelopment of the site. Locating new housing outside of an exclusion zone and placing public open space adjacent to it, clearly does not provide complete mitigation to the risk that this site poses to public health. <input type="checkbox"/> The site would not result in any coalescence with Barton Mills as new development would be located away from the eastern part of the site which fronts Station Road. <p>There could not therefore be any perception that the development of the site was bringing development towards Barton Mills, as the existing eastern building line created by the existing buildings adjacent to the entrance to the site which front Station Road would not be altered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The site can deliver early on within the plan period. This is important on the basis that there is little development already committed or completed at Mildenhall (177 units) and as much as 99.1% of the development proposed is intrinsically linked with a major expansion to the west of Mildenhall which will be subject to significant masterplanning work, various permissions and a lengthy build out programme. Allocating the additional alternative option at Mildenhall would therefore provide important flexibility at the settlement, as well as ensuring that the plan delivers the additional planning gains these representations have highlighted, including additional affordable housing and the re-use of previously 	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		developed land.		
24109 - Mrs Jan Schick [12871]	Object	I object to the above Local Plan documents as set out below: <input type="checkbox"/> The extent of new build on these sites would change the character of Mildenhall as an historic market town. <input type="checkbox"/> Mildenhall residents, of all ages and abilities, currently enjoy the River Lark and adjoining countryside which is a 5 minute walk from the town centre. The proposed sites and development would destroy this ease of access for all as residents would have to walk much further before being in rural surroundings.	Noted. The proximity of the site to the town centre are part of what makes this site sustainable. However, through careful masterplanning the river corridor can be protected and the rural character maintained.	No action required
23982 - C J Murfitt Ltd (Mr Colin Murfitt) [12870]	Object	Mildenhall site allocations map - OBJECT to non-allocation of land off Lark Road, Mildenhall as identified as M15, M18 and M22 in the issues and options document (August 2015)	These sites are all located within flood zone 3 and are unsuitable for development.	No action required
<i>Site M1(a) - Land west of Mildenhall (formerly M/19, M/21 & M/40)</i>				
23908 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans/policies in accordance with the safeguarding procedures	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24246 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites M1(a) (previously M/19) and M2(a) (previously M/28) were assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit</p> <p>Site SA4(a) Land west of Mildenhall (previously M1(a)) represents a significant area of growth on greenfield land and the requirement to incorporate the protection and enhancement of the existing hedgerows, scrub and woodland habitat through retention and connection to the River Lark corridor and the wider landscape is included in the policy wording for that site. In addition it is considered that additional wording is added to the policy to ensure that plants on the Suffolk rare plants list are considered as part of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Insert following text to policy SA4(a) The presence of flora species on the Suffolk rare plants list must be addressed as part of the proposals.</p>
24151 - Hastoe Housing Association [12914]	Comment	The site to the west of Mildenhall (M1) is a vast homogeneous area proposing mixed use development. Is it appropriate that such a large scale development is seen to be more preferable to perhaps a number of smaller scale developments that could assist in providing further amenities to existing settlements, promoting sustainable development. We are aware of a number of smaller scale mixed use developments that were proposed as part of the site submissions, why is it these are dismissed largely on being located in unsustainable locations when their development could make the villages more sustainable.	This matter is addressed by the Single Issue review of Core Strategy Policy CS7.	No action required
24222 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water resource and supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by a developer via our pre planning service.	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24400 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	6.14 says that 'Development will need to have regard to areas of known archaeological interest, the setting of a listed building, Wamil Hall, to the southwest and conservation area to the east' - amend to 'areas of known archaeological interest and areas of high potential...' Policy M1 is clear, although I would suggest inserting 'and to allow' before 'appropriate strategies'. We would strongly recommend evaluation prior to agreement of the masterplan. (question 4).	Agreed	Wording to policy amended (SA4)
24408 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	The A1101 roundabout (Queensway) would require considerable mitigation to provide additional capacity for a site of this size, or a relief road to provide additional wider capacity. Difficult to see how existing roundabout could be upgraded due to constraints. The residential and Industrial phases would require separate accesses. <i>A development of this size may require a potential western Relief Road for Mildenhall. The site is close to the end of the current speed limit, which would require extension</i>	An updated AECOM Traffic Study has been produced. This demonstrates that the allocations in the SALP can be achieved with highways mitigation and sustainable transport measures.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24347 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	<p>The following sites are close to the main river (River Lark, Cut Off Channel). Therefore, developers should assess the impacts on new development on these sites in terms of the WFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Site M1(a) - Land West of Mildenhall <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(b) - Land West of Eriswell Road <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(b) - Land at North Lakenheath <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(d) - Land North of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way <p>Developers should demonstrate compliance with the following WFD aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration of the chemical or ecological condition of surface waters and/or the chemical or quantitative condition of groundwater; and <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve overall good status on all waterbodies by 2021 or 2027 as appropriate for that waterbody. <input type="checkbox"/> Development proposals should demonstrate that any impacts on water quality, water resources, channel morphology, species diversity and ecological condition have been fully considered. <input type="checkbox"/> Apart from preventing deterioration, development proposals should outline the improvements to the environment that can be achieved by careful and considerate development design. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals should outline where habitat improvements, foul water treatment, surface water control and other mechanisms will help to achieve betterment, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 	Noted	No action required
23935 - Mr B Keane and Mrs L Planas [12852]	Comment	6.7 - major strategic growth to be accommodated in Mildenhall must be directed to appropriate sites with no planning constraints, immediately available - see attached notes	Response noted	No action required
23881 - Mrs Linz Osborn [5722]	Object	<p>This development must include new road infrastructure to keep traffic out of existing villages in the surrounding area.</p> <p><i>New relief road must be included to avoid traffic going through Mildenhall and Worlington village</i></p>	Comments Noted. An updated AECOM Traffic study is due to be published in November 2016. This demonstrates that the distribution in the SIR can be achieved with highways mitigation and sustainable transport measures.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24111 - Mrs Jan Schick [12871]	Object	<p>□ I also object on the grounds of traffic congestion if these sites were to be approved and developed. There is little employment in Mildenhall and new residents on the west side of town would need to commute to work. Mildenhall would become a through route for accessing the A11, exacerbating the existing congestion at Police Station Square and the Five Ways' roundabout. It is already hazardous for pedestrians trying to cross Queensway, Police Station Square and Kingsway. Extra traffic would raise serious safety issues.</p>	It is acknowledged that development of this site will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.	No action required
23882 - Worlington Parish Council (Councillor Rupert Osborn) [12690]	Object	Concerns re infrastructure, roads, impact on Mildenhall and villages, traffic, quality of life,	The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the IDP which will accompany the SIR consultation	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24362 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	<p>Site M1(a) is a strategic development location which seeks to deliver high levels of housing and infrastructure. Given the scale of the site, lack of any viability testing to date and undetermined highway impacts, it is clear that it is shrouded in uncertainty, the policy itself highlighting that precise numbers, uses and access arrangements will be determined by a detailed masterplan. The Council's housing trajectory suggests that the site may not deliver housing until 2024/25, at which point they consider high annual levels of development to be delivered, which we consider to be optimistic. Our view of the situation is that it is actually more likely for lower levels of development to be delivered 2026/27 - 2030/31, resulting in the site needing to continue to be built out into the next plan period. As a result we consider that the likely timescales associated with Site M1(a) is likely to result in the OAN not being fully met within the plan period.</p> <p>We therefore do not support the proposed allocation on the basis of the high levels of uncertainty associated with the Council's views on the proposed build out programme of the site, which from experience is exceptionally high at 200dpa. We consider that 150dpa is a more realistic annual rate of delivery, yet still generously optimistic for the housing trajectory to use. The impact of applying a challenging, yet more realistic approach, is that it is highly likely that c.250 dwellings will not be delivered by site M1a within the plan period. This would have a detrimental impact on the delivery of housing within Mildenhall, which due to its position within the settlement hierarchy has been considered to be suited to delivering the second highest overall percentage distribution of housing (22%). This statistic of course reflects both existing commitments and completions as well as allocations. Discounting existing commitments and completions from that statistic and reliance on housing delivery within Mildenhall is in fact much higher. Of the additional housing proposed by the SALP, Mildenhall is actually proposed to deliver the most housing of any of the settlements (equivalent to 29.3% of the SALP's total proposed housing), with 93% of that provision being attributed to just one site, M1a.</p> <p>1.25 Given the position of Mildenhall as a suitable</p>	Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		location for significant levels of housing, our concerns relating to the full delivery of Site M1a within this plan period and our general objections in respect of the lack of flexibility within the plan, we consider that additional housing should be allocated by the plan, and that some of this additional provision should be logically met at Mildenhall. Assuming the same overall percentage distribution and applying a 10% flexibility allowance within the plan to account for potential delays or nondelivery, an additional 700 dwellings would be required. This would result in an additional provision of 154 dwellings at Mildenhall. Including Site M/30 would therefore provide appropriate mitigation against the general issue of flexibility and also the specific issue in respect of		
<i>Policy M1: Focus on growth - Land west of Mildenhall</i>				
24126 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Comment	Although generally sympathetic to the principle of Policy M1 with the focus for growth on land west of Mildenhall, the expansion proposed is a cause for concern as this could result in a large volume of additional traffic along Worlington Road and also some additional traffic through Barton Mills village centre. Traffic calming and improvements to the footways and crossings are essential before more traffic can be accommodated on these roads. A new relief road must be a high priority as development progresses.	Comments Noted. An updated AECOM Traffic study is due to be published in November 2016. This demonstrates that the distribution in the SIR can be achieved with highways mitigation and sustainable transport measures.	No action required
24060 - Mr Harry Dring [6012]	Object	Inadequate road infrastructure with little scope for improvement at key junctions given the layout of existing buildings etc at those junctions <i>Reduce the size of the proposed development area to reduce traffic volumes and potential impact on the area. In addition propose clear road layouts demonstrating how the road network would handle the increase in traffic volumes.</i>	Comments Noted. An updated AECOM Traffic study is due to be published in November 2016. This demonstrates that the distribution in the SIR can be achieved with highways mitigation and sustainable transport measures.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24335 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Support	Sport England support this allocation, which should deliver new community sports facilities for the Mildenhall area, subject to prior approval of a detailed masterplan for the whole site. Sport England would wish to ensure that adequate facilities are secured for indoor and outdoor sport as part of the masterplanning exercise, and we would therefore welcome consultation on this element of the process. The masterplan should also ensure that informal recreation (walking, cycling etc) is integrated into the development, and Sport England have published 'Active Design' guidance to assist developers in planning for this element of the scheme. A copy and further information can be accessed here: https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/	Noted	No action required
<i>Question 4 - Mildenhall</i>				
24137 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Comment	Generally agree, but with serious reservations about transport links. Roads in the town centre are already congested including Queensway. Queensway does not have the capacity to cope with the development of this site, the Hub and further development in West Row. NO development on the site should start until suitable transport infrastructure has been provided - ideally a link road from the A11 junction at Red Lodge, by-passing Worlington to join the West Row Road west of Mildenhall. This would serve West Row, the Air Base, Mildenhall and the industrial estate relieving the town centre and Police Station Square.	It is acknowledged that development of this site will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure. Any improvements to the highway infrastructure in Mildenhall must take account of the potential impact of traffic in Worlington accessing the grade separated junction with the A11 at Red Lodge. The need for a relief road will be assessed.	No action required
23992 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Comment	Question 4 Response: Whilst ECDC has no objection in principle to locating most of Mildenhall growth to the west of the town, it repeats the above point that direct access to the B1102 from the site must be avoided (and, for the avoidance of doubt, Policy M1 perhaps could state that?), and that any other access points to the site should generally be positioned so as to discourage the use of the B1102 between Mildenhall and Fordham.	Noted. No part of the site has access to the B1102	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24364 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	Our objections to the overall level of housing and our detailed objections to the potential implications on deliverability of housing at Mildenhall, all provide a strong justification for the identification and inclusion of additional allocations at the settlement. Our view is that there is not sufficient weight available to demonstrate the deliverability of Site M2(b). If the purpose of the SHLAA is to collate basic information to demonstrate deliverability, then it is questionable why a site can subsequently be proposed for allocation with a caveat that "it might become available". There appears to therefore be two options available to the Council to address this issue. The first is to remove Site M2(b) as an allocation and allow it to come forward in the future as a windfall and the second is to make additional allocations which can ensure that any non-delivery would not result in overall failure to meet the OAN in full. We consider that this is required in any event irrespective of the position of Site M2(b).	The relocation of existing services to the Mildenhall Hub will bring this site forward for development within the plan period.	No action required
23937 - Mr B Keane and Mrs L Planas [12852]	Comment	Housing numbers/timescale uncertain, subject to masterplan, will not deliver for some time - see attached notes.	Noted	No action required
24513 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG considers that the development potential of RAF Mildenhall should be fully explored and identified as an alternative or additional focus for growth in this policy.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24311 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Object	No - Tattersalls considers that the development potential of RAF Mildenhall should be fully explored.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required
<i>Site M2(a) - Land at 54 Kingsway (formerly M/28)</i>				
23909 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures	No action required
24409 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Access would be from Kingsway or Robin Close, there is a current outline application site which is accessed from Kingsway. Robin Close is very narrow and residential, there might be scope to allow for pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the south via Robin Close <i>Robin Close sustainable links would require an upgrade of the existing facilities.</i>	noted	no action required
24247 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites M1(a) (previously M/19) and M2(a) (previously M/28) were assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	Development at Fengate Drove has commenced and this site is no longer allocated in the SALP	no action required
24223 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	We do not envisage any constraints on serving this development for water supply and foul drainage.	Noted	No action required

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
23943 - Mrs Millar [12847]	Object	re telephone conversation to your office today (24 May), I wish to object to my property i.e. 56 Kingsway being included in the above plan. I have been informed that this is most likely a drawing error. <i>I request that 56 Kingsway be removed from the plan</i>	Noted	Remove 56 Kingsway from the allocation. However, this will remove the ability to access the site from Kingsway. Accordingly, the allocation will need to include the area to the south to enable access from Robin Close.
Site M2(b) - District Council Offices, College Heath Road (formerly M/46)				
23910 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures	No action required
24224 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water resource and supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by a developer via our pre planning service.	Noted	No action required
23936 - Mr B Keane and Mrs L Planas [12852]	Comment	6.7 - major strategic growth to be accommodated in Mildenhall must be directed to appropriate sites with no planning constraints, immediately available - see attached notes	Noted	No action required
24248 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites M2(b) and EM1(a) were not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If they contain habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, they should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development.	Site SA5(b) District Council Offices, College Heath Road (previously M2(b)) comprises existing built development, amenity grass and shrubs and some young mature trees. Whilst any application will need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey, the risks to biodiversity and to delivery of the site are assessed as low. Site SA17(a) Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre site, Mildenhall (previously EM1(a)) comprises the existing built development, amenity grassland and planting and the existing tree belts along Bury Road which could be retained. The playingfields are not included. Redevelopment of the site would need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey and the risks to site biodiversity are assessed as low. This site is located close to the SPA and redevelopment of the site would need to have regard to this; this fact may limit the type of employment use that would be acceptable and a project level HRA will be required.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24410 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	The site has a good existing access, and there are a high number of existing trips from the current use which can be netted off, against the proposed residential use. However pedestrian, cycle and bus links would need to be reviewed as the site does not currently appear to be well served for sustainable travel options. <i>Improved sustainable links to Town Centre required</i>	noted	no action required
24402 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	This is fine. More detail could say that the site is within the extent of the former workhouse.	Noted	No action required
<i>Policy M2: Other Residential development in Mildenhall</i>				
24112 - Mrs Jan Schick [12871]	Object	<input type="checkbox"/> I also object on the grounds of traffic congestion if these sites were to be approved and developed. There is little employment in Mildenhall and new residents on the west side of town would need to commute to work. Mildenhall would become a through route for accessing the A11, exacerbating the existing congestion at Police Station Square and the Five Ways' roundabout. It is already hazardous for pedestrians trying to cross Queensway, Police Station Square and Kingsway. Extra traffic would raise serious safety issues.	This site is on the east side of Mildenhall.	No action required
<i>Question 5 - Mildenhall</i>				
23938 - Mr B Keane and Mrs L Planas [12852]	Comment	delivery of sites uncertain as are timescale, dwelling numbers - see attached notes	Site M2(a) can be delivered without delay, but M2(b) will require the prior relocation of existing activities.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24363 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	<p>We also have concerns in respect of delivering the OAN in full in respect of Site M2b and paragraph 6.16 of the SALP does little to satisfy these concerns. In introducing the site the paragraph states "this is the site of the council offices, surgery and library on College Heath Road and it might become available with the delivery of the Mildenhall Hub project" (our emphasis). Clearly, Site M2b is wholly reliant on the delivery of M1a. The Council's housing trajectory suggests that this site would start delivering housing within the next five years, commencing in 2020/21 and finishing in 2022/23. This would therefore assume that the site could be vacated by 2019/20, requiring the completion of the new Hub facilities at M1a before the uses can vacate their existing site. This seems highly unlikely, given any housing is not anticipated to start delivering for a further 4 years from the date that the infrastructure would be in place and operating.</p> <p>Our concerns in respect of Policy M2 and specifically M2(b) are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> M2(b) has a distinct lack of uncertainty shrouding its allocation as set out in Paragraph 6.16. As such we cannot support the allocation of the site, particularly with the SALP not providing any flexibility against the OAN figure. <input type="checkbox"/> M2(b) is intrinsically linked to the delivery of M1(a), yet the housing trajectory used in the background evidence does not seem to show this link and the likelihood of M1a having a masterplan agreed, applications for the hub achieved and new facilities built by 2019/20 to allow for M2(b) to start delivering development in 2010/21 seems fundamentally flawed. <input type="checkbox"/> The effect of issue 1 above and the lack of certainty involved with needing to close a number of public buildings within the coming years and relocate them, suggests that the site should not be included as an allocation but rather allowed to come forward as a windfall due to its position within the urban area. <p>When the SALP itself suggests that the site "might become available", the plan's meeting of the OAN cannot be justified. It is clear that the non-delivery of the 89 dwellings associated with this site would have implications for delivery within Mildenhall and of the overall OAN. This again points to the need to include our client's site, M/30 which the Council has</p>	The relocation of existing services to the Mildenhall hub will bring this site M2(b) forward for development within the plan period.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>themselves highlighted as an alternative option at Mildenhall.</p> <p>Our objections to the overall level of housing and our detailed objections to the potential implications on deliverability of housing at Mildenhall, all provide a strong justification for the identification and inclusion of additional allocations at the settlement. Our view is that there is not sufficient weight available to demonstrate the deliverability of Site M2(b). If the purpose of the SHLAA is to collate basic information to demonstrate deliverability, then it is questionable why a site can subsequently be proposed for allocation with a caveat that "it might become available". There appears to therefore be two options available to the Council to address this issue. The first is to remove Site M2(b) as an allocation and allow it to come forward in the future as a windfall and the second is to make additional allocations which can ensure that any non-delivery would not result in overall failure to meet the OAN in full. We consider that this is required in any event irrespective of the position of Site M2(b).</p>		
24139 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Comment	Generally agree if Hub development goes ahead. However site M2(b) already constitutes a public services hub (council offices, library, clinic, police) which is more central and convenient for existing residents and without the transport problems associated with the proposed site off Queensway.	The rationale for the Mildenhall Hub is explained in the adopted Design Brief.	No action required
24515 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG considers that the development potential of RAF Mildenhall should be recognised in this policy if it is not included in policy M1.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Alternative option - Mildenhall</i>				
24124 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Support	Barton Mills Parish Council welcomes the statement on p 27 that coalescence between Mildenhall and surrounding settlements (including Barton Mills) ought to be avoided and also that the development of The Old Railway Station Site has been rejected. (p37). We agree that developing this site would have a detrimental impact on Barton Mills and the landscape south of Mildenhall	Noted	No action required
<i>Existing commitments in Mildenhall</i>				
24125 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Support	We also welcome statement 6.17 on p38 which confirms that all development at Worlington Road is to remain outside the proposed settlement boundaries	Noted	No action required
<i>Question 6 - Mildenhall</i>				
24138 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Comment	Generally agree but have reservations about the southern edge of new settlement boundary following line of public right of way between Wamil Way and West Row. Would prefer a wider buffer zone outside the settlement boundary to include land to north of right of way ensuring a green corridor is maintained and retaining the rural character of the footpath / cycleway. Important to ensure no building can take place immediately adjacent public right of way.	These comments are noted. Through careful masterplanning the river corridor and connecting footpaths can be protected and the rural character maintained.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24368 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Comment	<p>Whilst we do not disagree with the proposed changes to the settlement boundary, we do strongly disagree with the recent permissions to the south of Mildenhall on Worlington Road not being included within the settlement boundary of Mildenhall. The justifications given to the proposed changes at Mildenhall in the table on page 38 of the SALP and indeed those used for many other proposed changes at other settlements, relate to a need to redraw boundaries to include new development. This is a logical and common approach when reviewing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.20 of the SALP states that "settlement boundaries in this location plan as shown on the Policies Map, encompass the developed area of settlements and all peripheral allocated sites". No justification is provided for the absence of a redrawing of the settlement boundary to the south of Mildenhall. Whilst historically the scattering of properties on the northern side of Worlington Road may have sat outside of a settlement boundary, the introduction of over 160 dwellings south of Worlington Road has significantly altered the location and effectively moved the entrance to Mildenhall. The urbanising effect resulting from these permissions should therefore be reflected in the settlement boundary. We therefore strongly support the extension of the settlement boundary to the south of Mildenhall to include these permissions. In light of our comments in respect of Site M/30 and our proposed promotion of that site from 'alternative option' to 'allocation', we also consider that the settlement boundary in this location should also incorporate Site M/30.</p>	Although the site benefits from planning permission for development, it is located within Barton Mills and is detached and remote from the existing settlement boundary for Mildenhall.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24519 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	the NHG considers that the Council should amend the settlement boundary to include RAF Mildenhall as this is a known development site that will be coming forward and is already previously-developed land within the Mildenhall area. The inclusion of this area is not restricted by any uncertainties that the Council may have about the timetable for release of this site or the extent of land that will be released.	It was announced on 18 January 2016 that the USVF intend to vacate RAF Mildenhall airbase by 2023. Given the work which will be required following their departure to bring the site forward for development, including any remediation of land contamination, the airbase cannot yet be considered as available and developable for this Local Plan period. A Local Plan Review is scheduled to commence in early 2018. Until there is certainty from the MoD over the future uses, their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site as an option in the Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23939 - Mr B Keane and Mrs L Planas [12852]	Comment	<p>suggest amendment to boundary to include appropriate, sustainable, immediately available site, without constraints - see attached notes</p> <p>The Respondents believe that the reasons for the larger site comprising M/41 and M/42 being deferred no longer apply.</p> <p>The smaller site the subject of these representations is immediately available, is deliverable and viable and has a number of planning advantages such as its existing access, the fact that the bulk of the site is brownfield/already developed, it immediately abuts new residential development coming through the planning pipeline and is much closer to existing facilities within Mildenhall than other parts of the urban area and more formally allocated sites.</p> <p>There are no constraints to the development of this site for residential purposes, which could make a substantial contribution to the Local Authority's housing needs. The Respondents respectfully request that this site be considered alongside the other sites proposed for additional residential allocation within Mildenhall and particularly those under references M1(a) and M2(b).</p> <p>M1(a) involves the loss of a substantial amount of agricultural land (unlike the site the subject of these representations), has no clearly defined urban edge. This site is further from facilities than the subject site. There is still considerable uncertainty about this site in terms of the form it will take, the housing numbers it can provide and all of this is subject to the preparation of an appropriate Masterplan. Clearly, therefore, this site will not deliver dwellings for some considerable time in the light of this uncertainty.</p> <p>With regards site M2(b) then, again, this site has an uncertain delivery with no known timescales or residential numbers and is reliant entirely upon other developments taking place within the urban area and will clearly not deliver dwellings for some time.</p> <p><i>suggest amendment to boundary to include appropriate, sustainable, immediately available site, without constraints - see attached notes</i></p>	<p>Disagree. Development of these sites within the parishes of Barton Mills and Worlington, remote from the established settlement of Mildenhall would further extend built development towards and threaten coalescence with the village of Worlington.</p>	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23983 - C J Murfitt Ltd (Mr Colin Murfitt) [12870]	Object	<p>Our clients strongly disagree with the proposed changes to the Mildenhall boundary as it fails to allocate land abutting the southern boundary of the Mildenhall's defined settlement limits.</p> <p>Pre-app submitted May 2016.</p> <p><i>reinstate the land 15.12ha M15/M18/M22 as identified in the I/O August 2015</i></p> <p><i>6.77ha should be allocated for residential development to accommodate 120 dwellings</i></p>	These sites are all located within flood zone 3, adjacent to the SPA and are unsuitable for development.	No action required
<hr/>				
<i>The local area - Newmarket</i>				
24322 - Mrs Rachel Hood [12509]	Comment	<p>Not enough consideration has been given to the movement of horses and traffic through the town and the best way for both to be accommodated safely. A comprehensive study should be done on this unique town and its requirements for safe passage of horses and riders around the town and the way the traffic is affected by the main employment industry in the town before any site allocations are made.</p> <p>We all need to move around Newmarket freely to get on with our day to day work, horses and traffic alike. Further congestion by traffic increases due to more housing will truly exacerbate the already busy roads.</p>	Comments noted. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town.	No action required.
<hr/>				
24129 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Comment	<p>Not enough consideration has been given to the movement of horses and traffic through the town and the best way for both to be accommodated safely. A comprehensive study should be done on this unique town and its requirements for safe passage of horses and riders around the town and the way the traffic is affected by the main employment industry in the town before any site allocations are made.</p> <p>We all need to move around Newmarket freely to get on with our day to day work, Horses and traffic alike. Further congestion by traffic increases due to more housing will truly exacerbate the already busy roads.</p>	Comments noted. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24115 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Comment	Newmarket Town Council is concerned that the document fails to understand to transportation and highway issues within the town. FHDC acknowledge that a town wide strategy is required in regard to the movement of horses and traffic around the town. Newmarket Town Council believe this should be undertaken prior to any site allocations.	Comments noted. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town.	no action required
24504 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	- The NHG considers that the public transport facilities within Newmarket are over-stated. It is also concerned to see the absence of any reference to existing traffic issues in Newmarket, which are acknowledged in the 2009 IDP and have been explored at the recent Hatchfield Farm I inquiry. The NHG considers that the document should acknowledge this as a constraint and the fact that horse movements around the town are also a constraint to traffic movement (reference to careful management of horse movements is not sufficient) . It should also acknowledge that development will need to ensure that horse movements are not adversely impacted on and that appropriate mitigation measures will be secured via development proposals.	Comments noted. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. JDMP LPD Policies DM47, 48 and 50 deal with horse movements and highway safety in a development management context.	No action required.
<i>Newmarket site allocations map</i>				
24184 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently capacity at the receiving Newmarket Water Recycling Centre to accommodate the level of growth indicated in Newmarket.	comments noted	no action required
24486 - Barley Homes (Group) Ltd (Kim Langley) [12932]	Comment	Please see attached some land identified at Studland's Park, Newmarket that Barley Homes have identified for a potential residential development.	These sites have been assessed and are considered not suitable for development as important planned open space serving a residential area with a community amenity, recreation and play function.	no action required
<i>Site NI(a) - Land at Brickfield Stud, Exning Road (formerly part of N/09)</i>				
24188 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. If necessary foul water matters can be controlled by condition when determining a planning application.	no action required

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
23911 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24251 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(a) (previously N/09); N1(b) (previously N/11); N1(c) (previously N/14); N1(d) (previously N/20); N1(e) (previously N/32) and RE1(a) (previously N/03) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.	Insert additional supporting text in Section 4: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
24411 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Not clear where access would be located, there are substantial trees which could affect visibility. The main access would be to DMRB due to the type of road. Exning Road is subject to a 40 mph speed limit, which may need to be reduced to 30 mph along the site frontage. No vehicle access to Brickfields Ave, but it would be useful to have sustainable links provided for cyclists and pedestrians. <i>improved routes for peds / cycles, lighting</i>	Noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
24506 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG maintains its object ion to the inclusion of this site as a housing allocation and considers it should be retained for horse racing uses. The distance of this site from facilities means that new residents w ill inevitable use their cars to access services, which will add to traffic congestion with an adverse impact on the horse racing industry. I it is noted that the SA for the SIR at paragraph 28.1.4 acknowledges this shortcoming of the site.	Noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site N1(b) - Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction (formerly N/11)</i>				
24412 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Equestrian issues with former Asda site as proposed access impacts on the Rowley Drive Horsewalk. Links to Town Centre are along narrow roads and footways. The site access onto high street is limited and could be permitted for a small development only, with only sustainable links between the two phases. <i>improved sustainable routes for pedestrians & cycles</i>	Noted. These are considered primarily development management issues. The council will continue to work closely with SCC Highways when considering proposals and drawing up a development brief for this site.	no action required
24190 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. If necessary foul water matters can be controlled by condition when determining a planning application.	no action required
23912 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24167 - Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [12915]	Comment	We note the inclusion of site N1(b) formerly site N/11 as a potential site allocation. This site has a complex planning history and our advice remains as set out in our 5 October 2015 response.	Any development would seek to deliver the repair and long-term sustainable use of the listed buildings as well as preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. No indicative capacity is shown for this site to allow suitable uses to be determined by a design brief informed by an assessment of significance, options appraisal and feasibility study. The council will continue to work with HE when considering options for this site.	No action required.
24252 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(a) (previously N/09); N1(b) (previously N/11); N1(c) (previously N/14); N1(d) (previously N/20); N1(e) (previously N/32) and RE1(a) (previously N/03) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.	Insert additional supporting text in Section 4: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24507 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG consider that this site should be retained for horse-racing uses as has been supported by previous planning decisions at this site. It is noted that the Council has yet to complete its feasibility work for this site to establish exactly what uses it could support. The NHG considers it inappropriate to allocate this site for development until such time as the potential uses are known so that this can be a matter for public consultation and so that the impacts can be fully considered. The NHG is pleased to see reference to the need to retain a horse racing related use at the site but is very concerned to see no reference to the need to consider the impact of the development on the horse-racing industry as a whole. The NHG is very concerned about the potential impact of development at this site on the Rowley Drive horsewalk.	This allocation requires a development brief to be approved subsequent to determination of any application for this site. The development brief will be subject to public consultation inline with the councils SCI. The impact of any development on the HRI and impact on the horse walks will be considered both in the preparation of the development brief and via JDMP policies DM48 and 50 when determining any subsequent proposal.	no action required
24086 - The Unex Group (Mr Stephen Walsh) [5804]	Support	The overall development envelope should include the site of the former swimming pool and the site of the former White Lion public house both of which are owned by Unex (No.3) Limited. The various landowners including the Gredley Charitable Trust and TAP Investments Limited support the proposed allocation of this site and confirm their willingness to work closely with the Council's officers and consultants to formulate the development brief. Unex has already submitted a draft site plan on 11th March which the head of planning responded positively to on 8th April 2016.	Comments noted. The inclusion of adjacent sites allows a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. Uses on this sensitive site will be informed by a feasibility study commissioned by the LPA and the preparation / approval of a development brief.	Amend site boundary to include former swimming pool and White Lion PH.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site N1(c)- Hatchfield Farm (formerly N/14)</i>				
24253 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(a) (previously N/09); N1(b) (previously N/11); N1(c) (previously N/14); N1(d) (previously N/20); N1(e) (previously N/32) and RE1(a) (previously N/03) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.	Insert additional supporting text in Section 4: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
23913 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24191 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	We do not envisage any constraints with serving this development for foul drainage.	comments noted	no action required
24413 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	live planning appeal site	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24508 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	<p>The NHG maintains its objection to the allocation of this site and is very concerned to see that the whole site has been identified as an allocation and for inclusion in the settlement boundary. This suggests that the redevelopment of this site could be for more development than is identified in policy N1. The NHG remains concerned about the potential impact of development at this site on the movement of horses around the town and is disappointed to see that this matter is not identified in the allocation as a matter to be taken into account when considering proposals. This site is located on the already congested Fordham Road, which the NHG considers will be exacerbated by development at this site. Furthermore, the mix of uses proposed in policy N1 exceeds the mix that has been tested recently at appeal and as such the cumulative impact of these uses has not been assessed when considering this allocation. The NHG considers that the proposed allocation of this site will lead to significant and adverse consequences for the horse-racing industry to the detriment of the local regional and potentially national economy.</p>	<p>Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24072 - Lord Derby [5831]	Support	<p>The Proposed Mixed Use Allocation at Hatchfield Farm : The proposed mixed use allocation on part of Hatchfield Farm in Policy N1(c) is supported. The site is in a single ownership and is available and deliverable in the early part of the remainder of the plan period.</p> <p>However, it is felt that it is confusing for Policy N1(c) to refer to the Hatchfield Farm allocation area as relating to the 64.7 hectares which comprise the whole of Hatchfield Farm. The allocation should be reduced in size to that necessary to deliver 400 homes, a primary school and the employment land. The plan of Newmarket which shows the proposed allocations should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>It is noted that Policy N1(c) refers to a minimum of 5 hectares of employment. This is regarded as a vague and open ended commitment. It is suggested that the text of the policy refers to 6.5 hectares of employment land as defined by the field adjoining the A14. The total allocation would then be 28.0 hectares (20 ha of housing, 1.5 ha Primary School and 6.5 ha of employment). A plan of the suggested allocation area is attached (No SS060854_21A).</p> <p>The commentary on site N1 (c) refers to regard being had to the relationship between the site and the Breckland SPA. This is due to the extreme eastern edge of the 64.7 ha Hatchfield Farm site being just touched by the Breckland SPA buffer zone. If the allocation is reduced to the eastern part of the site as shown on plan SS060854_21A, none of the development land is touched by the SPA buffer and this part of the text can be deleted. The suggested track changed revised text for Policy N1 is attached to this representation.</p>	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site N1(d) - Grassland off Leaders Way and Sefton Way (formerly N/20)</i>				
24009 - Mr Reginald Bailey [12838]	Comment	it is essential that that the area N1(d) is not increased during any future planning application by the Jockey Club	<p>Comments noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>The site was considered by the 2015 Wildlife Audit and any appropriate amendments made to the Policy and supporting text. See response to rep. ref. 24255 obo Suffolk Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and housing mix.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief. Add text to ensure development mitigates any conflict with HRI. Remove references to tenure.</p>
24192 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water resource and supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. If necessary foul water matters can be controlled by condition when determining a planning application.	no action required
24255 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(a) (previously N/09); N1(b) (previously N/11); N1(c) (previously N/14); N1(d) (previously N/20); N1(e) (previously N/32) and RE1(a) (previously N/03) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
23914 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24509 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	The NHG considers that the supporting text for the allocation should include the text within policy N1 that refers to occupation by those associated with the horse-racing industry.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. Occupation restrictions will be a matter for the sites owner / developers.	no action required
24414 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	The access off Hamilton Road is private and not suitable, therefore the site has no obvious link to the adopted highway network. Some access to Churchill Ave may be possible, but it is narrow and residential	Comments noted. As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access.	Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and add a requirement for a design brief.
23898 - Mr Ian Kirk [12842]	Object	Not suitable, lacking information, contradicts policy of not developing land used for racing industry.	<p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and housing mix.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief.</p>
<i>Concentrate on Hatchfield Farm</i>				
23891 - Mr Bob Reeves [12833]	Object	N1(d) - Why does the Planners not look at the wasted ground on the west side of Lower Hamilton Road at its exit on the Exning Road it would be a far more suitable place for a few houses and would not cause a major upset to so many residents who at the moment enjoy a very quiet residential area.	Comments noted. As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access and biodiversity issues.	Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23984 - Godfrey & Judith Nelmes & Oliver [12872]	Object	<p>We would like to state in the strongest terms our disagreement with the proposed housing development on the above site.</p> <p>We are strongly of the view that access to this site down Churchill Avenue is unfeasible.</p>	<p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access issues.</p>	<p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and add a requirement for a design brief.</p>
23944 - Mr & Mrs Carol and Roger Downham [12859]	Object	<p>The Jockey Club have got plenty of land to put houses on without trying to build houses in such close proximity to studs horses training ground and our bungalows, narrow roads which really can't take anymore traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access and biodiversity issues.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief. Add text to ensure development mitigates any conflict with HRI.</p>
23894 - David Everett [12840]	Object	<p>I would like to object AGAIN to the proposed buildings which are planned for the bottom of Churchill Avenue on the buffer zone between the gallops and Sefton Way and Leaders Way.</p> <p>On the original plans it showed the traffic was to exit via Churchill Avenue - As you will be aware this road is very narrow indeed and not built for a bypass, i.e. heavy traffic.</p> <p>Are you also aware that the Sewer Pumping Station at the bottom of Churchill Avenue has problems from time to time as it cant cope with both Drinkwater Close and Scaltback Estate Sewerage.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and foul water issues.</p>	<p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23902 - Mrs Shirley Gallagher [12846]	Object	<p>Any residential development would be to the detriment of the horse racing industry, as this land is associated with horseracing and should be protected for this reason being a historic cultural and important activity. The area in the plan, which surely is classed as green belt, should be protected, this area of grassland protects equine use and was established as a Buffer Zone between the existing houses (Leaders and Suffolk Way) and the training ground which would be surely lost if housing were allowed to go ahead. Also with the inevitable destruction of the trees, natural hedgerows, fauna and flora in this area, the birds nesting sites together with bats and insects their habitat will be destroyed, particularly the Song Thrush which nests here together with sightings of deer, all of which we must do our bit to preserve.</p> <p>The proposed site would surely add unnecessary risk and hazard to both horses, riders and vehicles as the entrance and exit proposed for the site would be condensed onto a very narrow private road which is basically for use by training yards, which there are many, and is used by racehorses entering and exiting the training grounds, this could potentially become a very dangerous situation with regards extra vehicles and the general public.</p> <p>Extra traffic from the proposed site N1(d) together with the Phillips Close site N1(f) would enter and exit onto Hamilton Road on a sharp bend and therefore both sites are unsuitable as the infrastructure cannot take the extra traffic and would unbalance growth in one small area of the town impacting on the horseracing industry.</p> <p>Another reason for and most import with regards to the housing needs of local people is that the grassland area and Phillips Close is earmarked for the racing industry only, this would not, therefore meet the government's policy of housing.</p> <p>We have a lack of affordable housing in Newmarket and the above site would not meet that needs of our young local folk who are desperate for this type of housing, to get on to the 'property ladder'.</p>	<p>Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and housing mix.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief. Add text to ensure development mitigates any conflict with HRI. Remove references to tenure.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Until a decision is made with regards to the Hatchfield site, surely the consultation should be delayed.		
23895 - Lynette Tonge [12841]	Object	I am a dog walker and do not wish to see yet another piece of grassland being taken from us. There are many birds living in the trees and bushes which will have their habitats affected. It would be interesting to know where the exit road is proposed as each end of Hamilton Road is busy either with children going to Laureate school or race horses at the other end. Therefore I believe this IS NOT an ideal site for new housing.	<p>Comments noted. The site was considered by the 2015 Wildlife Audit and any appropriate amendments made to the Policy and supporting text. See response to rep. ref. 24255 obo Suffolk Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access and biodiversity issues.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation and requirement for a design brief.</p>
23890 - Mr Michael Jefferys [12826]	Object	<p>This land is associated with horse racing and therefore should be protected.</p> <p>There is woodland covering much of the site. The loss of this woodland would considerably reduce the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p>If this land was developed, the adjacent roads are not wide enough to cope with an increase in traffic and there would be a significant increase in traffic through a quiet residential estate.</p> <p>The area is shown on the Suffolk Flood Survey to be prone to flooding in extreme weather conditions.</p> <p><i>This area of land should not be developed for housing.</i></p>	<p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>The site is not shown as an area liable to flood on the Environment Agency Flood Zone maps.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
23963 - Mrs P Haynes [12862]	Object	This area should be left to what it was set up for 'the use of Horses in Training' it is a natural border, including the heath on all sides which surrounds Newmarket and is unique to Newmarket and should be kept as such.	<p>Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and housing mix.</p> <p>Queensbury Lodge is a listed building in a conservation area which gives an extra layer of constraint to HRI use.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief. Add text to ensure development mitigates any conflict with HRI. Remove references to tenure.</p>
Site N1(e) - Former St Felix Middle School Site (formerly N/32)				
24193 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. If necessary foul water matters can be controlled by condition when determining a planning application.	no action required
24337 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Comment	This site contains the former playing fields of the St Felix Middle School site. Sport England would only support development that seeks to retain the playing fields and other sports facilities on the site for community use, linked to the existing George Lambton Community Playing Fields to the north. If the site is retained for educational use the playing fields and sports facilities should be retained to serve the educational use of the site.	Comments noted. The policy states 'development must make provision for the retention of the existing tennis courts and open space for public use and provide access and connectivity to this facility and open space from George Lambton playing fields...'	no action required
24416 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	The main access can be taken off Fordham Road, which would need to be to DMRB due to the road classification. There are opportunities for sustainable links to the Piggott Way and Noel Murless Drive <i>improved sustainable links to Town Centre along Fordham Road</i>	comments noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24254 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(a) (previously N/09); N1(b) (previously N/11); N1(c) (previously N/14); N1(d) (previously N/20); N1(e) (previously N/32) and RE1(a) (previously N/03) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.	Insert additional supporting text in Section 4: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
23915 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24510 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	This site is located on the already congested Fordham Road, which the NHG considers will be exacerbated by housing development at this site. The NHG is concerned that the allocation makes no reference to the need to consider impact on traffic and horse movements in this sensitive location. It is also concerned to note the suggestion that the site will be released if a new school is provided on the Hatchfield Farm site. In the event of a need for additional education land this site should be returned to education use ahead of providing a new facility on a greenfield site nearby	It is considered the impact of the development of some 50 houses on this site is likely to be less than the previous education use of 340 pupils and staff.	no action required
<i>Site N1(f) - Land at Phillips Close (formerly N/33)</i>				
23916 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
24418 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	This site is linked to N1d, and has the same issues regarding access off a private road <i>sustainable routes required</i>	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. Occupation will be a matter for the sites owner / developers.	Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and add a requirement for a design brief.
24194 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. If necessary foul water matters can be controlled by condition when determining a planning application.	no action required
24511 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Comment	The NHG considers that the supporting text for the allocation should include the text within policy N1 that refers to occupation by those associated with the horse-racing industry.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. Occupation will be a matter for the sites owner / developers.	no action required
24257 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(f) and EM1(b) were not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If they contain habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, they should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development.	Site SA6(c) Land at Philips Close (previously N1(f)) is an existing residential development. Most of the land is garden land and the garden assessment which formed part of the wildlife audit 2016 would be relevant. Site SA17(b) St Leger, Newmarket (previously EM1(b)) is an isolated undeveloped but disturbed plot in the existing employment area. Although there are some features on the site, it is poorly connected to other areas of habitat. A recent planning application was refused and dismissed at appeal however this was on amenity grounds relating to the size of the development rather than the principle of development. Whilst any application may need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey, the risks to biodiversity and to delivery of the site are assessed as low.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23903 - Mrs Shirley Gallagher [12846]	Object	<p>Any residential development would be to the detriment of the horse racing industry, as this land is associated with horseracing and should be protected for this reason being a historic cultural and important activity. The area in the plan, which surely is classed as green belt, should be protected, this area of grassland protects equine use and was established as a Buffer Zone between the existing houses (Leaders and Suffolk Way) and the training ground which would be surely lost if housing were allowed to go ahead. Also with the inevitable destruction of the trees, natural hedgerows, fauna and flora in this area, the birds nesting sites together with bats and insects their habitat will be destroyed, particularly the Song Thrush which nests here together with sightings of deer, all of which we must do our bit to preserve.</p> <p>The proposed site would surely add unnecessary risk and hazard to both horses, riders and vehicles as the entrance and exit proposed for the site would be condensed onto a very narrow private road which is basically for use by training yards, which there are many, and is used by racehorses entering and exiting the training grounds, this could potentially become a very dangerous situation with regards extra vehicles and the general public.</p> <p>Extra traffic from the proposed site N1(d) together with the Phillips Close site N1(f) would enter and exit onto Hamilton Road on a sharp bend and therefore both sites are unsuitable as the infrastructure cannot take the extra traffic and would unbalance growth in one small area of the town impacting on the horseracing industry.</p> <p>Another reason for and most import with regards to the housing needs of local people is that the grassland area and Phillips Close is earmarked for the racing industry only, this would not, therefore meet the government's policy of housing.</p> <p>We have a lack of affordable housing in Newmarket and the above site would not meet that needs of our young local folk who are desperate for this type of housing, to get on to the 'property ladder'.</p>	<p>Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(f) and the adjacent site N1(d) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and housing mix.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief. Add text to ensure development mitigates any conflict with HRI. Remove references to tenure.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		Until a decision is made with regards to the Hatchfield site, surely the consultation should be delayed.		
23964 - Mrs P Haynes [12862]	Object	This area should be left to what it was set up for 'the use of Horses in Training' it is a natural border, including the heath on all sides which surrounds Newmarket and is unique to Newmarket and should be kept as such.	<p>Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As in the same ownership it is considered that the merger of N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access, biodiversity and housing mix.</p> <p>Queensbury Lodge is a listed building in a conservation area which gives an extra layer of constraint to HRI use.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)) and requirement for a design brief. Add text to ensure development mitigates any conflict with HRI. Remove references to tenure.</p>
<i>Policy N1: Housing in Newmarket</i>				
24338 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Comment	This site contains the former playing fields of the St Felix Middle School site. Sport England would only support development that seeks to retain the playing fields and other sports facilities on the site for community use, linked to the existing George Lambton Community Playing Fields to the north. If the site is retained for educational use the playing fields and sports facilities should be retained to serve the educational use of the site.	Comments noted. The policy states 'development must make provision for the retention of the existing tennis courts and open space for public use and provide access and connectivity to this facility and open space from George Lambton playing fields...'	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24341 - The Trustees of the E G Lambton 1974 Settlement [5870]	Object	Site N18, GLPF should be identified as a site suitable for mixed use development in chapter 7 of the Site Allocations Local Plan. Newmarket is already identified for growth and needs to meet affordable housing targets. Site N18 would help to deliver these targets. Created a masterplan which could deliver up to 223 mixed tenure residential units. Would be advanced in relation to replacement of sport and recreation facilities.	GLPF was allocated for development subject to the provision of satisfactory replacement recreational facilities being provided elsewhere in the town in the last plan period, but did not come forward for development with an acceptable scheme in that time frame. The likelihood of it coming forward in the coming plan period if carried forward as an allocation is questioned. In addition as located off Fordham Road development of this large site is likely to raise similar concerns to those recently upheld by the SoS for the development of Hatchfield Farm.	no action required
24505 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG has submitted separate representations in relation to the SIR and the supporting documents for both documents . It considers that the Council has not adequately assessed the issues relevant to this process and has particular concerns regarding the consequences of this for the allocation of sites in Newmarket. The NHG is very worried about the impact of traffic on the horse-racing industry and is disappointed to note that the recommendations in the 2015 Deloitte report for further studies in this area have not been undertaken. .In general, the NHG considers that the allocation of sites is not appropriately supported for relevant evidence and that the impacts have not been adequately tested.	Comments noted. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. JDMP LPD Policies DM47, 48 and 50 deal with horse movements and highway safety in a development management context. It is considered the SALP is supported by a sound and relevant evidence base.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24073 - Lord Derby [5831]	Support	<p>The Proposed Mixed Use Allocation at Hatchfield Farm : The proposed mixed use allocation on part of Hatchfield Farm in Policy NI(c) is supported. The site is in a single ownership and is available and deliverable in the early part of the remainder of the plan period.</p> <p>However, it is felt that it is confusing for Policy NI(c) to refer to the Hatchfield Farm allocation area as relating to the 64.7 hectares which comprise the whole of Hatchfield Farm. The allocation should be reduced in size to that necessary to deliver 400 homes, a primary school and the employment land. The plan of Newmarket which shows the proposed allocations should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>It is noted that Policy NI(c) refers to a minimum of 5 hectares of employment. This is regarded as a vague and open ended commitment. It is suggested that the text of the policy refers to 6.5 hectares of employment land as defined by the field adjoining the A14. The total allocation would then be 28.0 hectares (20 ha of housing, 1.5 ha Primary School and 6.5 ha of employment). A plan of the suggested allocation area is attached (No SS060854_21A).</p> <p>The commentary on site NI (c) refers to regard being had to the relationship between the site and the Breckland SPA. This is due to the extreme eastern edge of the 64.7 ha Hatchfield Farm site being just touched by the Breckland SPA buffer zone. If the allocation is reduced to the eastern part of the site as shown on plan SS060854_21A, none of the development land is touched by the SPA buffer and this part of the text can be deleted. The suggested track changed revised text for Policy NI is attached to this representation.</p>	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	no action required
<i>Question 7 - Newmarket</i>				
24075 - Lord Derby [5831]	Comment	The Hatchfield Farm proposed allocation is supported with amendments	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23993 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Comment	Question 7 Response: ECDC has no objection in principle to the sites set out in the Newmarket policy, though if the outcome of the Hatchfield Farm decision is a refusal then we would welcome early discussion as to the implications for growth at Newmarket, and in particular the Hatchfield Farm site (including the A14/A142 junction).	The council will continue to work with EHDC through duty to cooperate and other strategic cross border issues.	no action required
24103 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	Hatchfield Farm is included but as subject to an enquiry should not be included.	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	no action required
24091 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	Why promote Hatchfield - we haven't had the planning enquiry results yet. No infrastructure report - we would have major traffic problems. Involve movement of horses in Newmarket.	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	no action required
24323 - Mrs Rachel Hood [12509]	Object	No we do not agree with these allocations, some of which breach the Horse Racing Land Policy. In particular site N1a Brickfield Stud and Site N1c Hatchfield Farm are unacceptable. I have previously objected to applications for housing on both of these sites. The SALP includes employment use for storage and distribution at St Leger Drive. The appropriateness of such sites when no data has been published to assess the suitability of the current infrastructure and traffic levels in Newmarket. The last such assessment was done in 2009, this was 7 years ago and things have significantly changed since then. Until such data is updated it is not appropriate to comment on the suitability of new employment and housing sites.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan has informed the production of the SALP.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24342 - The Trustees of the E G Lambton 1974 Settlement [5870]	Object	The appropriateness and deliverability of Sites N1(a), N1(b), N1(c) and N1(e). Site N1(a) Brickfield Stud, Exning Road is in equine use and hence protected by long standing policies which presume the sites on-going protection. Site N1(b) Land at Black Bear lane and Rowley Drive Junction. This site has a lengthy and complex planning history. The allocation confirms that any redevelopment would need to facilitate the sympathetic restoration and viable reuse of the listed buildings, retain a horse racing industry related use on the site, and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Site N1(c) Hatchfield Farmis subject to a lengthy and complex planning history which still remains un resolved. Site N1(e) Former Felix Middle School Site. The plan notes that the site is currently being held by SCC pending possible future education needs and hence thee is uncertainty in relation to this site. GLPF would potential pick up the shortfall from the issues with these sites.	<p>The LPA is content that it's proposed submission sites are available, viable and deliverable in the plan period.</p> <p>The appropriateness and deliverability of GLPF is unproven. The site was allocated for development (subject to the provision of satisfactory replacement recreational facilities being provided elsewhere in the town) in the last plan period, but did not come forward for development, with an acceptable scheme, in that time frame. The likelihood of it coming forward in the coming plan period if carried forward as an allocation is questioned. In addition as located off Fordham Road development of this large site is likely to raise similar concerns to those recently upheld by the SoS for the development of Hatchfield Farm.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24161 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [12903]	Object	See above.	<p>N1 Comments noted.</p> <p>Agreed. Para 7.15 states that the A14 forms a physical barrier to coalescence.</p> <p>Para 7.19. The term 'green gap' is not a designation. The wording describes the important contribution this area makes to the landscape setting and character of the two settlements.</p> <p>Para 7.23. Comment noted.</p> <p>Para 7.24 Comments noted. The merger of allocations N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. A development brief will be required which will address access issues.</p> <p>Para 7.24 Comments noted. The merger of allocations N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development. The indicative capacity for the merged allocation in Policy N1 is 117 dwellings net (147 gross) to allow for the loss of the existing dwellings on Phillips Close. This equates to approx. 35dph.</p> <p>comment noted. NPPF para 150 states 'Planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. Therefore applications for allocated sites would be expected to comply with relevant policies in any adopted development plan. As such the phrase can be deleted and the merger of allocations N1(d) and the adjacent site N1(f) will allow a comprehensive and coordinate approach to development through the production of a development brief.</p> <p>Policy N1 The Suffolk Historic Environment Record has an entry for a find on site post development.</p> <p>(f) Comment noted.</p>	<p>7.15 No change required.</p> <p>7.19 No change required</p> <p>7.23 Amend supporting text to allocation.</p> <p>7.24 Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation (SA6(c)), amend net site capacity and add requirement for a design brief.</p> <p>Delete phrase 'subject to compliance with all other policy requirements'. Amalgamate sites N1(d) and N1(f) into a single allocation and add requirement for a design brief</p> <p>Policy N1 No change required.</p> <p>(f) Remove 31 Hamilton Road from site plan.</p>

Draft Policy N1 needs to be changed to ensure it is factually correct with respect to the specific sites (d)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<i>and (f) so it in accordance with para 158 of the NPPF. The changes which need to be made are set out in the main representation.</i>		
24315 - Save Historic Newmarket Ltd (Ms Sara Beckett) [11232]	Object	No, not in agreement with the proposed allocations N1a is in breach of the horse racing land policy n1c is an unacceptable allocation is subject to by SOS	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p>	no action required
24130 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Object	NO we do not agree with these allocations , some of which breach the Horse Racing Land Policy. In particular site N1a Brickfield Stud and site N1c Hatchfield Farm are unacceptable. I have previously objected to applications for housing on both these sites. The SALP includes employment use for storage and distribution at St Leger Drive. The appropriateness of such sites when no data has been published to assess the suitability of the current infrastructure and traffic levels in Newmarket. The last such assessment was done in 2009, this is 7 years ago and things have significantly changed since then. Until such data is updated it is not appropriate to comment on the suitability of new employment and housing sites.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan has informed the production of the SALP.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24116 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	NO we do not agree with these allocations, some of which breach the Horse Racing Land Policy. In particular site N1a Brickfield Stud and site N1c Hatchfield Farm are unacceptable. Newmarket Town Council has objected to applications for housing on both these sites. Newmarket Town Council notes FHDC is undertaking a feasibility study on site N1b to assess what the site can support and welcomes this study in order to resolve this long standing issue. Newmarket Town Council notes that the SALP includes employment use for storage and distribution at St Leger. Newmarket Town Council has objected to the current application to develop this land. However Newmarket Town Council is unable to comment on the appropriateness of such sites when FHDC has not published any data to demonstrate that it has updated its assessment of infrastructure requirements and traffic levels in Newmarket since 2009. Until such data is updated it is not appropriate to comment on the suitability of new employment and housing sites.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan has informed the production of the SALP.	no action required
24231 - Mr Richard Ward [12917]	Object	The sites for Hatchfield Farm and Brickfield Stud should not be included. The former has not been decided, the latter cannot be allocated as it is protected against development for housing under the horse racing policies. <i>Exclude Hatchfield Farm and Brickfield Stud from allocation</i>	JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24201 - Ms Sara Beckett [6689]	Object	N1 a and N1 b should not be allocated for residential use as they are and should continue to be protected by the horse racing policies of FHDC. N1c cannot be allocated as it is subject to a 'call-in' by the SOS	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan has informed the production of the SALP.</p>	no action required
<i>Allocations within Newmarket need to be reassessed taking into account FHDC's owns policies for the HRI and the unique nature of the market town that makes Newmarket what it is.</i>				
24312 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Object	No Tattersalls does not agree with allocations for Newmarket. In particular site N1a Brickfield Stud and site N1b Queensbury Lodge should be retained for racing use. Site N1c Hatchfield Farm was objected to by NHG and furthermore the entire site has been included within the settlement boundary and this suggests the development of this site could be more than identified in policy N1.	<p>JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.</p> <p>The proposed allocation for Queensbury Lodge states that and any development should 'retain a horse racing related use on the site'.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24521 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG has identified the issues that need to be taken into account in the first section of this form.	Comments noted. As part of the LPAs evidence base AECOM have undertaken a study of the cumulative transportation impacts of the sites allocated for development in the SALP. In addition SCC Highways have regular meetings with the Jockey Club and other interested parties regarding the horse walks and crossings in the town. JDMP LPD Policies DM47, 48 and 50 deal with horse movements and highway safety in a development management context. It is considered the SALP is supported by a sound and relevant evidence base.	no action required
<i>Question 8 - Newmarket</i>				
24316 - Save Historic Newmarket Ltd (Ms Sara Beckett) [11232]	Comment	The settlement boundary should not be amended. Brickfield Stud is contrary to horse racing policy. Hatchfield farm should be excluded as this is subject to call in.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
24095 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	It is not right to put the whole of Hatchfield in the boundary changes. Only a part was included in first place.	comments noted	no actions required
24104 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	You have included sites not proposed for development.	Comment noted. All included sites are proposed for development.	No action required.
24233 - Mr Richard Ward [12917]	Object	It would appear that boundaries are being considered for change to accommodate sites that should not be allocated	There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
<i>Do not change boundaries</i>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24117 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	NO, Newmarket Town Council does not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained with the FHDC Core Strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
24522 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The NHG considers that the settlement boundary should not be extended to include sites N1(a) and N1(c) . It considers that neither site is suitable for development and that neither should be included in the settlement boundary. It further considers that it is inappropriate to include the whole of the Hatchfield Farm site within the settlement boundary when the scale of development proposed by allocation N (c) does not involve the whole site.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
24324 - Mrs Rachel Hood [12509]	Object	No, I do not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of the Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained within the FHDC Core Strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
24205 - Ms Sara Beckett [6689]	Object	I do not agree with proposed boundary changes which would increase allocation at N1c and include allocation at N1a	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
<i>Main current boundary</i>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24131 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Object	NO, I do not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained with the FHDC Core Strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required
24313 - Tattersalls Ltd (Mr John Morrey) [5726]	Object	No, Tattersalls does not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained within the FHDC core strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes. This application is for part of the site only and not the entire site as shown in the proposed settlement boundary plan.	Comments noted. JDMP Policy DM49 allows the allocation of sites in horse racing use to be considered via the adoption process of a local plan. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need whilst having regard to the settlement hierarchy as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints of each site.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Preferred sites for allocation in the key service centres</i>				
<i>The local area - Lakenheath</i>				
23897 - B F Yeo [5484]	Comment	I support Hermione Brown in her efforts to ensure that the Parish Council has a strong voice in Lakenheath development matters. As a one-time councillor in a distant village i was well aware of the little importance attached to Parish Council views by the District PLanners. We eventually managed to secure a concession in that a Parish representative was permitted to attend District planning meetings for relevant cases. The Parish representative was able to put the parish views but not to take part in the subsequent discussion. A small step forward perhaps.	Noted.	No action required.
24024 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	Areas of deficit should be considered as follows: Lack of employment opportunities. Key Service Centre facilities. Non car modes of transport. Lack of good transport links. Lack of pre-school, primary and secondary education facilities. Underfunded library. Insufficient retail facilities. No fuel services available. No Royal British Legion. <i>Review of omissions as above.</i>	Noted. The SALP allocates sites appropriate to Lakenheath's status as a Key Service Centre and in accordance with the infrastructure and environmental capacity constraints in the village.	No action required.
24023 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	The classification of Lakenheath as a Key Service Centre (KSC). LPC submits that it is inappropriate to allocate housing to Lakenheath as a KSC as the level of services and facilities within Lakenheath no longer meet the KSC criteria as they did in 2010. In summary, there are no new employment opportunities, Lakenheath does not serve as a public transport hub, and there are limited facilities, no petrol garage and few shops. Insufficient accessible transport modes, health services and education places. <i>Removal of classification of Lakenheath as a KSC.</i>	Noted. Lakenheath has a good range of services and facilities and is designated as a Key Service Centre in the Core Strategy.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Lakenheath planning constraints map</i>				
24592 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	L/28a and L/28b should be allocated and included within this policy	Noted. Site L/28 is not considered suitable for development/allocation for a number of reasons, including proximity to the Breckland Farmland SSSI and RAF Lakenheath SAC, the group TPO on the northern part of the site and the ecological value of the site (ranked medium in the Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2015 assessment).	No action required.
		<i>L/28a and L/28b should be allocated and included within this policy</i>		
<i>Lakenheath site allocations map</i>				
23884 - Mr Steve Dedross [12765]	Comment	I would like to put forward a plot of land in Lakenheath for consideration in the local response plan. I have attached a plan showing the parcel of land, please can you add to the plan for consideration?	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	no action required
24195 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently spare capacity at the receiving Lakenheath Water Recycling Centre to accommodate the scale of growth in Lakenheath indicated in the plan.	Noted. Anglian Water's comments are noted. The council will continue to work with AWS throughout the production of the Local Plan.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23889 - Margret Burroughs & Christopher Harding [6413]	Object	<p>We are writing to express our views regarding the proposed development at Lakenheath.</p> <p>We are writing to request that you keep Lakenheath as a village and do not over develop it into a town. The infrastructure in the village is such that it could not take a large number of additional houses, the facilities are simply not in the village. The idea of having 2 schools is ludicrous. Most of the residents want to keep the village as a small village.</p> <p>Given the additional housing which became available at Lords Walk, and of course with Mildenhall USAF vacating we feel there is no need for all this extra housing in Lakenheath. Take into account the Lords Walk houses and also consider the land at Mildenhall base for future development, please leave Lakenheath as it is.</p> <p>We are very worried that you will try and develop on the land called Middle Covert adjacent to Woodlands Estate where we live. This is the only area of woodland in the village, and I know at present it is protected by a TPO. Please let me know what your intention is regarding this land. Will the TPO be automatically renewed? When does the TPO expire.</p>	<p>Noted. Land at Middle Covert (L/28) is not proposed for allocation in the Plan due to a range of environmental constraints. The level of growth planned for Lakenheath generates the need for infrastructure provision to be made at the appropriate stage of the development process.</p> <p>More details can be found in the IDP which will accompany consultation on the SALP</p>	No action required.
<i>Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery (formerly L/29)</i>				
24421 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	<p>There is a previous application for a mixed retail and residential site, with access from B1112. The south potential access (Matthews Nursery) is on a bend and is not suitable for intensification of use. The minor road in the middle of the site, Dumpling Bridge Lane, is also not suitable. However the original north access point proposed for the former Tesco site would be acceptable for additional development.</p> <p><i>close to TC</i></p>	Noted. The comments in relation to access are noted.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24348 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	<p>The following sites are close to the main river (River Lark, Cut Off Channel). Therefore, developers should assess the impacts on new development on these sites in terms of the WFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Site M1(a) - Land West of Mildenhall <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(b) - Land West of Eriswell Road <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(b) - Land at North Lakenheath <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(d) - Land North of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way <p>Developers should demonstrate compliance with the following WFD aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration of the chemical or ecological condition of surface waters and/or the chemical or quantitative condition of groundwater; and <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve overall good status on all waterbodies by 2021 or 2027 as appropriate for that waterbody. <input type="checkbox"/> Development proposals should demonstrate that any impacts on water quality, water resources, channel morphology, species diversity and ecological condition have been fully considered. <input type="checkbox"/> Apart from preventing deterioration, development proposals should outline the improvements to the environment that can be achieved by careful and considerate development design. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals should outline where habitat improvements, foul water treatment, surface water control and other mechanisms will help to achieve betterment, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 	Noted. The comments about the need to assess impacts of development in terms of the Water Framework Directive are noted. This was not raised as a requirement at the planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the EA in the consideration of issues impacting on the allocation of sites for development.	No action required.
23920 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development. in accordance with current safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24196 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. Foul water matters will be dealt with by conditions as part of the respective planning application (as recommended by AWS).	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24259 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L1(a) (previously L/29); L1(b) (previously L/26); L2(a) (previously L/13); L2(b) (previously L/36); L2(c) (previously L/35) and L2(d) (previously L/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA8(b) (previously L2(b)), policy wording to protect an area of neutral semi-improved grassland has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit, and the size and location of the site in relation to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
24025 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>The existing owner has been unable to locate a retail purchaser for the retail part of the site. LPC understand that a sale is going through due process to a company likely to apply eventually for a change of use to residential. This will be a loss of the only possible future mode of employment.</p> <p><i>The existing owner has been unable to locate a retail purchaser for the retail part of the site. LPC understand that a sale is going through due process to a company likely to apply eventually for a change of use to residential. This will be a loss of the only possible future mode of employment.</i></p>	<p>Noted. There is an existing permission for an A1 retail store (supermarket) and 13 dwellings (F/2010/0338/FUL). The site is allocated for mixed use in line with the current permission.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<i>Site L1(b) - Land west of Eriswell Road (formerly L/26)</i>				
24423 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	<p>Recently submitted planning application. One of the original 3 sites in the cumulative assessment.</p> <p><i>links to TC required and traffic calming on adjacent streets</i></p>	<p>Suffolk County Council's Highway's comments are noted.</p>	<p>A paragraph has been included in both policies in the Lakenheath section stating that 'Permission will be granted where applicants can demonstrate that satisfactory measures to mitigate the cumulative and individual highway impacts of development on the site(s) can be formally secured and are deliverable.'</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24349 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	<p>The following sites are close to the main river (River Lark, Cut Off Channel). Therefore, developers should assess the impacts on new development on these sites in terms of the WFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Site M1(a) - Land West of Mildenhall <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(b) - Land West of Eriswell Road <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(b) - Land at North Lakenheath <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(d) - Land North of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way <p>Developers should demonstrate compliance with the following WFD aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration of the chemical or ecological condition of surface waters and/or the chemical or quantitative condition of groundwater; and <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve overall good status on all waterbodies by 2021 or 2027 as appropriate for that waterbody. <input type="checkbox"/> Development proposals should demonstrate that any impacts on water quality, water resources, channel morphology, species diversity and ecological condition have been fully considered. <input type="checkbox"/> Apart from preventing deterioration, development proposals should outline the improvements to the environment that can be achieved by careful and considerate development design. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals should outline where habitat improvements, foul water treatment, surface water control and other mechanisms will help to achieve betterment, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 	Noted. The comments about the need to assess impacts of development in terms of the Water Framework Directive are noted. This was not raised as a requirement at the planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the EA in the consideration of issues impacting on the allocation of sites for development.	No action required.
24197 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently sufficient capacity in the foul sewerage system to accommodate the proposed development of 140 dwellings.	Noted. Anglian Water's comments are noted. The council will continue to work with AWS throughout the production of the Local Plan.	No action required.
23919 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development, in accordance with current safeguarding procedures.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24260 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L1(a) (previously L/29); L1(b) (previously L/26); L2(a) (previously L/13); L2(b) (previously L/36); L2(c) (previously L/35) and L2(d) (previously L/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA8(b) (previously L2(b)), policy wording to protect an area of neutral semi-improved grassland has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit, and the size and location of the site in relation to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
24026 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Support	<p>Support a residential development so long as the Highways situation can be mitigated as could lead to a choke point. Serious consideration has to be given to access the site as the belt of trees fronting Eriswell Road are subject to tree preservation orders.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parish Council's support for this site is noted.</p>	<p>A paragraph has been included in both policies in the Lakenheath section stating that 'Permission will be granted where applicants can demonstrate that satisfactory measures to mitigate the cumulative and individual highway impacts of development on the site(s) can be formally secured and are deliverable.'</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Policy L1: Housing in Lakenheath</i>				
24216 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	Policy L1 and Policy L2: We welcome the wording on providing measures for influencing recreation by ensuring each development provides green infrastructure and dog friendly routes. It would also be useful to include as much detail as possible on developers contributions to any strategic schemes you are working on (as discussed above) to protect the sites.	Policies in the plan need to be flexible so that any new evidence and emerging mitigation measures can be considered at the time that development comes forward. The policy wording used appears to be restrictive as, for example it would not in its current form allow for the implementation of a warden scheme for existing sensitive natural greenspace which has been recommended as part of the strategy to address recreation pressure. The Council agrees that additional supporting text is required clearly setting out the purpose of the mitigation and referring to the strategy in the Accessible natural greenspace study. The Council will continue to work with Natural England to secure and implement mitigation measures to influence recreation in the region and particularly in the settlements of Brandon, Mildenhall, Red Lodge, Lakenheath, Beck Row, Kentford and West Row. These will be either onsite of offsite proportionate to the type, scale, and location of development in the plan such that these measures contribute to the strategy set out in the Accessible natural greenspace study.	Insert additional text in policies SA7, SA8 'or other agreed measures' Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP: There is concern that increased development in the district has the potential to contribute to recreational pressure on Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA). Natural England has advised that any development within 7.5km of Breckland SPA has the potential to contribute to cumulative recreational effects. The Council will continue to work with Natural England and developers to secure and implement mitigation measures to influence recreation in the region. These will be either onsite of offsite, proportionate to the type, scale, and location of development in the plan such that these measures contribute to the strategy set out in the Accessible natural greenspace study. Measures may include the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANGS) which is well connected; the enhancement /promotion of dog friendly facilities and access routes in the immediate vicinity of development ; the implementation of a warden for existing sensitive sites; or other such effective measures as may be agreed.
<i>Question 9 - Lakenheath</i>				
24028 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Comment Noise rating and air safety needs to be considered as current information is out of date and does not reflect the decision to relocate two F35 squadrons to RAF Lakenheath. It has to be remembered that the NPPF states that both new and existing development should be prevented from contributing to, or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of noise pollution. Additionally, The Forest Heath Core Strategy identifies aircraft noise as one of the key social, economic and environmental issues facing the district! See attachments.	Noted. The most up to date information available has been used to assess noise constraints in developing the Local Plan. The northern focus of growth in Lakenheath is the least environmentally constrained part of the village.	A paragraph has been inserted into both Lakenheath policies around the need for any development proposals to incorporate appropriate noise mitigation measures.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24002 - Necton Management Ltd [12888]	Comment	<p>We remain concerned that the infrastructure implications in respect of Mildenhall are so significant that there is a real risk that the onset of development will be delayed resulting in a shortfall in the early years of the plan</p> <p>Therefore additional sites ought to be provided that are capable of being delivered now in other locations such as former site L/25 which has the added advantage of being available now. This approach would provide a range and choice of sites, and locations as required by the Framework.</p>	Noted. This site is not suitable for allocation for a variety of reasons, including potential impact on the Maidscross SSSI and that a project level HRA for application DC/14/2073/FUL was not able to screen out likely significant effects.	No action required.
24302 - Elveden Farms Ltd [12921]	Support	<p>Support L1(b) - This site is in a sustainable edge of settlement location, within a reasonable distance of medical centres and the existing primary school, and is not subject to any specific ecological, landscape or heritage designations.</p> <p>An appropriate layout and design quality will be able to mitigate the very limited flood risk issue at the NW corner of the site and noise considerations.</p>	Noted. The comments in support of the site are noted. The site is allocated in the submission Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required.
<i>8.14</i>				
24029 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>Outside of the village settlement and erodes a natural landscape boundary feature. Part of the development is within the flight line of returning Jets to RAF Lakenheath and outgoing Helicopters. Wrong place for the school. The site is a mile outside of the village centre with no safe cycle or walking facilities.</p> <p><i>Not considered suitable for growth at this location.</i></p>	Noted. The northern focus of growth in Lakenheath is the least environmentally constrained part of the village. Site L2(b) application for 375 dwellings and a primary school has a resolution to approve (August 2016).	No action required.
24027 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>Object Outside of the village settlement and erodes a natural landscape boundary feature. Part of the development is within the flight line of returning Jets to RAF Lakenheath and outgoing Helicopters.</p> <p><i>Outside of the village settlement and erodes a natural landscape boundary feature. Part of the development is within the flight line of returning Jets to RAF Lakenheath and outgoing Helicopters.</i></p>	Noted. The northern focus of growth in Lakenheath is the least environmentally constrained part of the village. Site L2(a) application for up to 81 dwellings has a resolution to grant permission (June 2015).	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site L2(a) Rabbit Hill Covert, Station Road (formerly L/13)</i>				
24261 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L1(a) (previously L/29); L1(b) (previously L/26); L2(a) (previously L/13); L2(b) (previously L/36); L2(c) (previously L/35) and L2(d) (previously L/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA8(b) (previously L2(b)), policy wording to protect an area of neutral semi-improved grassland has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit, and the size and location of the site in relation to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
24198 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	We do not envisage any constrains with serving this development for foul drainage.	Noted. Anglian Water's comments are noted. The council will continue to work with AWS throughout the production of the Local Plan.	No action required.
23918 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development, in accordance with current safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24425 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Recently submitted planning application, this site is one of the 3 application included in the cumulative impact study	Noted. Suffolk County Highways comments are noted.	A paragraph has been included in both policies in the Lakenheath section stating that 'Permission will be granted where applicants can demonstrate that satisfactory measures to mitigate the cumulative and individual highway impacts of development on the site(s) can be formally secured and are deliverable.'
24030 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>Outside of the village settlement and erodes a natural landscape boundary feature. Part of the development is within the flight line of returning Jets to RAF Lakenheath and outgoing Helicopters.</p> <p><i>Review growth options.</i></p>	Noted. Site L2(a) application for up to 81 dwellings has a resolution to grant permission (June 2015).	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24459 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	L2(a) - The site owners and their development partners consider that the development proposed on this site is viable, and could be delivered in the short term. In view of the decision reached by the planning committee of Forest Heath District Council on this application this site is not considered further in these representations.	Noted. The comments in support of the site are noted. The site is allocated in the submission Site Allocations Local Plan.	No action required.
<i>Site L2(b) Land at North Lakenheath (formerly L/36)</i>				
24262 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L1(a) (previously L/29); L1(b) (previously L/26); L2(a) (previously L/13); L2(b) (previously L/36); L2(c) (previously L/35) and L2(d) (previously L/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA8(b) (previously L2(b)), policy wording to protect an area of neutral semi-improved grassland has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit, and the size and location of the site in relation to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of the SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24350 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	<p>The following sites are close to the main river (River Lark, Cut Off Channel). Therefore, developers should assess the impacts on new development on these sites in terms of the WFD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Site M1(a) - Land West of Mildenhall <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(b) - Land West of Eriswell Road <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(b) - Land at North Lakenheath <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(d) - Land North of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way <p>Developers should demonstrate compliance with the following WFD aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration of the chemical or ecological condition of surface waters and/or the chemical or quantitative condition of groundwater; and <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve overall good status on all waterbodies by 2021 or 2027 as appropriate for that waterbody. <input type="checkbox"/> Development proposals should demonstrate that any impacts on water quality, water resources, channel morphology, species diversity and ecological condition have been fully considered. <input type="checkbox"/> Apart from preventing deterioration, development proposals should outline the improvements to the environment that can be achieved by careful and considerate development design. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals should outline where habitat improvements, foul water treatment, surface water control and other mechanisms will help to achieve betterment, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). 	Noted. The comments about the need to assess impacts of development in terms of the Water Framework Directive are noted. This was not raised as a requirement at the planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the EA in the consideration of issues impacting on the allocation of sites for development.	No action required.
24199 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. Foul water matters will be dealt with by conditions as part of the respective planning application (as recommended by AWS).	No action required.
24427 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Live planning application, the site includes a school. Included in the follow on stage of the cumulative assessment (phase 1)	Suffolk County Highways comments are noted.	A paragraph has been included in both policies in the Lakenheath section stating that 'Permission will be granted where applicants can demonstrate that satisfactory measures to mitigate the cumulative and individual highway impacts of development on the site(s) can be formally secured and are deliverable.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23922 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development, in accordance with current safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24031 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	Outside the village settlement and a greenfield site part of which is within a flood zone. The development is within the flight line of returning Jets to RAF Lakenheath and outgoing Helicopters - pending application LPC objected to. <i>Review of development growth.</i>	Noted. Site L2(b) application for 375 dwellings and a primary school has a resolution to grant permission (August 2016).	No action required.
24460 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	L2(b) - site provides the opportunity for a new much needed primary school, with scope to include a pre-school, and a significant quantity of open space that will future proof the needs of the village. The comments on the submitted planning application and the documents supporting the planning application show that all constraints to development can be overcome. In conclusion the site meets the requirements of local and national planning policy and is available for housing and education development. Its development will provide housing and infrastructure in an area of need so the proposed allocation is supported.	The support is noted. Site L2(b) application for 375 dwellings and a primary school has a resolution to approve (August 2016).	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site L2(c) Land off Briscoe Way (formerly L/35)</i>				
24263 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L1(a) (previously L/29); L1(b) (previously L/26); L2(a) (previously L/13); L2(b) (previously L/36); L2(c) (previously L/35) and L2(d) (previously L/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA8(b) (previously L2(b)), policy wording to protect an area of neutral semi-improved grassland has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit, and the size and location of the site in relation to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of the SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
23921 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development. In accordance with current safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24200 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	We do not envisage any constraints with serving this development for foul drainage. However, it should be noted the proximity to Lakenheath Water Recycling Centre that may pose a risk of odour impact; an odour risk assessment should be completed to determine an acceptable distance.	Noted. The need for an odour risk assessment is noted. This can be dealt with by condition (as recommended by AWS).	No action required.
24428 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	<p>Site has a good potential access and options for sustainable links to the town centre. One of the original 3 sites included in the cumulative assessment.</p> <p><i>The sustainable links to the Town Centre will need to be improved, this can be included in a S106 agreement for town wide improvements</i></p>	Noted. The comments around the securing sustainable links to the town centre through a S106 have been noted and will be considered in the context of application DC/13/0660/FUL which has a resolution to approve.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24032 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Support	Natural progression of the estate. Would prefer to see another entrance via Burrow Drive into the extension as full access via one road could lead to a choke point.	Noted. The Parish Council's comments are noted. Site L2(c) has a resolution to grant planning permission (September 2014).	No action required.
<i>Site L2(d) - Land north of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way (formerly L/12 & L/39)</i>				
24429 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	this site can only be accessed from the adjacent site L2c. If it links into residential streets 2 points of access would be required to form an internal loop. There is a further potential link to the next field. Drift Road is not suitable for access. <i>sustainable links to the Town Centre required</i>	Noted. Site L2d forms part of the northern focus of growth in Lakenheath. Sites B and C future proof access to site L2d as part of their respective planning applications.	no action required
24351 - Environment Agency (Elizabeth Mugova) [12393]	Comment	The following sites are close to the main river (River Lark, Cut Off Channel). Therefore, developers should assess the impacts on new development on these sites in terms of the WFD. <input type="checkbox"/> Site M1(a) - Land West of Mildenhall <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(a) - Matthews Nursery <input type="checkbox"/> Site L1(b) - Land West of Eriswell Road <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(b) - Land at North Lakenheath <input type="checkbox"/> Site L2(d) - Land North of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way Developers should demonstrate compliance with the following WFD aims: <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent deterioration of the chemical or ecological condition of surface waters and/or the chemical or quantitative condition of groundwater; and <input type="checkbox"/> Achieve overall good status on all waterbodies by 2021 or 2027 as appropriate for that waterbody. <input type="checkbox"/> Development proposals should demonstrate that any impacts on water quality, water resources, channel morphology, species diversity and ecological condition have been fully considered. <input type="checkbox"/> Apart from preventing deterioration, development proposals should outline the improvements to the environment that can be achieved by careful and considerate development design. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals should outline where habitat improvements, foul water treatment, surface water control and other mechanisms will help to achieve betterment, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Noted. The comments about the need to assess impacts of development in terms of the Water Framework Directive are noted. This will need to be assessed by the developer in relation to any application for development on the site. The council will continue to work with the EA in the consideration of issues impacting on the allocation of sites for development.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24202 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service. It should be noted the proximity of to Lakenheath Water Recycling Centre that may pose a risk of odour impact; an odour risk assessment should be completed to determine an acceptable distance.	Noted. The need for an odour risk assessment is noted. This can be dealt with by a condition on any future application for development (as recommended by AWS).	No action required.
24264 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites L1(a) (previously L/29); L1(b) (previously L/26); L2(a) (previously L/13); L2(b) (previously L/36); L2(c) (previously L/35) and L2(d) (previously L/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA8(b) (previously L2(b)), policy wording to protect an area of neutral semi-improved grassland has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit, and the size and location of the site in relation to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
23917 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	Noted. The council will continue to work with the MoD in the consideration of air traffic noise emissions, and other issues, when allocating new sites for development, in accordance with current safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24033 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Support the area outside flood zone.	The Parish Council's support for the area outside the flood zone is noted.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Policy L2: Focus of growth: North Lakenheath</i>				
24217 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	Policy L1 and Policy L2: We welcome the wording on providing measures for influencing recreation by ensuring each development provides green infrastructure and dog friendly routes. It would also be useful to include as much detail as possible on developers contributions to any strategic schemes you are working on (as discussed above) to protect the sites.	Policies in the plan need to be flexible so that any new evidence and emerging mitigation measures can be considered at the time that development comes forward. The policy wording used appears to be restrictive as, for example it would not in its current form allow for the implementation of a warden scheme for existing sensitive natural greenspace which has been recommended as part of the strategy to address recreation pressure. The Council agrees that additional supporting text is required clearly setting out the purpose of the mitigation and referring to the strategy in the Accessible natural greenspace study. The Council will continue to work with Natural England to secure and implement mitigation measures to influence recreation in the region and particularly in the settlements of Brandon, Mildenhall, Red Lodge, Lakenheath, Beck Row, Kentford and West Row. These will be either onsite of offsite proportionate to the type, scale, and location of development in the plan such that these measures contribute to the strategy set out in the Accessible natural greenspace study.	Insert additional text in policies SA7, SA8 'or other agreed measures' Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP: There is concern that increased development in the district has the potential to contribute to recreational pressure on Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA). Natural England has advised that any development within 7.5km of Breckland SPA has the potential to contribute to cumulative recreational effects. The Council will continue to work with Natural England and developers to secure and implement mitigation measures to influence recreation in the region. These will be either onsite of offsite, proportionate to the type, scale, and location of development in the plan such that these measures contribute to the strategy set out in the Accessible natural greenspace study. Measures may include the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANGS) which is well connected; the enhancement /promotion of dog friendly facilities and access routes in the immediate vicinity of development ; the implementation of a warden for existing sensitive sites; or other such effective measures as may be agreed.
24458 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	L2(a) - The site owners and their development partners consider that the development proposed on this site is viable, and could be delivered in the short term. In view of the decision reached by the planning committee of Forest Heath District Council on this application this site is not considered further in these representations. L2(b) - site provides the opportunity for a new much needed primary school, with scope to include a pre-school, and a significant quantity of open space that will future proof the needs of the village. The comments on the submitted planning application and the documents supporting the planning application show that all constraints to development can be overcome.	Noted. The support for sites L2(a) and L2(b) is noted.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 10 - Lakenheath</i>				
24285 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	<p>The proposal to make the north of Lakenheath the main focus of new development is welcomed and as such the allocation of the series of sites promoted under the previous consultation is also welcomed.</p> <p>However, given the SHLAA's conclusion that the Council's allocations are conservative, it is considered that there would be potential to extend the town 's allocation.</p> <p>The combined sites of L/28a and L/28b should, therefore, be allocated and included within this policy.</p> <p>It is considered that the site identified as L28 at the previous stage of consultation and in the SHLAA should form part of this policy.</p>	Noted. Site L/28 is not considered suitable for development/allocation for a number of reasons, including proximity to the Breckland Farmland SSSI and RAF Lakenheath SAC, the group TPO on the northern part of the site and the ecological value of the site (ranked medium in the Suffolk Wildlife Trust 2015 assessment).	No action required.
24303 - Elveden Farms Ltd [12921]	Object	<p>Object as policy fails to address the need to provide the highway improvements that are necessary to accommodate any major development in the Lakenheath area.</p> <p><i>The policy should address the need to provide the highway improvements that are necessary to accommodate any major development in the Lakenheath area.</i></p>	Comments Noted. An updated AECOM Traffic study is due to be published in November 2016. This demonstrates that the distribution in the SIR can be achieved with highways mitigation and sustainable transport measures.	A paragraph has been included in both policies in the Lakenheath section stating that 'Permission will be granted where applicants can demonstrate that satisfactory measures to mitigate the cumulative and individual highway impacts of development on the site(s) can be formally secured and are deliverable.'
24034 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>It cannot be assumed as suitable for development and a school as mainly outside village boundary with constraints to highways, accessibility to village, noise and safety from RAF Lakenheath.</p> <p>The alternative option identified as L14 dismissed for housing only could be an ideal location for the new school with possible access from 3 areas of the Village. As close to the existing facility staggered starting and finishing times would have to be arranged. In addition, Part of L2(d) could be considered as well as the dioceses land off Maids Cross Hill.</p> <p><i>Review growth in north Lakenheath.</i></p>	Noted. The northern focus of growth in Lakenheath is the least environmentally constrained part of the village. Site L2(b) application for 375 dwellings and a primary school has a resolution to approve (August 2016).	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24003 - Necton Management Ltd [12888]	Object	Necton Management strongly objects to the above Policy in particular the proposal to include a primary school within site L2(b) Land at North Lakenheath. This site falls lies within the flight contours for the US/RAF operations at Lakenheath and would mean that the flight patter of F15 and F18 aircraft would include landing approaches over the proposed new school site.	Noted. The northern focus of growth in Lakenheath is the least environmentally constrained part of the village. Site L2(b) application for 375 dwellings and a primary school has a resolution to approve (August 2016).	No action required.
24457 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Support	L2(a) - The site owners and their development partners consider that the development proposed on this site is viable, and could be delivered in the short term. In view of the decision reached by the planning committee of Forest Heath District Council on this application this site is not considered further in these representations. L2(b) - site provides the opportunity for a new much needed primary school, with scope to include a pre-school, and a significant quantity of open space that will future proof the needs of the village. The comments on the submitted planning application and the documents supporting the planning application show that all constraints to development can be overcome.	The support for sites L2(a) and L2(b) is noted.	No action required.
<i>Question 11 - Lakenheath</i>				
24286 - Bennett Homes [6665]	Comment	The extension of the site boundary to include the now allocated sites to the north of the town is welcomed. However if, as argued in our SiR representation and discussed in the SHLAA, the town has a greater capacity, it would be necessary to extend the town's boundaries to incorporate other potential sites.	Noted. The sites in the SALP meet the distribution strategy in the SiR. It is not considered appropriate to include sites beyond the distribution set out in the SiR.	No action required.
24035 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Comment	Happy to accept the extension of the village boundary to the west of Eriswell Road to accommodate allocation L1(b). Happy to accept the extension to the north to reflect allocations L2(c) and L2(d) Not happy with the extension to the north to reflect allocations L2(a) and L2(b). These areas should be buffer zones to the Village Line. Accessibility will be dangerous because of location. No other changes to the Lakenheath boundary should be considered.	Noted. Allocations L2a and L2b have resolutions to grant planning permission.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24004 - Necton Management Ltd [12888]	Comment	<p>Former Site L/25 which represents the current planning application for land south of Broom Road, Lakenheath should be allocated for development.</p> <p>Necton Management consider that insufficient evidence has been gathered by the LPA to discount the Broom Road site and question the validity of It's decision to do so.</p> <p>Natural England has confirmed that the residential development of 120 dwellings on this site would not adversely impact the SPA</p> <p>Having regard to the above there are no constraints to the residential development of the site.</p> <p>Not withstanding the outcome of the pending planning appeal, Site L/25 should be allocated for residential development.</p>	Noted. This site is not suitable for allocation for a variety of reasons, including potential impact on the Maidscross SSSI and that a project level HRA for application DC/14/2073/FUL was not able to screen out likely significant effects.	No action required.
24304 - Elveden Farms Ltd [12921]	Support	<p>Support the Extension to the west of Eriswell Road to reflect the allocation of L1(b). This site is in a sustainable edge of settlement location, within a reasonable distance of medical centres and the existing primary school, and is not subject to any specific ecological, landscape or heritage designations.</p> <p>An appropriate layout and design quality will be able to mitigate the very limited flood risk issue at the NW corner of the site and noise considerations.</p>	Noted. The support for site L1(b) is noted.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Red Lodge planning constraints map</i>				
24218 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Comment	At Red Lodge, we have worked with applicants and the council to ensure there is sufficient mitigation to mitigate for effects to stone curlew nesting outside Breckland SPA, but which are part of the population of the SPA. Therefore we are happy with the allocations listed. As with Lakenheath, we welcome the wording regarding what developers must do to address issues related to recreational pressure but recommend you add as much detail as possible on what that will entail.	Policies in the plan need to be flexible so that any new evidence and emerging mitigation measures can be considered at the time that development comes forward. The policy wording used appears to be restrictive as, for example it would not in its current form allow for the implementation of a warden scheme for existing sensitive natural greenspace which has been recommended as part of the strategy to address recreation pressure. The Council agrees that additional supporting text is required clearly setting out the purpose of the mitigation and referring to the strategy in the Accessible natural greenspace study. The Council will continue to work with Natural England to secure and implement mitigation measures to influence recreation in the region and particularly in the settlements of Brandon, Mildenhall, Red Lodge, Lakenheath, Beck Row, Kentford and West Row. These will be either onsite of offsite proportionate to the type, scale, and location of development in the plan such that these measures contribute to the strategy set out in the Accessible natural greenspace study.	<p>Insert additional text in policies SA9, SA10 or other agreed measures</p> <p>Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>There is concern that increased development in the district has the potential to contribute to recreational pressure on Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA). Natural England has advised that any development within 7.5km of Breckland SPA has the potential to contribute to cumulative recreational effects. The Council will continue to work with Natural England and developers to secure and implement mitigation measures to influence recreation in the region. These will be either onsite of offsite, proportionate to the type, scale, and location of development in the plan such that these measures contribute to the strategy set out in the Accessible natural greenspace study. Measures may include the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace (SANGS) which is well connected; the enhancement /promotion of dog friendly facilities and access routes in the immediate vicinity of development ; the implementation of a warden for existing sensitive sites; or other such effective measures as may be agreed.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site RL1(a) - Land off Turnpike Road and Coopers Yard (formerly parts RL/03 & 04)</i>				
24207 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed upto 2029/2030. Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been historic sewerage network issues particularly relating to Warren Road Pumping Station and Herringswell Terminal Pumping Station it should be noted improvement works have been completed by Anglian Water and network connectivity changes have taken place that will alleviate the capacity concerns. New development at Red Lodge will be connected to Kings Warren Pumping Station network rather than to Warren Road Pumping Station network thus avoiding the areas where there has been historic capacity constraints.	noted/welcomed	no action required
24265 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites RL1(a) (previously RL/03 and part RL/04); RL1(b) (previously part RL/06); RL1(c) (previously part RL/06); RL2(a)/G1(b) (previously part RL/15); EM1(c) (previously RL/13) and the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' (previously RL/15) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. Also the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' potentially includes or borders several sites designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS), it should therefore be ensured that any policy for this growth area includes appropriate protection for sites of nature conservation importance. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>For site SA10 (previously RL2), policy wording to protect notable plant species has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit.</p> <p>The 'area for potential growth' has not been allocated in the submission draft document</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24432 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	The access would be onto Turnpike Road, visibility to appropriate standards should be achievable on site. <i>improved sustainable links & crossing required to access school</i>	Noted. The comments in relation to access and sustainable transport links are noted.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24329 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Support	<p>My client agrees that the site RL1a should be included within Policy RL1 as an allocation for development in the local plan. My client owns the south western portion of the site (which is hatched red in figure 4). The site is 1.64 ha. The site area highlighted in the preferred options document excludes a portion of land to the south of the site (hatched blue in figure 4) that provides direct access onto the B108, despite this area not being included in the site plan that was submitted in the 2nd stage Issues and Options consultation. This area of land therefore should be included in any allocation of the site because the access point is also within my client's ownership and therefore the site is able to come forward for development, independent of any redevelopment of the Willoway Caravan Park. Development on the site is therefore achievable and deliverable, and my client is able to bring the site forward for housing development at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The site is contained within the existing settlement boundary. It is a brownfield site that relates well to the existing settlement and is bounded by residential uses to the north east and south west and west. Therefore development of the site would be entirely compatible with the site's neighbouring uses.</p> <p>The use of the site for residential purposes would result in the cessation of use of a haulage yard, which would lead to significant residential amenity benefits to neighbouring properties. Additionally, it would enable significant improvements to the character and appearance of the area and environmental improvements from the removal of the existing dilapidated buildings fronting Turnpike Road.</p> <p>The Environment Agency Flood Map (figure 3) shows that the site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding. The site is has few constrains and is locate in a sustainable location with good public transport links.</p> <p>Therefore it is clear that the site presents an opportunity to develop a brownfield site, within the settlement envelope, in a highly sustainable location.</p>	<p>Noted. The site boundary can be amended to include new area to south west to including Coopers Yard. Given the sites multiple ownership a development brief will be required in order to ensure a comprehensive and coordinated approach to development.</p> <p>It is desirable for pedestrian / dog friendly walks to be provided on this site that link to the routes already planned on adjacent developments and the existing footpath network. These routes can be considered through the development brief.</p>	<p>Amend site boundary and capacity if appropriate.</p> <p>Add need for development brief to ensure comprehensive development of site to policy.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Development of the site will help to meet Forest Heath and the wider West Suffolk area's housing requirements, whilst reducing the need to release greenfield or less sustainable sites.</p> <p>Therefore the site should remain a preferred site for development and should therefore be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>Although my client broadly agrees with the wording of policy RL1, the District Council should review how the residential development of the three sites detailed within the policy can provide 'enhancement and promotion of a dog friendly access route in the immediate vicinity of the development'. It is difficult to envision how the three sites can promote dog friendly access routes, particularly on land that is not within the same ownership. This matter ought to perhaps be referred to the supporting text of the policy rather than a specific requirement.</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>Site RL1(b) - Land East of Red Lodge: north (formerly RL/06b)</i>				
24210 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	<p>Recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed upto 2029/2030. Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been historic sewerage network issues particularly relating to Warren Road Pumping Station and Herringswell Terminal Pumping Station it should be noted improvement works have been completed by Anglian Water and network connectivity changes have taken place that will alleviate the capacity concerns. New development at Red Lodge will be connected to Kings Warren Pumping Station network rather than to Warren Road Pumping Station network thus avoiding the areas where there has been historic capacity constraints.</p>	Noted and welcomed.	no action required
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24266 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites RL1(a) (previously RL/03 and part RL/04); RL1(b) (previously part RL/06); RL1(c) (previously part RL/06); RL2(a)/G1(b) (previously part RL/15); EM1(c) (previously RL/13) and the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' (previously RL/15) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. Also the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' potentially includes or borders several sites designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS), it should therefore be ensured that any policy for this growth area includes appropriate protection for sites of nature conservation importance. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>The 'area for potential growth' has not been allocated in the submission draft document</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>For site SA10 (previously RL2), policy wording to protect notable plant species has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit.</p>
24417 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>Paragraph 9.16 of the SALP should however be corrected to state that part, not all, of site RL1(b) site lies within the 1,500 metre Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) constraint zone in respect of nesting stone curlew. None of the site lies with the SPA itself.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.21 should be amended to allow more general vehicular access, rather than just emergency access, to the proposed mixed use site RL2(a) to allow greater flexibility in the masterplanning of these two sites.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 9.16 of the SALP should however be corrected to state that part, not all, of site RL1(b) site lies within the 1,500 metre Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) constraint zone in respect of nesting stone curlew. None of the site lies with the SPA itself.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 9.21 should be amended to allow more general vehicular access, rather than just emergency access, to the proposed mixed use site RL2(a) to allow greater flexibility in the masterplanning of these two sites.</i></p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 9.16 is not carried forward to the submission draft. HRA issues are addressed in the redrafted policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.21 does not preclude the provision of more general vehicular access if demonstrated as appropriate at the design stage.</p>	no action required

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
24435 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	It is not clear where the site access would come from, the road to the north of the site is not adopted. There would need to be multiple points of access if accessed from the existing estate roads. This site is next to RL1c <i>improved sustainable links</i>	Noted. The comments in relation to access and sustainable transport links are noted.	no action required
24440 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	Paragraph 9.16 of the SALP should be corrected to state that part, not all, of the site lies within the 1,500 metre Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) constraint zone in respect of nesting stone curlew. None of the site lies within the SPA itself. <i>Paragraph 9.16 of the SALP should be corrected to state that part, not all, of the site lies within the 1,500 metre Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) constraint zone in respect of nesting stone curlew. None of the site lies within the SPA itself.</i>	Noted. Paragraph 9.16 is not carried forward to the submission draft. HRA issues are addressed in the redrafted policy.	No action required.
24441 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Comment	Paragraph 9.21 should be amended to allow more general vehicular access, rather than just emergency access, to the proposed mixed use site RL2(a) to allow greater flexibility in the masterplanning of these two sites. <i>Paragraph 9.21 should be amended to allow more general vehicular access, rather than just emergency access, to the proposed mixed use site RL2(a) to allow greater flexibility in the masterplanning of these two sites.</i>	Paragraph 9.21 does not preclude the provision of more general vehicular access if demonstrated appropriate at the design stage.	no action required
24239 - Herringwell Parish Council (Mrs Su Field) [5165]	Object	The Parish Council have similar objections to those made above for the inclusion of this site. Red Lodge is not ready for continued development.	Noted. Anglia Water state that recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed up to 2029/2030. The Infrastructure delivery plan has identified what infrastructure is required to support growth in the settlement. The LPA will continue to work with providers in order to meet future demands at the appropriate time.	No action required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24439 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Support	<p>Crest Nicholson supports the allocation in this policy of the site now identified as RL1(b). The area identified by the red shading does however unnecessarily exclude potential development land to both the south east (which is included in the 2016 SHLAA) and along the north eastern boundary (the OS base plan shows the footprint of a historical reservoir and currently part of the SUDs basin outside the shaded area).</p> <p><i>the extent of site RL1(b) should be extended eastwards to the existing farm track and to the southwest to the boundary with the existing King Warren development. A site plan showing the suggested site area is attached.</i></p>	Noted. The site can be extended to the west and east, however it is considered the tree belt to the south east should be retained and therefore not included within the development site.	Increase site boundary to east and west, but exclude woodland strip to south east. Remove woodland from settlement. Amend site area and capacity to reflect change.

Site RL1(c) - Land East of Red Lodge: south (formerly RL/06a)

24211 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	<p>Recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed upto 2029/2030. Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been historic sewerage network issues particularly relating to Warren Road Pumping Station and Herringswell Terminal Pumping Station it should be noted improvement works have been completed by Anglian Water and network connectivity changes have taken place that will alleviate the capacity concerns. New development at Red Lodge will be connected to Kings Warren Pumping Station network rather than to Warren Road Pumping Station network thus avoiding the areas where there has been historic capacity constraints.</p>	noted and welcomed	no action required
---	---------	---	--------------------	--------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24267 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites RL1(a) (previously RL/03 and part RL/04); RL1(b) (previously part RL/06); RL1(c) (previously part RL/06); RL2(a)/G1(b) (previously part RL/15); EM1(c) (previously RL/13) and the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' (previously RL/15) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. Also the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' potentially includes or borders several sites designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS), it should therefore be ensured that any policy for this growth area includes appropriate protection for sites of nature conservation importance. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>The 'area for potential growth' has not been allocated in the submission draft document</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>For site SA10 (previously RL2), policy wording to protect notable plant species has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit.</p>
24436 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	Application submitted for first phase of development <i>improved sustainable links</i>	Noted. This is considered a development management issue.	no action required
24238 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Su Field) [5165]	Object	The Parish Council raised strong objections to this particular site when it was considered as a planning application. Our concerns and objections remain. We do not believe that Red Lodge is in a position to accept development of this scale until the infrastructure deficits have been addressed, along with the continuing problems with the effective removal of sewerage from Red Lodge to Tuddenham.	Noted. Anglia Water state that recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed up to 2029/2030. The Infrastructure delivery plan has identified what infrastructure is required to support growth in the settlement. The LPA will continue to work with providers in order to meet future demands at the appropriate time.	No action required.
<i>Policy RL1: Housing in Red Lodge</i>				
24291 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Object	We do not agree with Draft Policy RL1 as 'Land East Of Newmarket Road' should be allocated for residential development. It is the most deliverable and developable site in Red Lodge, the site is available for development now, and will provide a much needed contribution to the Council's housing supply.	Noted. This site now benefits from a resolution to approve planning permission for the erection of up to 125 dwellings (DC/16/0596/OUT)	Amend text and map to include site as residential allocation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24336 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Support	Sport England supports this allocation provided adequate provision is made for indoor and outdoor sport, preferably through an extension to the existing community sports facility site adjacent to these allocations.	noted	no action required
24442 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Support	Crest Nicholson welcomes the recognition in this policy of the existing planning permission for 374 dwellings on the site now known as RL1(c).	noted	no action required
<i>Question 12 - Red Lodge</i>				
23994 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Comment	<p>Question 12 / 13 Response: ECDC has no objection in principle to further growth at Red Lodge, and makes no comment on the preferred specific sites. However, further to recent officer level communications, ECDC would like to remind your council that a relatively large site to the south of Red Lodge, immediately adjacent to your district border, has been submitted to ECDC as a potential allocation in the ECDC Local Plan. ECDC has made no decision on this site, and is yet to appraise its merits. Nevertheless, should this suggested site appear to have merit, both councils will need to discuss issues arising.</p> <p>In terms of detailed wording in RL1 and RL2, both refer in general terms to "cycle and pedestrian links should be created within the site and linking to the surrounding area". It would be helpful to understand whether this requirement extends to linkages towards Kennet railway station, including potentially on land within ECDC area. If so, the policy could usefully be explicit in this regard.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. FHDC will continue to work closely with ECDC on cross border issues.</p> <p>Within the context of policies RL1 and RL2 it is envisaged that cycle and pedestrian links should primarily be within the site and link to the surrounding network as appropriate at the sites boundaries. A sustainable transport link to Kennet Station is desirable and FHDC would welcome further discussion on the issue.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24331 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>RL18 My client is disappointed that the second parcel of land in his ownership, land to the south of the Carrops (RL18) that was evaluated in the Issues and options document, has been omitted as a potential allocation site.</p> <p>Appendix B of the the Preferred Options document provides the justification for the omission of the site. The site was omitted for the following reasons: a) Flood Zone 2 and 3; b) Record of Protected Species in the area; c) Visually sensitive site on the edge of the village settlement.</p> <p>With regards to reason a), the Environment Agency's Flood Map (figure 3), demonstrates that the western edge of the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but the developable area of the site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a very low risk of flooding. Therefore the site should not be omitted as a preferred option because only a small portion of the whole of the site sits within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>As with any development site, further investigation into the presence of protected species on the site could be required. As a consequence it would be unjustifiable to omit the site for this reason.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site is adjacent the current settlement boundary. However, the Council's conclusion the site is 'visually sensitive', is not considered to be correct. The site has most recently be used for trailer storage and presents an unattractive entrance to the village. The site could be brought back in to usage for other open storage purposes. Clearly, the residential development of the site would present opportunities to enhance the area with the promotion of open space and landscaping. Fundamentally, one of the Core Principles of the NPPF is to 'encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)' for development. The current adopted Core Strategy (2001) stressed that, due to the predominantly rural nature of the district, government targets relating to the percentage of</p>	<p>Noted. Site RL18 is not considered suitable for development / allocation for a number of reasons including areas of the site being in flood zones 2 and 3, records of protected species in the area, visual sensitivity on the edge of the settlement and the adjacent 'bad neighbour use' of a scrap yard to the east</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>brownfield land that should be developed in the district would not be made. It can be inferred that the District suffers a shortage of brownfield sites. Therefore, the site presents an opportunity for brownfield development in Red Lodge and the site should be considered to be a preferred location for development because development of the site would provide a small contribution to reducing the need for the release of greenfield land elsewhere in the District.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24332 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	<p>My client agrees that the site RL1a should be included within Policy RL1 as an allocation for development in the local plan. My client owns the south western portion of the site (which is hatched red in figure 4). The site is 1.64 ha. The site area highlighted in the preferred options document excludes a portion of land to the south of the site (hatched blue in figure 4) that provides direct access onto the B108, despite this area not being included in the site plan that was submitted in the 2nd stage Issues and Options consultation. This area of land therefore should be included in any allocation of the site because the access point is also within my client's ownership and therefore the site is able to come forward for development, independent of any redevelopment of the Willoway Caravan Park. Development on the site is therefore achievable and deliverable, and my client is able to bring the site forward for housing development at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>The site is contained within the existing settlement boundary. It is a brownfield site that relates well to the existing settlement and is bounded by residential uses to the north east and south west and west. Therefore development of the site would be entirely compatible with the site's neighbouring uses.</p> <p>The use of the site for residential purposes would result in the cessation of use of a haulage yard, which would lead to significant residential amenity benefits to neighbouring properties. Additionally, it would enable significant improvements to the character and appearance of the area and environmental improvements from the removal of the existing dilapidated buildings fronting Turnpike Road.</p> <p>The Environment Agency Flood Map (figure 3) shows that the site is in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding. The site is has few constrains and is locate in a sustainable location with good public transport links.</p> <p>Therefore it is clear that the site presents an opportunity to develop a brownfield site, within the settlement envelope, in a highly sustainable location.</p>	<p>Noted. The site boundary can be amended to include new area to south west to including Coopers Yard. Given the sites multiple ownership a development brief will be required in order to ensure a comprehensive and coordinated approach to development.</p> <p>It is desirable for pedestrian / dog friendly walks to be provided on this site that link to the routes already planned on adjacent developments and the existing footpath network. These routes can be considered through the development brief.</p>	<p>Amend site boundary and capacity.</p> <p>Add need for development brief to ensure comprehensive development of site to policy.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>Development of the site will help to meet Forest Heath and the wider West Suffolk area's housing requirements, whilst reducing the need to release greenfield or less sustainable sites.</p> <p>Therefore the site should remain a preferred site for development and should therefore be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>Although my client broadly agrees with the wording of policy RL1, the District Council should review how the residential development of the three sites detailed within the policy can provide 'enhancement and promotion of a dog friendly access route in the immediate vicinity of the development'. It is difficult to envision how the three sites can promote dog friendly access routes, particularly on land that is not within the same ownership. This matter ought to perhaps be referred to the supporting text of the policy rather than a specific requirement.</p>		
24237 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Su Field) [5165]	Object	<p>We do not agree with the suggested changes to the boundary for Red Lodge. We consider the amount of growth suggested for this rural village, to be over development. The village needs to be able to absorb the huge levels of growth it has already accommodated. The amount of growth suggested is not sequential and does not provide sustainable development for this area. Only development which can be accommodated within the development boundary should be considered, with any surplus development being direct to the 3 market towns.</p> <p>We do not wish to see ANY additional development at Red Lodge until the infrastructure has been provided, the sewerage system is functioning in a reliable and consistent manner and the second school has been opened. The policy should reflect these needs.</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered that the growth proposed for Red Lodge is sustainable. The sites have been selected on a sequential bases whilst taking into account the constraints on the settlement as well as the individual constraints of each site. Anglia Water state that recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed up to 2029/2030. The Infrastructure delivery plan has identified what infrastructure is required to support growth in the settlement. The LPA will continue to work with providers in order to meet future demands at the appropriate time.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24289 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Object	<p>Jaynic Properties Ltd do not agree with Policy RL1; Housing in Red Lodge. Whilst it is accepted that Red Lodge needs to accommodate a certain level of housing development in order for Forest Heath to meet its housing requirements, it is considered that the draft allocations may not be either deliverable or developable, as recently highlighted by the Inspector at the Meddler Stud Appeal.</p> <p>In light of the Council's potential problems with a number of its proposed allocations in Lakenheath and Newmarket, additional sites are likely to be required in order to meet the Council's housing targets. We do not agree with Draft Policy RL1 as 'Land East Of Newmarket Road' should be allocated for residential development. It is the most deliverable and developable site in Red Lodge, the site is available for development now, and will provide a much needed contribution to the Council's housing supply</p>	<p>Noted. Land east of Newmarket Road now benefits from a resolution to approve planning permission for the erection of up to 125 dwellings (DC/16/0596/OUT)</p>	<p>Amend text and map to include site as residential allocation.</p>
24082 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Object	<p>The draft policy is not supported. In its current form it is neither positively prepared nor justified. Site RL/07 should be allocated to address this. See attached supporting documents which form part of these representations and include suggested wording for a new policy.</p> <p><i>Site RL/07 should be allocated to redress the identified shortfall. Site RL/07 should be allocated for a mixed use development comprising horse racing industry uses and residential development of c80 homes. See attached supporting documents which form part of these representations and include suggested wording for a new policy.</i></p>	<p>It is considered that the plan is positively prepared and meets its objectively assessed housing need. The housing numbers for Red Lodge have been revised in the Submission Plan in the light of consultation responses, further consideration of preferred and omitted sites and the evidence base. The contents of the submitted ecological assessment are noted. Taking into account all the above site RL/07 is considered less favourable than other available sites and is located within the 1500m Stone Curlew nesting constraint zone.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24438 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Support	<p>Crest Nicholson supports the allocation in this policy of the site now identified as RL1(b). The area identified by the red shading does however unnecessarily exclude potential development land to both the south east (which is included in the 2016 SHLAA) and along the north eastern boundary (the OS base plan shows the footprint of a historical reservoir and currently part of the SUDs basin outside the shaded area).</p> <p><i>the extent of site RL1(b) should be extended eastwards to the existing farm track and to the southwest to the boundary with the existing King Warren development. A site plan showing the suggested site area is attached.</i></p>	Noted. The site can be extended to the west and east, however it is considered the tree belt to the south east should be retained and therefore not included within the development site.	Increase site boundary to east and west, but exclude woodland strip to south east. Remove woodland from settlement. Amend site area and capacity to reflect change.
24415 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Support	<p>The Landowner welcomes the recognition in this policy of the existing planning permission for 374 dwellings on the site now known as RL1(c). The proposed allocation of the site now identified as RL1(b) is also supported although it unnecessarily excludes potential development land to both the south east (which is included in the 2016 SHLAA) and along the north eastern boundary (the OS base plan shows the footprint of a historical reservoir and currently part of the SUDs basin outside the shaded area). The extent of site RL1(b) should be extended eastwards to the existing farm track and to the southwest to the boundary with the existing King Warren development and the indicative capacity increased accordingly.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 9.16 of the SALP should however be corrected to state that part, not all, of site RL1(b) site lies within the 1,500 metre Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) constraint zone in respect of nesting stone curlew. None of the site lies with the SPA itself.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 9.21 should be amended to allow more general vehicular access, rather than just emergency access, to the proposed mixed use site RL2(a) to allow greater flexibility in the masterplanning of these two sites.</i></p>	<p>Noted. The site can be extended to the west and east, however it is considered the tree belt to the south east should be retained and therefore not included within the development site.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraph 9.16 is not carried forward to the submission draft. HRA issues are addressed in the redrafted policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.21 does not preclude the provision of more general vehicular access if demonstrated as appropriate at the design stage.</p>	<p>Increase site boundary to east and west, but exclude woodland strip to south east. Remove woodland from settlement. Amend site area and capacity to reflect change.</p> <p>9.16 - No action required.</p> <p>9.21 - No action required</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site RL2(a) Land north of Acorn Way (formerly part RL/15, RL/16, RL/20 and RL/21)</i>				
24437 - Suffolk County Council (John Pitchford) [12927]	Comment	This is a very large potential site, and was considered as separate areas previously. RL15 would have considerable impacts on the A11 which would need to be assessed, and also some impact on the adjacent villages, which would be locally sensitive. RL16 would require cycle improvements. RL20/21 would need any junctions to comply with the appropriate visibility standards. Acorn Way is a private road and is currently a Cycleway only. There is a stub to allow for a limited amount of development to be served from the existing roundabout. <i>improved sustainable links</i>	Noted. The comments in relation to access and sustainable transport are noted.	No action required.
23923 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24426 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	9.29 - The Landowner supports draft Policy RL2 and considers it appropriate in its scope and level of detail. Greater flexibility is however required in respect of paragraph 9.29 which currently seeks the retention of the sustainable drainage structure (swale) on land formerly referenced as RL21. Suffolk County Council's Education Department has advised that the new primary school may need to increase its capacity to 630 pupils in the future to serve the additional homes proposed under this policy. Accordingly the Landowner will safeguard land adjoining the proposed school site to the east which includes the swale, as shown on the attached Illustrative Masterplan prepared by Barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 27 June 2016. Aspect Ecology has surveyed the swale and advised that if it were to be relocated, it could be expected to vegetate in a similar manner to the existing. Paragraph 9.29 should be amended to enable the swale to be relocated to avoid fettering the delivery of the mixed use development. <i>Paragraph 9.29 should be amended to enable the swale to be relocated to avoid fettering the delivery of the mixed use development.</i>	Noted. The reference to the retention of the swale is deleted, but text ensuring that any proposal has regard to the proper functioning of the sustainable urban drainage system should be retained.	Remove reference to retention of swale on proposed school expansion area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24213 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Recent capacity improvements undertaken at the receiving Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre means there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposed upto 2029/2030. Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been historic sewerage network issues particularly relating to Warren Road Pumping Station and Herringswell Terminal Pumping Station it should be noted improvement works have been completed by Anglian Water and network connectivity changes have taken place that will alleviate the capacity concerns. New development at Red Lodge will be connected to Kings Warren Pumping Station network rather than to Warren Road Pumping Station network thus avoiding the areas where there has been historic capacity constraints.	noted and welcomed	no action required
24268 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites RL1(a) (previously RL/03 and part RL/04); RL1(b) (previously part RL/06); RL1(c) (previously part RL/06); RL2(a)/G1(b) (previously part RL/15); EM1(c) (previously RL/13) and the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' (previously RL/15) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. Also the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' potentially includes or borders several sites designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS), it should therefore be ensured that any policy for this growth area includes appropriate protection for sites of nature conservation importance. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>The 'area for potential growth' has not been allocated in the submission draft document</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p> <p>For site SA10 (previously RL2), policy wording to protect notable plant species has been incorporated. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit.</p>
24127 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Comment	A small area of site RL2 (a) falls within Barton Mills parish. We have no objection to the proposed inclusion of this area as part of a mixed use development in Red Lodge although the environment surrounding Northlodge Cottages will need to be appropriately safeguarded.	Noted. The setting and amenity of Northlodge Cottage can be addressed at the masterplan stage.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24240 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Su Field) [5165]	Object	We object to the inclusion of this site. The development boundary should not be moved. It is the opinion of the Parish Council that the employment land at Kings warren business park should be retained and the need for a second school site should be within site EM1 (c) and any unmet need for housing should be sought within the 3 market towns.	Noted. It is considered that the focus of growth on land north of Acorn Way is sustainable. Employment uses are retained on the wider mixed use site. SCC appraised a number of sites for the school and this was their preferred site. Site EM1(c) has recently benefited from a resolution to approve planning permission for residential use.	no action required
<i>Policy RL2: Focus of growth: North Red Lodge</i>				
24292 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Support	Site RL2 is agreed with for mixed use in this area, however it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use. <i>Site RL2 is agreed with for mixed use in this area, however it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use.</i>	Noted. Land east of Newmarket Road now benefits from a resolution to approve planning permission for the erection of up to 125 dwellings (DC/16/0596/OUT)	Amend text and map to include site as residential allocation.
<i>Question 13 - Red Lodge</i>				
23995 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Comment	Question 12 / 13 Response: ECDC has no objection in principle to further growth at Red Lodge, and makes no comment on the preferred specific sites. However, further to recent officer level communications, ECDC would like to remind your council that a relatively large site to the south of Red Lodge, immediately adjacent to your district border, has been submitted to ECDC as a potential allocation in the ECDC Local Plan. ECDC has made no decision on this site, and is yet to appraise its merits. Nevertheless, should this suggested site appear to have merit, both councils will need to discuss issues arising. In terms of detailed wording in RL1 and RL2, both refer in general terms to "cycle and pedestrian links should be created within the site and linking to the surrounding area". It would be helpful to understand whether this requirement extends to linkages towards Kennet railway station, including potentially on land within ECDC area. If so, the policy could usefully be explicit in this regard.	Comments noted and welcomed. FHDC will continue to work closely with ECDC on cross border issues. Within the context of policies RL1 and RL2 it is envisaged that cycle and pedestrian links should primarily be within the site and link to the surrounding network as appropriate at the sites boundaries. A sustainable transport link to Kennet Station is desirable and FHDC would welcome further discussion on the issue.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24084 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Object	<p>The draft policy is not supported. In its current form it is neither positively prepared nor justified. Site RL/07 should be allocated to address this. See attached supporting documents which form part of these representations and include suggested wording for a new policy.</p> <p><i>Site RL/07 should be allocated to redress the identified shortfall. Site RL/07 should be allocated for a mixed use development comprising horse racing industry uses and residential development of c80 homes. See attached supporting documents which form part of these representations and include suggested wording for a new policy.</i></p>	<p>It is considered that the plan is positively prepared and meets its objectively assessed housing need. The housing numbers for Red Lodge have been revised in the Submission Plan in the light of consultation responses, further consideration of preferred and omitted sites, the evidence base and other evidence. The content of the submitted ecological assessment are noted. Taking into account all the above site RL/07 is considered less favourable than other available sites and is located within the 1500m Stone Curlew nesting constraint zone.</p>	No action required.
24290 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Support	<p>Jaynic Properties Ltd agrees with Policy RL2 and the proposed mixed use site to include 300 dwellings, 8ha of employment land and 2ha for a new primary school. This site is in a good location to support the mixed uses, especially with regards to the employment land (which should not suffer the same constraints as my clients land), and the provision of a new primary school will meet the identified need with Red Lodge (and for which the application on site EM1(c) will provide S106 contributions).</p> <p>We would suggest that this allocation of employment land would be sufficient to meet the employment needs of Red Lodge. As a result, proposed site EM1(c) does not need to be allocated for employment. Site RL2 is agreed with for mixed use in this area, however it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use.</p>	<p>Noted. Land east of Newmarket Road now benefits from a resolution to approve planning permission for the erection of up to 125 dwellings (DC/16/0596/OUT)</p>	Amend text and map to include site as residential allocation.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
24296 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Support	<p>Site RL2 is agreed with for mixed use in this area, however it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use.</p> <p><i>Site RL2 is agreed with for mixed use in this area, however it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use.</i></p>	Noted. Land east of Newmarket Road now benefits from a resolution to approve planning permission for the erection of up to 125 dwellings (DC/16/0596/OUT)	Amend text and map to include site as residential allocation.
24419 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Support	<p>The Landowner supports draft Policy RL2 and considers it appropriate in its scope and level of detail. Greater flexibility is however required in respect of paragraph 9.29 which currently seeks the retention of the sustainable drainage structure (swale) on land formerly referenced as RL21. Suffolk County Council's Education Department has advised that the new primary school may need to increase its capacity to 630 pupils in the future to serve the additional homes proposed under this policy. Accordingly the Landowner will safeguard land adjoining the proposed school site to the east which includes the swale, as shown on the attached Illustrative Masterplan prepared by Barber Casanovas Ruffles dated 27 June 2016.</p> <p>Aspect Ecology has surveyed the swale and advised that if it were to be relocated, it could be expected to vegetate in a similar manner to the existing. Paragraph 9.29 should be amended to enable the swale to be relocated to avoid fettering the delivery of the mixed use development.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 9.29 should be amended to enable the swale to be relocated to avoid fettering the delivery of the mixed use development.</i></p>	Noted. The reference to the retention of the swale is deleted, but text ensuring that any proposal has regard to the proper functioning of the sustainable urban drainage system should be retained.	Remove reference to retention of swale on proposed school expansion area.
Employment sites - Red Lodge				
24128 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Comment	The possible additional employment land (p82 9.31) north of the A11 could increase the traffic along Worlington Road between this site and Mildenhall. We think that all development at Red Lodge should be confined to south of the A 11.	There is no evidence in the 2016 FHDC ELR that there is need for an employment site north of the A11 in this plan period. This site has been removed from the submission SALP.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24140 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Support	Support the area of potential employment growth marked by a star to north of A11 junction.	The evidence indicates that sufficient land is allocated at Red Lodge in this plan.	no action required
<i>Settlement boundary changes - Red Lodge</i>				
24220 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	We welcome the removal of Red Lodge Heath SSSI from the settlement boundary.	comment noted	no action required
<i>Question 14 - Red Lodge</i>				
24333 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Comment	It is considered that the existing settlement boundary needs to be amended. As proposed, the amendment to the settlement, would lead to all land to the south of Green Lane being excluded from the settlement boundary. The justification for this is that the amendment would 'reflect the open nature and countryside character of area'. This is not a suitable justification because the amendment would result in a brownfield site, the Carrops, R18, being classified as open countryside. One of the Core Principles of the NPPF is to 'encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)', Therefore, the settlement boundary should be maintained same to allow for the effective reuse of the site for residential development and opportunities to enhance the entrance to the village.	Noted. Removing the SSSI and land to the south from the settlement boundary allows a green wedge to penetrate into the settlement and provides a visual and physical link to the countryside to the south. Site RL18 is not considered suitable for residential development / allocation for a number of reasons including areas of the site being in flood zones 2 and 3, records of protected species in the area, visual sensitivity on the edge of the settlement and the adjacent 'bad neighbour use' of a scrap yard to the east	No change Required
24420 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Support	The proposed changes to the settlement boundary are supported.	Noted and welcomed.	No change required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Preferred sites for allocation in the primary villages</i>				
<i>Beck Row site allocations map</i>				
24225 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently capacity at the receiving Mildenhall Water Recycling Centre to accommodate the level of growth indicated for Beck Row.	noted	no action required
<i>Site BR1(a) - Lamble Close (formerly BR/01)</i>				
23924 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24227 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently sufficient capacity in the foul sewerage system to accommodate the proposed development of 60 dwellings	noted	no action required
24270 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites BR1(a) (previously BR/01); BR1(b) (previously BR/03); BR1(c) (previously BR/10); BR1(d) (previously BR/26); and BR1(e) (previously BR/27) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	Sites SA11(a) Lamble Close (previously BR1(a)) and SA11(c) Land adjacent to and south of the caravan park, Aspal Lane (previously BR1(c)), both have planning permission, policy wording to protect notable plant species has been incorporated into the policy wording. This reflects the findings of the 2016 wildlife audit and the measures required by condition on the outline permissions for site SA11(a). Additional text is required to ensure that it is clear that this text relates only to these two sites. Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.	Second paragraph of policy should be preceded with 'Sites (a) and (c)'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site BR1(b) - Land adjacent to Smoke House Inn, Skeltons Drove (formerly BR/03)</i>				
24228 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	We advised upgrades to the foul sewerage system would be required to accommodate the proposed development of 166 dwelling	Noted. This is considered a development management issue. Planning permission has been granted for this site (DC/14/1206/FUL). The Decision Notice states the following condition - 15 PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE 2 - FOUL WATER DRAINAGE DETAILS 'No dwelling shall be first occupied within phase 2 (as shown on the Phasing Plan, approved drawing reference 6740 SLO1 W) until a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul water drainage has been constructed and completed in accordance with details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and/or specifications.'	no action required
23925 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24271 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites BR1(a) (previously BR/01); BR1(b) (previously BR/03); BR1(c) (previously BR/10); BR1(d) (previously BR/26); and BR1(e) (previously BR/27) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part	Site SA11(a) Land adjacent to Smoke House Inn, Skeltons Drove (previously BR1(b)) has planning permission and has commenced on site therefore it will not be allocated in the plan. Any biodiversity issues including biodiversity enhancement will have to be addressed as part of the planning process. Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site BR1(c) - Land adjacent to and south of the caravan park, Aspal Lane (formerly BR/10)</i>				
24272 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites BR1(a) (previously BR/01); BR1(b) (previously BR/03); BR1(c) (previously BR/10); BR1(d) (previously BR/26); and BR1(e) (previously BR/27) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part	Sites SA11(a) Lamble Close (previously BR1(a)) and SA11(c) Land adjacent to and south of the caravan park, Aspal Lane (previously BR1(c)), both have planning permission, policy wording to protect notable plant species has been incorporated into the policy wording. This reflects the findings of the 2015 wildlife audit and the measures required by condition on the outline permissions for site SA11(a). Additional text is required to ensure that it is clear that this text relates only to these two sites.	Amend policy so text reads 'proposals for sites (a) and (c) . . .'
23926 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24229 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	In response to the application consultation we advised upgrades/mitigation would be required to enable connection of the development. We have recently been approached by the developer via our pre planning service and a solution is currently being investigated.	Noted. This is considered a development management issue.	no action required
<i>Site BR1(d) - Land East of Aspal Lane (formerly BR/26)</i>				
24230 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	We would not envisage any constraints in serving the development for foul drainage service.	noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24273 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites BR1(a) (previously BR/01); BR1(b) (previously BR/03); BR1(c) (previously BR/10); BR1(d) (previously BR/26); and BR1(e) (previously BR/27) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part	it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit to allow for a situation where the current planning permissions lapsed. Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.	Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
23927 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
<i>Site BR1(e) - Land adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm (formerly BR/27)</i>				
23928 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24232 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	In response to the application consultation we advised upgrades/mitigation would be required to enable the development to connect to the foul sewerage system. This will be investigated when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Noted. This is considered a development management issue.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24274 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites BR1(a) (previously BR/01); BR1(b) (previously BR/03); BR1(c) (previously BR/10); BR1(d) (previously BR/26); and BR1(e) (previously BR/27) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part	It is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit to allow for a situation where the current planning permissions lapsed. Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.	Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
<i>Question 15 - Beck Row</i>				
23966 - Mr T Sore [12864]	Object	Object. The land at Stock Corner Farm, as shown in red on the attached plan should be allocated for residential development. The site is suitable , available and achievable for residential development within the first five years of the Plan. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Beck Row and represents a sustainable form of development in accordance with the NPPF. Beck Row is a Primary Village and therefore is a suitable location for further housing growth, to help the Council meet their housing targets. The site lies between the existing residential development of Beck Row defined by the settlement boundary and also adjacent to an approved residential development under application reference DC/14/2293/FUL for five dwellings. The proposal would provide for the redevelopment of a previously developed site, which would be remediated and would provide for a significant visual improvement to the edge of Beck Row.	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23968 - Mr P Bonnett [12865]	Object	Object. The land off Wilde Street, as shown in red on the attached plan should be allocated for residential development. The site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development within the first five years of the Plan. The site lies between residential development to both the east and west of the site and therefore represents a logical infill residential site along Wilde Street. The site adjoins the settlement boundary to the south of the site. Beck Row is a Primary Village and therefore is a sustainable location for further housing growth, to help the Council meet their housing targets.	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	no action required

Question 16 - Beck Row

23969 - Mr P Bonnett [12865]	Object	Object. The settlement boundary of Beck Row should be amended to include land off Wilde Street, as shown on the attached plan. Part of the site has been developed for housing known as 'The Paddocks' and therefore the amendment to the settlement boundary would represent a meaningful representation of the built up area. The remainder of land to be included with the settlement boundary represents a site which is suitable, available and achievable for residential development within the first five years of the Plan. The site lies between residential development to both the east and west of the site and therefore represents a logical infill residential site along Wilde Street. The site currently adjoins the settlement boundary to the south of the site. Beck Row is a Primary Village and therefore is a sustainable location for further housing growth, to help the Council meet their housing targets.	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary has not been amended accordingly. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	no action required
------------------------------	--------	--	--	--------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23967 - Mr T Sore [12864]	Object	<p>Object. The settlement boundary of Beck Row should be amended to include land at Stock Corner Farm, as shown on the attached plan. The site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development within the first five years of the Plan. The site is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Beck Row and represents a sustainable form of development in accordance with the NPPF. Beck Row is a Primary Village and therefore is a suitable location for further housing growth, to help the Council meet their housing targets.</p> <p>The site lies between the existing residential development of Beck Row defined by the settlement boundary and also adjacent to an approved residential development under application reference DC/14/2293/FUL for five dwellings. The proposal would provide for the redevelopment of a previously developed site, which would be remediated and would provide for a significant visual improvement to the edge of Beck Row.</p>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary has not been amended accordingly. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	no action required
<i>Exning site allocations map</i>				
24175 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently capacity at the receiving Newmarket Recycling Centre to accommodate the level of growth indicated in the plan.	comments noted	no action required
24591 - The Exning Estate [12928]	Comment	<p>It is considered that the policy should be amended to include 'Land North of Lacey's Lane, Exning' as a residential allocation. The site has the capacity to accommodate 45 dwellings and it is discussed in greater detail in response to question 18.</p> <p><i>It is considered that the policy should be amended to include 'Land North of Lacey's Lane, Exning' as a residential allocation. The site has the capacity to accommodate 45 dwellings and it is discussed in greater detail in response to question 18.</i></p>	There are better sites available to meet the housing need.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site E1(a) - Land south of Burwell Road</i>				
24276 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, it should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	The features of site SA12(a) Land south of Burwell Road and west of Queens View (previously E1(a)) have been assessed; this is agricultural land - mainly arable. There are no onsite existing features and survey of the adjacent site revealed no major biodiversity constraints; the risks to biodiversity and to delivery of the site are assessed as low. Any planning application would need to be supported by the relevant ecological surveys as required by the local validation requirements and development management policies DM10 and DM11 Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.	no action required
24177 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply network may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Anglian Water say some upgrading may be required. This can be picked up at the planning application stage and no change is therefore required	No action required
<i>Question 17 - Exning</i>				
23996 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Comment	Question 17 Response: ECDC recognises that, in principle, Exning is close to Newmarket and therefore potentially an area for growth. It is also recognised that one site for 120 dwellings off Burwell Road is 'committed' via permission. However, a further 140 dwellings immediately adjacent to this permitted site has the potential for further impact on traffic in the Burwell area, and further impact on community facilities / infrastructure in Burwell. As such, Policy E1 should more explicitly refer to the need to contribute to improving cycle/footway facilities between Burwell and Exning, and should also make reference for the need to consider (and address as appropriate) the implications on infrastructure more generally in the Burwell area.	change the policy to seek the delivery of a cycle path between Burwell and Exning	Change wording within the policy to identify need for a cross boundary cycle route.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
24401 - The Exning Estate [12928]	Comment	<p>It is considered that the policy should be amended to include 'Land North of Lacey's Lane, Exning' as a residential allocation. The site has the capacity to accommodate 45 dwellings and it is discussed in greater detail in response to question 18.</p> <p><i>It is considered that the policy should be amended to include 'Land North of Lacey's Lane, Exning' as a residential allocation. The site has the capacity to accommodate 45 dwellings and it is discussed in greater detail in response to question 18.</i></p>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	No action required
23987 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Object	<p>Site E1(a) is not the most sustainable outcome for Exning.</p> <p>Please see attached representation for detailed reasoning.</p> <p><i>Review of SA Deallocation of E1(a) Allocation of amended E16.</i></p>	This site is detached from centre of Exning and Newmarket. There are better sites which can help deliver the councils housing needs	No change required
24164 - Jockey Club Farming Co Ltd [12904]	Object	<p>See above.</p> <p><i>With regard to para 11.2 and 11.8 plan needs to be updated in accordance with para 158 of NPPF.</i></p>	change pre amble text to the policy	change pre amble to text to say that "pressure exists on local primary school provision but it is anticipated that that the current school site can be adapted to accommodate further growth."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24352 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Ms Laura Townes) [12549]	Support	<p>Persimmon Homes supports the allocation of site E1(a) Land south of Burwell Road and west of Queens View with the following comments regarding highways and site capacity.</p> <p>HIGHWAYS Suffolk County Council Highways have advised that the following access strategy is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Main access via existing access from Burwell Road (through site E1(b)). <input type="checkbox"/> An emergency access onto Burwell Road to the west of the existing dwellings. <input type="checkbox"/> A looped internal arrangement as a continuation of the internal roads of site E1(b). <p>This access arrangement can accommodate up to 300 dwellings in total - this includes the 120 dwellings in site E1(b) and the 22 existing dwellings on Burwell Road (i.e. an additional 158 dwellings above existing commitments).</p> <p>The proposed emergency access is shown on drawing 47343-C-001A. This includes deliverable visibility splays. The proposed allocation boundary as shown on page 99 of the consultation document is able to accommodate the emergency access plus a landscaping belt.</p> <p>An alternative access strategy would be to propose a second (non-emergency) access as shown on drawing 47343-C-002A. This arrangement enables deliverable visibility splays. The allocation boundary would need to be up to 40m west of the existing dwellings on Burwell Road.</p> <p>If considered appropriate in design terms, these arrangements might benefit from an element of frontage development facing onto Burwell Road. Suffolk County Council Highways have confirmed that the provision of this second main access could serve in excess of 300 dwellings.</p> <p>SITE CAPACITY Policy E1 has estimated the site's capacity as 140 dwellings, which is based on the SHLAA methodology of 30 dph of 60% of gross site area.</p> <p>The site's development capacity can be refined having regard to the planning permission on site E1(b), which was policy compliant in terms of open</p>	Comments noted	Comments noted and site expanded to accommodate a greater number of dwellings in the submission SALP

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>space and infrastructure requirements and is currently under construction. Given its proximity to site E1(a) the areas can be scaled up to give a more accurate representation of the site's capacity for housing as follows.</p> <p>Site E1(b) (existing planning permission):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Gross site area: 5.487 ha □ On-site public open space (play space, informal green space and natural green space provided in compliance with Open Space, Sport and Recreation Supplementary Planning Document (2011): 0.8478 ha □ Drainage lagoons: 0.1708 ha □ Net residential area (gross site area minus on site public open space and drainage lagoons): 4.1192 ha □ Density: 120 dwellings / 4.1192 ha = 29 dph <p>NB Phase 1 also provided an additional 8,094 sqm of public open space in excess of policy requirements off-site adjacent to the southern boundary of Phase 1. These areas provide an accurate indication of the open space and drainage areas likely to be required for a planning application at Site E1(a) to be policy compliant and technically feasible. The design of the scheme was considered acceptable at a net density of 29 dph so it is reasonable to assume the same density is appropriate for Site E1(a).</p> <p>Site E1(a) (proposed allocation):</p> <p>It is proposed to contribute an additional 0.4 ha of public open space in excess of policy requirements to enlarge the 0.8478 ha of public open space adjacent to Site E1(b). This substantial central hub of open space would integrate the two sites and provide a valuable improved facility for use by the residents of both sites and existing residents.</p> <p>In addition, it has been assumed that strategic landscape buffers could be provided along the west and southern boundaries to soften the development edge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Gross site area (excluding the additional land for the open space hub and the strategic landscape buffers noted above): 6.83 ha. The following figures have therefore been scaled accordingly (x1.2): □ On-site public open space (play space, informal green space and natural green space provided in compliance with Open Space, Sport and Recreation Supplementary Planning Document (2011): 0.8478 ha x 1.2 = 1.0 ha 		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Drainage lagoons: 0.1708 ha x 1.2 = 0.2 ha <input type="checkbox"/> Net residential area (gross site area minus on site public open space and drainage lagoons): 5.63 ha <input type="checkbox"/> Site capacity at 29 dph: 5.63 ha x 20 dph = 163 dwellings <p>As explained above, the site can accommodate an additional 158 dwellings using the existing access and an emergency access (or over 158 dwellings if a second full access onto Burwell Road is provided). Therefore, it is proposed that Policy E1 should be amended to reflect the more accurately calculated likely site capacity, such as: "approximately 150 dwellings".</p>		
<hr/>				
<i>Site E1(b) - Land off the Drift/Burwell Road (formerly E/02)</i>				
24275 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Site E1(b) (previously E/02) was assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit report are included in the policy for this site should it be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	This site has a planning permission and has commenced on site therefore it will not be allocated in the plan. Any biodiversity issues including biodiversity enhancement will have been addressed as part of the planning process.	no action required
<hr/>				
23929 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
<hr/>				
24178 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	Upgrades to the foul network and water supply may be required. This will be investigated further when we are approached by the developer via our pre planning service.	Development underway and Anglian Water comments considered at the planning application stage.	No action required
<hr/>				

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

Question 18 - Exning

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24403 - The Exning Estate [12928]	Comment	<p>It is proposed that the Exning settlement boundary be amended to incorporate the following land as a residential allocation which is under the ownership of the Exning Estate:</p> <p>* Land North of Lacey's Lane (site location plan enclosed as part of submission)</p> <p>The site is approximately 1.5ha in size, is a greenfield site and located immediately to the South West of the existing residential development of the Exning. The site is currently used as a football pitch which could be relocated to another piece of land under the ownership of the Exning Estate. The exact relocation of the football pitch would be agreed with the Council at a later date and an Exning Estate land ownership plan is also included as part of this submission for reference. Residential development abuts the site along its eastern boundary, greenfield land is located to the North and West and Lacey's Lane spans the length of the sites southern edge with residential development beyond. The site is well screened by existing trees and hedgerows that surround the site on all sides. Access to the site could be provided from Lacey's Lane which could potentially be widened as part of any proposed residential at the site to alleviate potential congestion issues.</p> <p>The site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding) as defined by the Environment Agency flood mapping system and there are no listed buildings located on the site. As highlighted on the Planning Constraints map on page 97 of the SALP, the site is located adjacent to the defined settlement boundary of Exning and outside of the defined Conservation Area. The site is not located in close proximity to listed buildings and development at the site would not adversely affect any heritage assets.</p> <p>At full capacity, it is anticipated that the site could provide up to 45 dwellings (at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare(dph)). A site density of 30dph is in accordance with the Council's site selection criteria for sites of less than 100 dwellings and detailed on page 13 of the SALP Preferred Options consultation document. The Exning Estate welcome discussions</p>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	No Action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>with Forest Heath District Council to establish a mutually agreeable site capacity.</p> <p>The site is located in a sustainable location and within walking distance of Exning's village centre which has several local services and facilities including a primary school, public houses and bus stops. Additionally, there are a number of larger settlements located in close proximity to Exning, which are listed below :</p> <p>*Newmarket {3.8km South East}; *Burwell {3.3km North West}; *Cambridge {24km South West}.</p> <p>Exning is located within twenty five minutes of all the above settlements which provide further essential services and facilities for the local community.</p> <p>The landowner is supportive of residential development at this site which is available, suitable and achievable for residential development now. The development of this site would comply with paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('The Framework') which states that "To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."</p> <p>As such, we consider our client's land, as shown on the enclosed site location plan, to be suitable, available, achievable and deliverable land to accommodate housing development during the plan period. We respectfully request, therefore, that the land is allocated for housing.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24166 - Jockey Club Farming Co Ltd [12904]	Object	See above. <i>Exning settlement boundary needs to be amended to include the alternative allocation known as E/03 land to rear of Lacey's Lane. Local Plan confirms that site E/03 is relatively unconstrained. And as such should be allocated for 150 dwellings (including re-provision and new allotments if appropriate).</i>	There more appropriate sites available to meet the housing need. The reasons for omitting this site remain unchanged.	no action required
<i>The local area - Kentford</i>				
24001 - Meddler Properties Ltd [12884]	Object	The land between the two parts of Kentford does not perform any morphological or strategic landscape function and should not be designated as such as a strategic gap. <i>Use of strategic gap terminology should be removed from all supporting text.</i>	Noted. The land forms a strategic landscape gap marking the valley of the River Kennett. It additionally forms a significant physical and historical break between the two distinct settlement boundaries of the village and should be protected and maintained.	No action required
<i>Kentford site allocations map</i>				
24179 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently capacity at the receiving Newmarket Recycling centre to accommodate the level of growth indicated in Kentford.	noted	no action required
24596 - Stockland Green Ltd [12920]	Comment	New employment site submission - 2.1 ha - B1, B2, B8 Bury Road, Kentford	The planning applications referred to have yet to be determined. The submitted site is a long way outside the settlement boundary for Kentford (to the east), and is entirely within the 1500m Stone Curlew constraint zone. The council does not have the requisite evidence to support an allocation on this land.	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24590 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>we propose the allocation of the southern half of the site referenced as K/11 on the 2016 SHLAA, as advocated in the previous representations. We consider the case for doing so no less strong than last autumn.</p> <p>The site is however absent from Appendix 1, which lists the SHLAA sites not taken forward into the Site Allocations Local Plan. Two separate but related issues arise. First, the Council has not explained or justified the omission of this site from further consideration. Secondly, Appendix 1 provides a brief summary of why the sites listed in it have been excluded. Of the eleven sites, eight were excluded because they are located within 1,500 metres of the buffer zone for stone curlew nesting, two for reasons relating to flood risk and equine policy, and the last on general grounds of sustainability. We agree with these reasons; even more important, we again wish to emphasise very strongly that they do not apply to Site K/11. AHT therefore continues to seek the allocation of this site as a means towards the end of providing sufficient housing in the District in the Plan period.</p> <p><i>we propose the allocation of the southern half of the site referenced as K/11 on the 2016 SHLAA, as advocated in the previous representations. We consider the case for doing so no less strong than last autumn.</i></p>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	Site added to Settlement Boundary Review and SALP Omission Sites document with reason for omission.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site K1(a) - Land west of Herringswell Road (formerly K/10)</i>				
24277 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites K1(a) (previously K/10) and K1(b) (previously K/16) were assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit. Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.	Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
24180 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	A pre planning report was completed for the developer in 2014 that provided a potential strategy to enable connection for water supply and foul drainage.	noted	no action required
<i>Site K1(b) - Land to the rear of The Kentford (formerly K/16)</i>				
24182 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	In response to the planning application we confirmed there is treatment and foul network capacity within the existing sewerage system without the need for infrastructure upgrades.	noted	no action required
23930 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24278 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Sites K1(a) (previously K/10) and K1(b) (previously K/16) were assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
<hr/>				
<i>Policy K1: Housing in Kentford</i>				
24449 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Object	<p>We support the principle of the allocation of land in this area for housing as it reflects a significant extant planning permission of part of which is currently under construction. We object to the inclusion in the allocation of B1 offices, the allocation should solely be for housing and should be for around 75 homes.</p> <p>The inclusion of the office use in the indicative capacity is unnecessary.</p> <p>The construction and use of the part of the site that has approval for offices has not been taken forward with the construction of homes on the site. This is because the rents that can be obtained locally for offices are not at a sufficient level to fund the building.</p> <p><i>The description of the Indicative Capacity should be changed to "around 75 homes".</i></p> <p><i>This would provide the flexibility to ensure that the Local Plan is effective by being deliverable over its period.</i></p>	<p>Noted. Site K1(a) - Land West of Herringswell Road has been removed as an allocated site within the Plan due to the commencement of the site (application F/2013/0061/HYB).</p>	<p>Remove the allocation of Site K1(a) - Land West of Herringswell Road within Policy K1: Housing and Mixed Use Development in Kentford.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 19 - Kentford</i>				
24174 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Object	<p>AHT does not agree with the draft policy. The policy notes that both sites, K1(a) and K1(b), were granted planning permission during 2015; and so there can be no reasonable objection in principle to their allocation.</p> <p>we propose the allocation of the southern half of the site referenced as K/11 on the 2016 SHLAA, as advocated in the previous representations. We consider the case for doing so no less strong than last autumn.</p> <p>The site is however absent from Appendix 1, which lists the SHLAA sites not taken forward into the Site Allocations Local Plan. Two separate but related issues arise. First, the Council has not explained or justified the omission of this site from further consideration. Secondly, Appendix 1 provides a brief summary of why the sites listed in it have been excluded. Of the eleven sites, eight were excluded because they are located within 1,500 metres of the buffer zone for stone curlew nesting, two for reasons relating to flood risk and equine policy, and the last on general grounds of sustainability. We agree with these reasons; even more important, we again wish to emphasise very strongly that they do not apply to Site K/11. AHT therefore continues to seek the allocation of this site as a means towards the end of providing sufficient housing in the District in the Plan period.</p>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	Site added to Settlement Boundary Review and SALP Omission Sites document with reason for omission.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24452 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Object	<p>We support the principle of the allocation of land in this area for housing as it reflects a significant extant planning permission of part of which is currently under construction. We object to the inclusion in the allocation of B1 offices, the allocation should solely be for housing and should be for around 75 homes.</p> <p>The inclusion of the office use in the indicative capacity is unnecessary.</p> <p>The construction and use of the part of the site that has approval for offices has not been taken forward with the construction of homes on the site. This is because the rents that can be obtained locally for offices are not at a sufficient level to fund the building.</p> <p><i>The description of the Indicative Capacity should be changed to "around 75 homes".</i></p> <p><i>This would provide the flexibility to ensure that the Local Plan is effective by being deliverable over its period.</i></p>	Noted. Site K1(a) - Land West of Herringswell Road has been removed as an allocated site within the Plan due to the commencement of the site (application F/2013/0061/HYB).	Remove the allocation of Site K1(a) - Land West of Herringswell Road within Policy K1: Housing and Mixed Use Development in Kentford.
23999 - Meddler Properties Ltd [12884]	Object	<p>Since the publication of the draft Site Allocations Plan, planning appeal ref. 3070064 for the erection of 63 dwellings and a racehorse training establishment has been allowed at the former Meddler Stud site (SHLAA ref K/02). Accordingly, this site should now be included as a site allocation, having been found to be an acceptable development by a Planning Inspector.</p> <p><i>Include the Meddler Stud site as an allocation.</i></p>	Noted. Site SA13(b) - Land at Meddler Stud (formerly K/02) has been included as an allocated site within the Plan due to the granting of planning permission of the site (appeal reference APP/H3510/W/15/3070064).	Include the allocation of Site SA13(b) (formerly K/02) - Land at Meddler Stud within Policy K1: Housing and Mixed Use Development in Kentford.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 20 - Kentford</i>				
24181 - Animal Health Trust [4678]	Comment	<p>AHT's position follows on from the response to Question 19. The settlement boundary for Kentford should be extended to include the southern part of site K/11.</p> <p>Figure 11 in the Site Allocations Local Plan Policies Map Book shows the settlement boundary for Kentford. To include the site AHT recommends for allocation would extend the settlement boundary no further south and no further west than the existing and proposed boundaries. It is therefore considered that, to the extent to which the allocation of a site and the extension of a settlement boundary to accommodate it can be separated, no adverse consequences would arise from extending the settlement boundary of Kentford in this way. In particular, it would not give rise to any issues of coalescence referred to in paragraph 27.1.6 of the Sustainability Appraisal; indeed, it is difficult to understand why the SA raises this issue at all.</p>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.	no action required
24000 - Meddler Properties Ltd [12884]	Object	<p>Following allowed planning appeal ref. 3070064 for the erection of 63 dwellings and a racehorse training establishment has been allowed at the former Meddler Stud site (SHLAA ref K/02), this site should be allocated (see response to Q19) and the settlement boundary should be amended accordingly to include this site in its entirety.</p> <p><i>Amend the settlement boundary to include the entire Meddler Stud site.</i></p>	Noted. Site SA13(b) - Land at Meddler Stud (formerly K/02) has been included as an allocated site within the Plan due to the granting of planning permission of the site (appeal reference APP/H3510/W/15/3070064).	Include the allocation of Site SA13(b) (formerly K/02) - Land at Meddler Stud within Policy K1: Housing and Mixed Use Development in Kentford and amend the settlement boundary accordingly.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24450 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Object	<p>We object to the settlement boundary around the allocation K1 (a) in Kentford. We attach a plan below that shows proposed amendments to the boundary. The area in between the allocation K1 (a) and the homes along the north of Bury Road (the site) which is shown shaded purple below should be included in the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Kentford Lodge is not a designated heritage asset, and there is potential for some well-designed and small scale development in this area that would be sustainably located and which would not harm the character of the locality. The Lodge has a village and not a countryside character. It is proposed that a small number of well designed homes could be accommodated in this area. The settlement boundary as shown is not sound plan making as it is not the most appropriate strategy based on the evidence, and is therefore not justified as required by national planning policy.</p> <p>In conclusion the amendment to the settlement boundary as proposed would deliver sustainable development, and there are no constraints to development that cannot be overcome. The benefits of new housing in the area would outweigh the impacts.</p>	Noted. Site K1(a) - Land West of Herringswell Road has been removed as an allocated site within the Plan due to the commencement of the site (application F/2013/0061/HYB).	Amend the settlement boundary to reflect the extent of built development within permission F/2013/0061/HYB.
<i>West Row planning constraints map</i>				
23886 - Mildenhall Parish Charities (Mr Vince Coomber) [5591]	Support	confirm site remains viable for inclusion within the document.	Comments noted	no action required
<i>West Row site allocations map</i>				
24234 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	There is currently capacity at the receiving Mildenhall Water Recycling Centre to accommodate the level of growth indicated for West Row.	Comments Noted	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site WRI(a) - Land east of Beeches Road (formerly part of WR/07)</i>				
24235 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	In response to the planning application consultation we advised there is sufficient capacity in the foul sewerage system to accommodate the proposed development of 138 dwellings. The site is in close proximity to a Pumping Station and this should be considered in determining the site layout.	Comments noted	No action required
24279 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites WR1(a) (previously WR/07); WR1(b) (previously WR/06) and WR1(c) (previously WR/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. The site proposed for school expansion was not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If it contains habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, it should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>The features of the school expansion site have been assessed and it is considered that the risks to biodiversity are low although further assessment would be required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
23932 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No action required
<i>Policy WRI: Focus of growth: West Row</i>				
24453 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Object	SUPPORT - for principle of allocation OBJECT - as allocation should be increased in size	Comments noted	Enlarge allocation and Housing Settlement Boundary to accommodate further growth

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 21 - West Row</i>				
24455 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Object	These representations support the principle of policy WR1 (a) and argue for the allocation to cover a larger area in order to reflect the provision of self-build housing in the current planning application.	Comments noted	Enlarge allocation and Housing Settlement Boundary to accommodate further housing
<i>Site WR1(b) - Land north of Mildenhall Road (formerly WR/06)</i>				
23931 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24236 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [11226]	Comment	In response to the planning application consultation we advised there is sufficient capacity in the foul sewerage system to accommodate the proposed development of 26 dwellings.	Comments noted	No action required
24280 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites WR1(a) (previously WR/07); WR1(b) (previously WR/06) and WR1(c) (previously WR/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. The site proposed for school expansion was not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If it contains habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, it should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>The features of the school expansion site have been assessed and it is considered that the risks to biodiversity are low although further assessment would be required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site WR1(c) - Land adjacent to Park Garden, Friday Street (formerly WR/12)</i>				
24281 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites WR1(a) (previously WR/07); WR1(b) (previously WR/06) and WR1(c) (previously WR/12) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. The site proposed for school expansion was not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If it contains habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, it should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	<p>The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.</p> <p>The features of the school expansion site have been assessed and it is considered that the risks to biodiversity are low although further assessment would be required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Development management policy DM12 requires that enhancement for biodiversity should be included in all proposals, commensurate with the scale of the development.</p>	<p>Insert supporting text in Section 4 of SALP:</p> <p>A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.</p>
23933 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Ms Louise Dale) [12850]	Comment	See attached MOD assessment	The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
<i>Settlement boundary changes - West Row</i>				
23985 - Mr Trevor Palmer [6418]	Support	13.20 support - residential dwellings are required in West Row <i>land south of the 'Gables' Chapel Road should be included in settlement boundary to allow residential development to contribute towards the dwelling requirement</i>	Site is below the threshold to be considered for an allocation	No action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 22 - West Row</i>				
24456 - Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [7169]	Comment	<p>we suggest that the north east boundary of the allocation should follow the established field and hedge boundary as shown on the plan below. This makes a more logical boundary than that shown in the Preferred Options document.</p> <p><i>we suggest that the north east boundary of the allocation should follow the established field and hedge boundary as shown on the plan below. This makes a more logical boundary than that shown in the Preferred Options document.</i></p>	Comments Noted	Enlarge the Housing Settlement Boundary to accommodate further growth
23986 - Mr Trevor Palmer [6418]	Support	<p>land south of the 'Gables' Chapel Road should be included in settlement boundary to allow residential development to contribute towards the dwelling requirement</p> <p><i>land south of the 'Gables' Chapel Road should be included in settlement boundary to allow residential development to contribute towards the dwelling requirement</i></p>	Too small to be treated as an allocation	No change required

14. Preferred sites for allocation in the secondary villages

Moulton boundary plan

24282 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>The site proposed for school expansion was not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If it contains habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, it should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development.</p>	<p>The features of the school expansion site have been assessed and it is considered that the risks to biodiversity are low although further biodiversity survey may be required at the planning application stage.</p>	No action required
---	---------	--	---	--------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
15. Settlement boundary reviews				
<i>Question 23</i>				
24113 - Moulton Parish Council (Mr Bill Rampling) [12007]	Comment	<p>It is particularly concerning that the review of the Moulton settlement boundary has still not been addressed. As you know we have raised this on a number of occasions and our dialogue on this is well documented in numerous emails to you and other officers at the LPA. The Council asked again in October 2015 that the current out of date settlement boundary for Moulton village should be extended to reflect the houses, which form part of the village of Moulton and include the dwellings around the Playing Field and Village Green,</p> <p>Brookside, and properties on Gazeley Hill and Griffiths Yard. In addition the dwellings which adjoin the settlement boundary behind The Street should be included within the boundary. Whilst it is acknowledged that the inclusion of land within a settlement boundary does not mean that development will automatically be permitted or prohibited outside the boundary, the confines of this out of date settlement area is having a direct impact on the possible development of the village. The only amendment to the boundary in the current consultation is the triangle of land on which Moulton School is located, which has been extended to include the piece of land which borders the footpath.</p>	Noted. The proposed amendments could lead to additional development within the village and an expansion that would not be appropriate or proportionate for a secondary village in line with Policy CS1 of the Forest Heath adopted Core Strategy and the council's emerging Single Issue Review (SiR) of Policy CS7. Singularly, none of the suggested amendments represent an allocated site within the SALP that would require an amendment to the settlement boundary.	no action required
23956 - Mr & Mrs H Moazzeni [12860]	Comment	<p>The Respondents agree to the proposed amendments to the boundaries of Barton Mills as set out on page 124 of the Site Allocations Local Plan but propose further amendments as set out above. There have been substantial and material changes in planning circumstances since the existing village boundary was drawn. There is a need to keep even "secondary villages" alive with limited/controlled development throughout the plan period to 2031. This site is suitable and immediately available for limited residential development.</p>	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23946 - Mr & Mrs R Lewis [5666]	Comment	The Respondents agree to the proposed amendments to the boundaries of Barton Mills as set out on page 124 of the Site Allocations Local Plan but propose further amendments as set out above. There have been substantial and material changes in planning circumstances since the existing village boundary was drawn. There is a need to keep even "secondary villages" alive with limited/controlled development throughout the plan period to 2031. This site is suitable and immediately available for limited residential development.	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
23958 - Mrs W Vale [12861]	Comment	The Respondents agree to the proposed amendments to the boundaries of Barton Mills as set out on page 124 of the Site Allocations Local Plan but propose further amendments as set out above. There have been substantial and material changes in planning circumstances since the existing village boundary was drawn. There is a need to keep even "secondary villages" alive with limited/controlled development throughout the plan period to 2031. This site is suitable and immediately available for limited residential development.	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
24305 - Elveden Farms Ltd [12921]	Comment	There is scope for amendments to the boundaries of additional secondary villages, both to address minor anomalies in the existing boundaries and major changes to facilitate development that would underpin the provision of new infrastructure and community facilities that would enhance the sustainability of these settlements.	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages within the SALP, or the SiR. Amendments to the settlement boundaries of secondary villages within the SALP, reflect anomalies in existing boundaries only.	no action required
24317 - Save Historic Newmarket Ltd (Ms Sara Beckett) [11232]	Comment	The settlement boundary should not be amended. Brickfield Stud is contrary to horse racing policy. Hatchfield Farm should be excluded as this is subject to call in.	Noted. Following the SoS decision, the Hatchfield Farm proposal is not being allocated within the SALP and the settlement boundary will not extend to incorporate this site as a result. The Brickfield Stud site remains an allocation within the SALP (see relevant responses to Newmarket Section of SALP), and the settlement boundary amendment will remain as proposed.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24146 - Barton Mills Parish Council (Ms Abigail Davies) [12778]	Comment	We support the four suggested amendments to our settlement boundary (pl 24) to include within it some additional properties which have already been built. However, this will leave just four vacant plots within the settlement boundary (three on the former Sandford Nursery site) for development up to 2031. We feel that this level of future growth is insufficient to sustain a vibrant community.	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages within the SALP.	no action required
24155 - Gladman (Mr Russell Spencer) [6673]	Comment	Gladman query the soundness of setting and amending settlement boundaries when the housing requirement and distribution of development for the district has not been established. Any settlement boundary needs to be flexible; setting strict settlement boundaries does not allow adequate flexibility for development to come forward outside the settlement boundary if this is required (for example due to a shortfall of housing land). Gladman would be opposed to the definition of an urban edge if this would preclude appropriately sited and sustainable development coming forward to meet the district's housing needs, in accordance with the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. Proposals that are sustainable should go ahead without delay. An overly restrictive approach could result in a plan that is not positively prepared or effective.	Noted. The principle of settlement boundaries in the Plan area is already established. The SALP amends settlement boundaries as necessary in line with the scope and context of the Plan. Any forthcoming proposals for development within, adjacent, or outside established development boundaries will be assessed on their merits in line with a presumption in favour of sustainable development and all relevant planning policies within the Plan area.	no action required
24118 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	NO, Newmarket Town Council does not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained with the FHDC Core Strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes.	Noted. Following the SoS decision, the Hatchfield Farm proposal is not being allocated within the SALP and the settlement boundary will not extend to incorporate this site as a result. The Brickfield Stud site remains an allocation within the SALP (see relevant responses to Newmarket Section of SALP), and the settlement boundary amendment will remain as proposed.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24132 - John Gosden Racing LLP (Mr John Gosden) [12700]	Object	NO, I do not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained with the FHDC Core Strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes.	Noted. Following the SoS decision, the Hatchfield Farm proposal is not being allocated within the SALP and the settlement boundary will not extend to incorporate this site as a result. The Brickfield Stud site remains an allocation within the SALP (see relevant responses to Newmarket Section of SALP), and the settlement boundary amendment will remain as proposed.	Remove Hatchfield Farm site from SALP and keep the settlement boundary as it currently exists for this site. Keep amendment relating to Brickfield Stud allocation.
24325 - Mrs Rachel Hood [12509]	Object	No I do not agree with the amended settlement boundary which shows part of Brickfield Stud and all of Hatchfield Farm included within the town boundary. Neither of these sites should be included as the Brickfield Stud application is contrary to the Horse Racing Policy as contained in FHDC Core Strategy; and Hatchfield Farm should be excluded until a decision is made by the Secretary of State in regard to the planning application for 400 homes.	Noted. Following the SoS decision, the Hatchfield Farm proposal is not being allocated within the SALP and the settlement boundary will not extend to incorporate this site as a result. The Brickfield Stud site remains an allocation within the SALP (see relevant responses to Newmarket Section of SALP), and the settlement boundary amendment will remain as proposed.	Remove Hatchfield Farm site from SALP and keep the settlement boundary as it currently exists for this site. Keep amendment relating to Brickfield Stud allocation.
23965 - P & J Haylock [12027]	Object	Object. The settlement boundary of Holywell Row should be amended to include the land at Laurel Farm, as shown on the attached plan. The current settlement boundary runs through the existing properties of Laurel Close, and therefore does not currently demonstrate a meaningful edge of settlement. The settlement boundary should be amended as set out on the attached map to include land at Laurel Farm (the boundary of which is dashed in red). The site represents an extension to the existing settlement pattern at Laurel Close. The site would involve the redevelopment of the unsightly existing agricultural buildings, creating a significant visual improvement to this part of the settlement. The proposed dwellings would contribute to local housing need, to provide a residential development in keeping with the existing properties at Laurel Close.	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
23989 - Ms Jane Andrews [12882]	Support	Support Barton Mills	noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24016 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	<p>Although I support the primary villages settlement boundary decisions of Q23, I have reservations and implications for review of secondary villages, where no residential sites are being allocated, that may or not be supported on the basis of an upgrade of the 1995 Local Plan.</p> <p>I would question if this is possible for 10 villages. As a resident of Tuddenham 'site T1' I have submitted sufficient and coherent evidence to review in detail the settlement boundary in Tuddenham at T1, supported by professional and expert advice within Planning(including FHDC), HRA the Breckland SPA Highways and Natural England.</p>	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
24308 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	<p>I have responded to this Q23 but would like to add a foot note through the attached files that support my plea for a change of settle boundary at T/01.</p> <p>Particularly I would like to have an accompanied visit to the site. I want to erect one fully ECO house on my site for my wife and me with no further development. Thank you.</p>	Noted. No changes to the settlement boundary of Tuddenham are proposed within the SALP. The erection of a single dwelling is considered a development management issue and outside the scope of the SALP.	no action required
<i>Barton Mills boundary plan</i>				
23957 - Mrs W Vale [12861]	Comment	<p>The Respondents agree to the proposed amendments to the boundaries of Barton Mills as set out on page 124 of the Site Allocations Local Plan but propose further amendments as set out above.</p> <p>There have been substantial and material changes in planning circumstances since the existing village boundary was drawn.</p> <p>There is a need to keep even "secondary villages" alive with limited/controlled development throughout the plan period to 2031.</p> <p>This site is suitable and immediately available for limited residential development.</p>	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
23945 - Mr & Mrs R Lewis [5666]	Comment	<p>The Respondents agree to the proposed amendments to the boundaries of Barton Mills as set out on page 124 of the Site Allocations Local Plan but propose further amendments as set out above. There have been substantial and material changes in planning circumstances since the existing village boundary was drawn. There is a need to keep even "secondary villages" alive with limited/controlled development throughout the plan period to 2031. This site is suitable and immediately available for limited residential development.</p> <p><i>amendment to Barton Mills Boundary</i></p>	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
23955 - Mr & Mrs H Moazzeni [12860]	Comment	<p>The Respondents agree to the proposed amendments to the boundaries of Barton Mills as set out on page 124 of the Site Allocations Local Plan but propose further amendments as set out above. There have been substantial and material changes in planning circumstances since the existing village boundary was drawn. There is a need to keep even "secondary villages" alive with limited/controlled development throughout the plan period to 2031. This site is suitable and immediately available for limited residential development.</p>	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
24339 - Christine May [12900]	Comment	<p>I fully support the respondents in their attempt to enhance the beauty and development of Barton Mills. settlement boundary of Barton Mills to be changed to reflect site as shown on attached</p> <p><i>change settlement boundary to reflect site as shown on attached plan</i></p>	Noted. The council is not putting forward any site options for housing within the secondary villages. As such the site representing the settlement boundary change has not been allocated in the plan and the settlement boundary not amended as a result.	no action required
23988 - Ms Jane Andrews [12882]	Support	In support of settlement boundary review for Barton Mills.	noted	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
16. Economy and jobs				
<i>Overview of employment in the district</i>				
24314 - Save Historic Newmarket Ltd (Ms Sara Beckett) [11232]	Comment	An assessment of the movement of horses and traffic needs to be undertaken to truly demonstrate the effect that future allocation of house and sites would have on the main employment industry, that being HRI.	Following the Secretary of State's decision in August 2016 to refuse planning permission for 400 dwellings on a site at Hatchfield Farm to the north east of Newmarket, this site has not been included as a housing allocation in this Plan.	
<i>no action required</i>				
<i>What we have learnt</i>				
24156 - Gladman (Mr Russell Spencer) [6673]	Comment	We believe that the Plan should be ambitious in seeking to achieve high levels of economic growth, and that any possible risks of planning for a corresponding level of housing are vastly outweighed by the potential benefits.	The SALP allocates sufficient land to meet its needs during the plan period. The plan will be monitored, and if circumstances change, reviewed.	no action required
<i>EM1(a) site plan</i>				
24249 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites M2(b) and EM1(a) were not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If they contain habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, they should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development.	Site SA5(b) District Council Offices, College Heath Road (previously M2(b)) comprises existing built development, amenity grass and shrubs and some young mature trees. Whilst any application will need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey, the risks to biodiversity and to delivery of the site are assessed as low. Site SA16(a) Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre site, Mildenhall (previously EM1(a)) comprises the existing built development, amenity grassland and planting and the existing tree belts along Bury Road which could be retained. The playingfields are not included. Redevelopment of the site would need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey and the risks to site biodiversity are assessed as low. This site is located close to the SPA and redevelopment of the site would need to have regard to this; this fact may limit the type of employment use that would be acceptable and a project level HRA will be required.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24141 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Support	Part of site EM1(a) would also be suitable for a traveller site, with far more convenient vehicular access than the proposed site off the West Row road.	Site EM1(a) (Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre site) currently provides employment and is well located on the A1101 on the eastern edge of the town. The site is within the 400m Woodlark/Nightjar constraint zone, and land immediately south of the site is within Flood Zone 2. Sufficient housing land is being allocated on land west of Mildenhall, including land to accommodate gypsies and travellers. Evidence supports allocation of this site for employment uses.	no action required
<i>EM1(b) site plan</i>				
24258 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(f) and EM1(b) were not included within the 2015 wildlife audit. If they contain habitats or features likely to support protected and/or Priority species, they should be assessed further prior to any allocation for development.	<p>Site SA6(c) Land at Philips Close (previously N1(f)) is an existing residential development. Most of the land is garden land and the garden assessment which formed part of the wildlife audit 2016 would be relevant.</p> <p>Site SA17(b) St Leger, Newmarket (previously EM1(b)) is an isolated undeveloped but disturbed plot in the existing employment area. Although there are some features on the site, it is poorly connected to other areas of habitat. A recent planning application was refused and dismissed at appeal however this was on amenity grounds relating to the size of the development rather than the principle of development. Whilst any application may need to be accompanied by the relevant ecological survey, the risks to biodiversity and to delivery of the site are assessed as low.</p>	no action required
<i>Policy EM1: Proposed employment allocations - preferred option</i>				
24294 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Object	Jaynic Properties Ltd does not agree with Policy EM1: Proposed Employment Allocations - Preferred Options. This site should not be allocated for employment use. The Application site was originally allocated as a 'Business Development Area' within the Forest Heath Local Plan 1995 and the Red Lodge Masterplan 1998. The site remains undeveloped.	Application reference DC/16/0596/OUT was granted planning permission for residential development for up to 125 dwellings (subject to a S016 agreement) in September 2016, and will be allocated for residential use in the SALP.	Site EM1(c) is allocated for residential use in the SALP. (Now site SA9(d))

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan	Council's Assessment	Action
24293 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Object	<p>it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use.</p> <p><i>it is requested that as employment need is being sufficiently met in the area, that site EM1(c) is not allocated for employment. It is believed this site is more appropriate for residential use.</i></p>	Application reference DC/16/0596/OUT was granted planning permission for residential development for up to 125 dwellings (subject to a S016 agreement) in September 2016, and will be allocated for residential use in the SALP.	Site EM1(c) is allocated for residential use in the SALP. (Now site SA9(d))
Question 24				
24241 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Su Field) [5165]	Comment	Site EM1 (c) is suitable for siting the second school. This would provide balance within the village, rather than siting the second school on the business park which is in close proximity to the existing school. It would mean the business park can be retained with no changes, and any under supply of housing for the district can be located within one of the 3 market towns or back to Hatchfield farm.	Application reference DC/16/0596/OUT was granted planning permission for residential development for up to 125 dwellings (subject to a S016 agreement) in September 2016, and will be allocated for residential use in the SALP.	Site EM1(c) is allocated for residential use in the SALP. (Now site SA9(d))
24105 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	St Leger as a distribution centre. No updated evidence on traffic conditions.	The council has commissioned a study (following the update of the 2009 AECOM study that was published in may 2016) of the cumulative effect of growth proposals that includes junctions in Newmarket. The St Leger site is adjacent to existing employment sites and there is no evidence to suggest that this allocation is unsustainable.	no action required
24300 - Stockland Green Ltd [12920]	Comment	Please see attached documents and plans	The submitted site is a long way outside the settlement boundary for Kentford (to the east), and is entirely within the 1500m Stone Curlew constraint zone. The council does not have the requisite evidence to support an allocation on this land.	no action required
24295 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Object	<p>Jaynic Properties Ltd does not agree with Policy EM1: Proposed Employment Allocations - Preferred Options. This site should not be allocated for employment use.</p> <p>The Application site was originally allocated as a 'Business Development Area' within the Forest Heath Local Plan 1995 and the Red Lodge Masterplan 1998. The site remains undeveloped.</p>	Application reference DC/16/0596/OUT was granted planning permission for residential development for up to 125 dwellings (subject to a S016 agreement) in September 2016, and will be allocated for residential use in the SALP.	Site EM1(c) is allocated for residential use in the SALP. (Now site SA9(d))

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24012 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	5741 Agree especially proposed Mildenhall Hub Agree Red Lodge but sensitive monitoring will be required as demand increases for housing, community and recreational facilities.	noted	no action required

Question 25

24297 - Jaynic Properties Ltd [12521]	Comment	<p>Jaynic Properties Ltd considers that the land to the North of the A11 at Red Lodge (marked with a star in the Site Allocations Local Plan) could be an appropriate location for employment growth. This location benefits from very good transport links as well as the synergy that could be created between this site and the mixed use site RL2(a) and its employment land.</p> <p>This potential site alongside site RL2(a) can provide more than enough provision for employment land for not just Red Lodge, but many of the surrounding areas. This location alongside proposed site RL2(a) should be viewed as the main and only employment sites at Red Lodge.</p> <p>It is agreed that this proposed site to the North of the A11 at Red Lodge is an appropriate location for employment and should be designated as such. This designation should be solely for employment use, rendering site EM1(c) not required for employment use. Site EM1(c) should be proposed as residential land as its current designation is inappropriate and the land North of the A11 will not suffer from the same constraints that have prevented the development of Site EM1(c) since its allocation over 20 years ago.</p>	There is no evidence that a site north of the A11 for employment uses in this plan period	no action required
---------------------------------------	---------	--	---	--------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24242 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Su Field) [5165]	Comment	No. Nor do we consider this to be an appropriate question. The question has failed to define the scale of employment, the type of employment and the period this may or may not be brought forward. Too much land is already identified for Red Lodge through this consultation. A total of 12.1 hectares of employment land is sought for Red Lodge out of a possible 25.3 hectares. Half the employment land would be allocated to this part of the district. Additional growth is inappropriate.	The views of Herringswell Parish Council are noted. Whilst the evidence indicates that sufficient land is allocated at Red Lodge in this plan, the council has identified this area adjacent to the A11 in the Cambridge Norwich corridor as the focus for identifying new employment sites for the Joint West Suffolk Local Plan which is due to commence preparation in 2017/18. The council will work with its neighbours to attract investment and promote infrastructure improvements (particularly to improve the east to west/north to east link to/from the A11 and A14, and capacity/safety at the A11 Fiveways/Barton Mills roundabout) to ensure the advantages of this corridor can be fully realised.	no action required
24142 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Support	There is surely scope for an employment zone along the A11 corridor between Red Lodge and Fiveways roundabout.	There is no evidence in the 2016 FHDC ELR that there is need for an employment site north of the A11 in this plan period. This site has been removed from the submission SALP.	no action required
24422 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Support	The Landowner supports land to the north of the A11 at Red Lodge as an appropriate location for employment growth that would further support and strengthen the existing business park at Kings Warren, Red Lodge, identified as a strategic employment site in the A11 Growth Corridor Feasibility Study prepared by Bruton Knowles. As previously stated in our response to Question RL2 of the October 2015 consultation, its location on the A11 junction offers significant opportunities for the general industrial and logistics sectors and businesses seeking accessible, unencumbered commercial premises, in close proximity to existing local amenities at Red Lodge.	There is no evidence in the 2016 FHDC ELR that there is need for an employment site north of the A11 in this plan period. This site has been removed from the submission SALP.	no action required
24013 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	Depending on any expansion of the site, access to the junction of the B1085 and the A 11 could become a traffic congestion issue.	There is no evidence in the 2016 FHDC ELR that there is need for an employment site north of the A11 in this plan period. This site has been removed from the submission SALP.	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Policy EM2: Existing General Employment Areas</i>				
24250 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	<p>Employment area EM2(k) includes the Roadside Nature Reserve (RNR) 171 (also designated as County Wildlife Site Forest Heath 64), which is designated for its rare flora. It should be ensured that any policy adopted for this area EM2(k) protects the RNR.</p> <p>It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.</p>	SA15(k) Industrial estate north of the settlement, Mildenhall (previously EM2(k)) is an existing employment site that has been built out and there are no firm proposals for further development. Any redevelopment of sites in policy EM2 would be treated similarly to any other planning application. However it is noted that the Roadside Nature Reserve would be better protected if it were removed from the allocation.	Amend the boundary of allocation SA15(k) to exclude RNR171
24014 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	Agree in principle but not sufficiently knowledgeable of all the sites.	noted	no action required

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

17. Retail

Policy RE1: Proposed Retail Allocations

24256 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites N1(a) (previously N/09); N1(b) (previously N/11); N1(c) (previously N/14); N1(d) (previously N/20); N1(e) (previously N/32) and RE1(a) (previously N/03) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted.	The information in the wildlife audit is intended to guide site allocations through assessment of the risks to biodiversity. Any future development will be informed not only by the wildlife audit findings but also by any additional up to date information and detailed surveys. However it is agreed that additional supporting text would be appropriate to draw attention to the findings of the wildlife audit.	Insert additional supporting text in Section 4 of SALP: A wildlife audit has been undertaken of allocated sites which were considered to contain important habitats or features likely to support protected or priority species. The findings of this audit forms background evidence to support the SALP and has been considered in allocating sites. The detailed recommendations and comments in the site assessment which forms part of the 'Forest Heath: Wildlife audit of proposed site allocations 2015' along with up-to-date ecological information should inform the design and subsequent management of allocated sites.
---	---------	--	---	---

Question 26

24106 - BBA Shipping and Transport Ltd (Mr Kevin Needham) [12680]	Comment	Supermarket permission not followed up on. Is it really needed and could the site be better used?	The site has a valid planning consent for a foodstore (F/2011/0712/FUL). It is appropriate to allocate the site for retail purposes.	no action required
24100 - Newmarket Trainers' Federation (Mr Mark Tompkins) [12333]	Comment	The gas works has planning for a superstore. Which hasn't been built. This could all be housing and should be.	The site has a valid planning consent for a foodstore (F/2011/0712/FUL). It is appropriate to allocate the site for retail purposes.	no action required
24069 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	Fully support this MP1 policy	noted	no action required
24074 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	Increasing traffic and therefore pollution is becoming a serious problem at Mildenhall.	Noted. Policy MP1 will address traffic management and car parking.	no action required

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

18. Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Future requirements

24157 - Gladman (Mr Russell Spencer) [6673]	Comment	It is important that the Site Allocations Local Plan seeks to meet the district's full need for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation (identified through a proper, appropriate assessment), unless significant and demonstrable harm would result when tested against the policies of the Framework. Gladman would draw the Council's attention to the Inspector's Interim Findings on the Maldon Local Plan, which raised significant concerns regarding that Council's treatment of Gypsy and Traveller site allocations. The Council may find it helpful to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment as part of the Sustainability Appraisal to identify and address the potential equality impacts the plan is likely to have on Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.	An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken on the submission draft SALP.	no action required
---	---------	---	---	--------------------

Site G1(a): Land west of Mildenhall

24143 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Object	Consider this site unsuitable due to inadequate road connections to the trunk road network. Suggest part of site EM1(a) would have far better road links and therefore be more suitable. Land between the A11 north and A1101 to east of Fiveways appears to be in use as a traveller site and could be developed formally. Also consider area to south of A1101 between Fiveways Travel Lodge and Cut Off Channel previously used as a contractor's compound. <i>See above</i>	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocation G1 (a) Land west of Mildenhall has been removed.	no action required
--------------------------------------	--------	--	---	--------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Site G1(b) : North Red Lodge</i>				
24269 - Suffolk Wildlife Trust (Mr James Meyer) [12367]	Comment	Sites RL1(a) (previously RL/03 and part RL/04); RL1(b) (previously part RL/06); RL1(c) (previously part RL/06); RL2(a)/G1(b) (previously part RL/15); EM1(c) (previously RL/13) and the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' (previously RL/15) were all assessed as part of the Forest Heath Wildlife Audit in 2015 and we recommend that the recommendations made within the audit reports are included in the policies for these sites should they be adopted. Also the area identified as 'Area for potential employment growth' potentially includes or borders several sites designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS), it should therefore be ensured that any policy for this growth area includes appropriate protection for sites of nature conservation importance. It should also be ensured that the policies for all development sites secure ecological enhancements as part of any development plans.	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocations G1 (a) and G1 (b) have been removed.	no action required
<i>Policy G1: Allocations for Gypsy and Travellers</i>				
24144 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Object	As previously stated we do not consider the site to west of Mildenhall suitable due to unsuitable road access.	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocation G1 (a) Land west of Mildenhall has been removed.	no action required
<i>Please see previous comments</i>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Question 27</i>				
24424 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Comment	<p>The Landowner acknowledges the need in principle to make appropriate provision in development plans for gypsies and travellers.</p> <p>The policy is insufficiently precise about the scale of provision for gypsies and travellers at each of the identified sites. Although we would not expect the policy to specify exactly the number of pitches, provision at each site should be proportional to the size of the site, and in the case of RL2(a) take fully into account not only the range of principal uses, but also supporting infrastructure (strategic landscaping, public open space, sustainable urban drainage, pedestrian and cycle links, other community facilities) which itself will occupy substantial amounts of land. Furthermore, the Council should be aware, and take full account, of the constraints imposed by the gas pipeline that crosses the site and the effect this has on both the amount of development possible and the disposition of uses across the site as a whole. Brief reference to this "major hazard pipeline" is made in Policy RL2. Regard should also be had to any existing and proposed gypsies and traveller provision elsewhere in Red Lodge to ensure that such provision is not disproportionate to the size of the settlement and is also provided at other locations across the district.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to draw attention to these matters in advance of masterplans being approved. As far as Policy G1 itself is concerned, we recommend the insertion of the words "on a proportionate basis" after the word "determined" in the last sentence of the policy.</p> <p><i>As far as Policy G1 itself is concerned, we recommend the insertion of the words "on a proportionate basis" after the word "determined" in the last sentence of the policy.</i></p>	<p>Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocations G1 (a) and G1 (b) have been removed.</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24145 - Mr Michael Croughton [12911]	Object	Object to land west of Mildenhall on highway grounds. <i>Please see previous comments and alternative site suggestions.</i>	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocation G1 (a) Land west of Mildenhall has been removed.	no action required
24015 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	Agree with the council's draft policy.	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocations G1 (a) and G1 (b) have been removed.	no action required
24077 - Mr Gerald Ball [5741]	Support	This is an important issue. I support the Council's determination to seek suitable sites.	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP. The proposed policy G1 and allocations G1 (a) and G1 (b) have been removed.	no action required
<i>Submit your site</i>				
24017 - Mr R Oakley [12896]	Comment	Land at Skeltons Drove, Beck Row Owner of site is very interested in developing this site. This site ticks all the right boxes. If this site is approved the access road known as Skeltons Drove can be improved and the whole area cleaned up.	Noted. The GTAA 2016 has updated the previous study upon which the PO SALP was based. This has identified no need to allocate permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in the SALP.	no action required

Appendix B - table of sites considered in the Issues and Options consultation (August to October 2015) with reason for omission from the Preferred Options Consultation

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

Appendices

Appendix B - table of sites considered in the Issues and Options consultation (August to October 2015) with reason for omission from the Preferred Options Consultation

24165 - Historic England (Dr Natalie Gates) [12915]	Comment	we welcome the inclusion of site B/18, B/27, B/28 and N/10 within the list of omission sites.	The comments are noted.	No action required.
---	---------	---	-------------------------	---------------------

Appendix B - table of sites considered in the Issues and Options consultation (August to October 2015) with reason for omission from the Preferred Options Consultation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24330 - Garnham Properties [12702]	Object	<p>My client is disappointed that the second parcel of land in his ownership, land to the south of the Carrops (RL18) that was evaluated in the Issues and options document, has been omitted as a potential allocation site.</p> <p>Appendix B of the the Preferred Options document provides the justification for the omission of the site. The site was omitted for the following reasons: a) Flood Zone 2 and 3; b) Record of Protected Species in the area: c) Visually sensitive site on the edge of the village settlement.</p> <p>With regards to reason a), the Environment Agency's Flood Map (figure 3), demonstrates that the western edge of the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but the developable area of the site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore a very low risk of flooding. Therefore the site should not be omitted as a preferred option because only a small portion of the whole of the site sits within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>As with any development site, further investigation into the presence of protected species on the site could be required. As a consequence it would be unjustifiable to omit the site for this reason.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site is adjacent the current settlement boundary. However, the Council's conclusion the site is 'visually sensitive', is not considered to be correct. The site has most recently be used for trailer storage and presents an unattractive entrance to the village. The site could be brought back in to usage for other open storage purposes. Clearly, the residential development of the site would present opportunities to enhance the area with the promotion of open space and landscaping. Fundamentally, one of the Core Principles of the NPPF is to 'encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)' for development. The current adopted Core Strategy (2001) stressed that, due to the predominantly rural nature of the district, government targets relating to the percentage of brownfield land that should be developed in the</p>	<p>Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.</p>	no action required

Appendix B - table of sites considered in the Issues and Options consultation (August to October 2015) with reason for omission from the Preferred Options Consultation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>district would not be made. It can be inferred that the District suffers a shortage of brownfield sites. Therefore, the site presents an opportunity for brownfield development in Red Lodge and the site should be considered to be a preferred location for development because development of the site would provide a small contribution to reducing the need for the release of greenfield land elsewhere in the District.</p>		
24365 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	<p>In respect of the representations made above, we strongly object to our client's site, M/30 being omitted as an allocation within the SALP and stress the need for the Council to consider this in light of our comments and instate the site into the plan following conclusion of this current consultation process. We set out the justification for this below.</p>	<p>Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan due to its location, potential coalescence with Barton Mills and its potential landscape impact. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.</p>	no action required

Appendix B - table of sites considered in the Issues and Options consultation (August to October 2015) with reason for omission from the Preferred Options Consultation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24340 - The Trustees of the E G Lambton 1974 Settlement [5870]	Object	<p>From the evidence based contained within the PPS it is clear that the current facilities provided on the GLPF are being significantly under-utilised. The Action plan within the PPS and the Draft Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy sets out a number of priorities for investment into improved indoor and outdoor sport facilities in Forest Heath. Forest heath is not a priority area for investment by the FA and other sporting bodies and so the Local Authority will need to be flexible in its search for investment to deliver these priorities. Appropriate development of the GLPF either whole or in part has the potential to release investment for the delivery of a number of the objectives set out in the PPS and Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy during the plan period. This submission highlights ways in which some these priorities can be delivered through enhancements to existing green space both on and off site. The evidence contained in the draft PPS and shift in emphasis in national Policy will enable sufficient of the criteria set out in the SE Policies E1,4&5 to be met by an appropriate development proposal. The omission of the GLPF from the list of preferred sites with the SALP at this stage has the potential to significantly limit the Local Authority's ability to deliver on their objectives during the plan period and will condemn GLPF to remaining and underutilised asset. This does not need to happen and therefore we request that Site N18 be removed from Appendix B: Omission Sites and be reinstated as an Allocation Site for mixed use in section 7. This will create on-going opportunity to maximise the potential of the site and the opportunity to deliver new and enhanced sport and recreation facilities that will better meet the needs of the community ad policy.</p>	<p>Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan due to the loss of designated open space in accordance with Policy DM42 of the Forest heath JDMPD (adopted February 2015). Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document for further details on the reason for this site's omission.</p>	no action required