

# Proposed Submission Site Allocations Local Plan

## Public Participation Report

# D52

1. The Site Allocations Local Plan; background, process and accompanying documents

1.1-1.14

### Representations

### Nature

### Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan

### Council's Assessment

### Action

## 1. The Site Allocations Local Plan; background, process and accompanying documents

### 1.1-1.14

24871 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]

Object

1.12

The NHG has consistently raised concerns about the adequacy of the Habitats Regulation Assessment. These concerns have not been addressed by the responses given. In light of these concerns, the NHG considers that this part of the Local Plan fails the test of soundness. It is not considered to be justified by the evidence available and the inadequacies of the HRA make it inconsistent with n

*The inadequacies identified need to be addressed to allow this paragraph to remain.*

LUC (the council's HRA consultants) has liaised with Natural England throughout the HRA process to agree the methodology and emerging findings. As the appropriate nature conservation body to be consulted on assessments of plans and projects under the Habitats Regulations, Natural England has confirmed (letter to FHDC dated 13 March 2017, 'Natural England is satisfied that the current proposed submission does not require any further changes (in accordance with our remit).'

No action required.

24868 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]

Object

1.10

The NHG has consistently raised concerns about the timing of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the preparation of the policies within this document. These are not addressed by the latest draft of the IDP, which again has been produced after the policies have been written rather than informing the policies as this paragraph suggests. The NHG considers that this renders the document unsound as it has not been adequately justified.

*The IDP should have been prepared to inform the policies that have subsequently been written. Further work is required on the IDP to confirm the infrastructure impacts arising from the site allocations that have been selected. This further work is required before the sites can be considered.*

The IDP is an evolving and iterative document, and this version has been informed by continuing dialogue with infrastructure and service providers and the study updates commissioned in 2015 and 2016. It indicates the strategic and local level infrastructure and services can be maintained/provided at the appropriate level for the distribution of housing growth in the SIR and SALP.

Work will continue with infrastructure and service providers, and with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies to produce a full version of the IDP following examination and adoption of the SIR and SALP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24663 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>SALP hasn't been positively prepared; it evolved because of speculative, developer-led ideas rather than plan-led strategy. The SIR of 2013/14 excluded development in Lakenheath North and omitted school provision. It was added when stakeholders identified the need. School sites were proposed, with no proper consultation Lakenheath north would appear to be developer-led.</p> <p>We don't believe FHDC can deliver because of infrastructure constraints. The identified school site is problematic as under the return jets flight path and affected by noise. Without the school, there is unsustainable education provision. Traffic mitigation isn't under control of FHDC as third party land required</p> <p><i>Properly plan-led rather than developer-led.</i></p> <p><i>Further detail should be included to cover the infrastructure provision within planned growth. It should confirm as an example mitigation to increase facilities within the areas concerned.</i></p>	The IDP is an evolving and iterative document, and this version has been informed by continuing dialogue with infrastructure and service providers and the study updates commissioned in 2015 and 2016. It indicates the strategic and local level infrastructure and services can be maintained/provided at the appropriate level for the distribution of housing growth in the SIR and SALP.	No action required.
24870 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	<p>1.11</p> <p>The NHG has consistently raised concerns about the adequacy of the Sustainability Appraisal. These concerns have not been addressed by the responses given. In light of these concerns, the NHG considers that this part of the Local Plan fails the test of soundness. It is not considered to be justified by the evidence available and the inadequacies of the SA make it inconsistent with national policy. It also calls into question the extent to which the document is legally compliant.</p> <p><i>The issues raised must be addressed to allow this paragraph to remain in the plan.</i></p>	The SA has been undertaken in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase ACT 2004 and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. SA-related documentation has been published at relevant points in the plan-making process to help inform stakeholder consultation.	No action required.
24891 - Gladman (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [13119]	Object	<p>The Site Allocations Plan is not based on an OAN that has been arrived at in an NPPF and PPG compliant manner.</p> <p>The total number of allocations must be increased to ensure that full OAN can be met over the plan period.</p>	The SHMA update 2016 has demonstrated there is a need to provide 6800 dwellings in 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>
24802 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>Notification received in December of the consultation to commence 10th January. Lakenheath were provided with a drop in event to elaborate on the contents of the consultation, leaflet attached stating representations could be made in writing or email. Insufficient time given to advertise the event. The Parish arranged their own event 7th February to better inform the Village of the proposals. This was well attended. The overwhelming response was astonishment as to the extent of the proposals. Representations have been submitted but not all accepted by the LPA as they are not on prescribed forms. These forms are ridiculously complex.</p> <p><i>User friendly forms with no representations returned. All representations should be accepted and noted.</i></p>	<p>All parishes/town councils were notified of the consultation start date and the council-run and advertised events. While we invite parishes to undertake additional advertising of the event where possible, this is not a requirement.</p> <p>Notes were provided alongside the forms to assist with completion. While people were encouraged to use the forms, responses were still accepted in other formats.</p>	No action required.

## ***2. National and local planning policy context***

### ***2.1-2.9***

24664 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>To ensure all points are heard, please see attached.</p> <p><i>A masterplan approach for each town centre should promote environmental improvements that enhance the attractiveness of the area and promote growth required for Lakenheath too.</i></p> <p><i>The possible retail land earmarked for Tescos is again up for sale with the agents having difficulty in finding a commercial buyer.</i></p> <p><i>After all FHDC seek a minimum of 45% growth in Lakenheath over the plan period, the largest in the district.</i></p>	<p>Lakenheath is designated as a Key Service Centre in Core Strategy Policy CS1. There is no evidence to suggest in the 2016 Settlement Profiles document that this designation is no longer appropriate.</p> <p>The comments are noted. In respect of noise, please see the signed statement of common ground between FHDC and the DIO. A modification has been suggested at paragraph 3.9 to update the noise contour map to the 2017 version.</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>
<b>3. the Forest Heath context, constraints and our evidence base</b>				
<i>3.1-3.12 and noise constraints map</i>				
24665 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	To ensure all points are heard, please see attached.	The comments are noted. The Council is satisfied that the AECOM traffic studies provide evidence to support the level of development planned for Lakenheath. The noise contours have been updated and a modification suggested to the SALP as outlined in the signed statement of common ground between FHDC and the DIO.	No action required.
<i>When the new documents were released, they should have been added and included in the evaluation.</i>				
24793 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>Within this document the MOD, on the basis of the Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath (24th February 2017) objects to the following:</p> <p>Paragraph 3.9 and accompanying MOD Noise Contour 2015 Map - this should be supplemented with a reference to the Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath dated 24th February 2017.</p>	The comments are noted. A modification has been suggested to the SALP as set out in the signed statement of common ground between FHDC and the DIO.	<p>Insert the following text at paragraph 3.9 after '...RAF Lakenheath':</p> <p>'(based on Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath dated 24th February 2017).'</p>
24642 - Mr David Chandler [13004]	Object	<p>My vision is about social housing, jobs, RAF Mildenhall and infrastructure issues.</p> <p>I also want to seek reform in local government as staff have been axed but councillors are not reducing in size which I feel should be in all shared services in districts and county.</p> <p>I also wish to make representation on social care &amp; NHS issues so hope that can be taken on board as a new vision for the future.</p>	The comments are noted. Local government reform and social care are not within the remit of 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>
24727 - Mrs Sue Malina [13074]	Object	<p>3.10 I do not believe that the traffic capacity constraints have been correctly determined for Lakenheath in the Aecom study. Other traffic consultants have stated that the data was not collected or interpreted appropriately, with lower traffic flow times chosen to achieve the desired result! Other consultants have come to very different conclusions in terms of the amount of extra traffic these junctions can take and have also assessed the scheme for mitigating the junction as unsafe/dangerous. This is a key issue for the village and getting it wrong would have a huge impact on local people.</p> <p><i>New independent traffic study needed.</i></p>	The comments are noted. The Council is satisfied that the AECOM traffic studies provide evidence to support the level of development planned for Lakenheath.	No action required.
24898 - Anglian Water (Ms Hannah Wilson) [13062]	Object	<p><b>New Sites</b> The foul flows from future growth will have an impact on the existing foul sewerage network. There is insufficient capacity in the foul sewerage network to accommodate the majority of site allocations; as such infrastructure upgrade will be required. It is therefore crucial that development is phased to ensure Anglian Water can make timely improvements in order to meet the demand.</p> <p><b>Surface Water</b> With regards to surface water, disposal to surface water sewers should be seen as the last option when all sustainable urban drainage solutions (SUDs) and discharge direct to watercourses have been investigated and proven to be non viable. Anglian Water strongly recommends that there is inclusion of a district wide or site specific policy regarding SUDs in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. These issues will be addressed through the final IDP.</p> <p>Policy DM6 in the Joint Development Management Policies document sets out the district wide policy on flooding and sustainable drainage.</p>	No action required.
24827 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	<p>(See attached highways, education, Suffolk Fire and Rescue information within letter)</p> <p>Policy SA8 E states that each applicant must demonstrate satisfactory measures to mitigate the cumulative and individual effects of impacts to the highways network. The County Council will discuss with the District the possibility of this policy being applied to other settlements through a main modification to the respective policies.</p>	The comments are noted. A modification has been suggested for a new paragraph 3.12 to clarify the requirements in respect of cumulative impacts on the highways network. See signed statement of common ground between FHDC and SCC.	Modification suggested for new paragraph 3.12. See modification schedule and signed statement of common ground.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24782 - RSPB - Eastern England (Mr Mike Jones) [6257]	Support	We support the approach taken by the Council in the submission draft of the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP), which avoids adverse effects from new residential allocations on the Breckland Special Protection Area by avoiding allocations in close proximity to sensitive areas, as described in policy CS2 of the Core Strategy. We also support the commitment set out in 4.6 of the SALP to avoidance of the adverse effects of recreational pressure from new development and would be happy to offer our knowledge and experience on this issue if that would be helpful.	The comments are noted.	No action required.
24617 - Norfolk County Council (Ms Laura Waters) [11365]	Support	3.10-3.12 - Norfolk Council will expect to work closely with adjoining authorities on the delivery of major infrastructure with particular focus at Brandon.	The comments are noted.	No action required.

**Representations****Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan****Council's Assessment****Action****4. How have the sites been selected?****4.1-4.9**

24666 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]

Object

It's difficult for the people of Lakenheath not to feel that their community has been used as a planning substitute for all the housing that FHDC failed to secure in Newmarket. The needs of the horseracing industry took precedence over child welfare, with the failure to accept that it is not appropriate to site a school under a flight path, with noise at levels considered by the World Health Organisation and medical experts to affect cognitive development. With increased employment facilities in market towns why is there no suggestion of improved transport links as encouraged by the NPPF?

*A sequential approach to development occurring in the 3 market towns followed by the Key Service Centres as per national and local planning policy.*

Noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints within each settlement. The council is satisfied that the housing distribution is consistent with the settlement hierarchy.

No action required.

24869 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]

Object

4.5

The NHG has consistently raised concerns about the timing of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the preparation of the policies within this document. These are not addressed by the latest draft of the IDP, which again has been produced after the policies have been written rather than informing the policies as this paragraph suggests. The NHG considers that this renders the document unsound as it has not been adequately justified.

*The IDP should have been prepared to inform the policies that have subsequently been written. Further work is required on the IDP to confirm the infrastructure impacts arising from the site allocations that have been selected. This further work is required before the sites can be considered.*

The IDP is an evolving and iterative document, and this version has been informed by continuing dialogue with infrastructure and service providers and the study updates commissioned in 2015 and 2016.

Work will continue with infrastructure and service providers, and with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies to produce a final version of the IDP following examination and adoption of the SIR and 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>
24812 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	4.8 Newmarket Town Council is concerned that RAF Mildenhall is an acknowledged development alternative that has not been considered within the plan. NTC notes there is a commitment to a local plan review in 2018 but this is not policy. The site is of considerable importance to the district and hence the assessment of the site should be policy and undertaken as priority.	The comments are noted. Until there is certainty from the MOD over the future uses at RAF Mildenhall and their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site in the Site Allocations Local Plan or consider it as a reasonable alternative. See core document CD:D29 for updated statement from USAF confirming closure no earlier than 2024.	No action required.
24754 - Mr Philip Cobbold [7852]	Object	The Site Allocations Local Plan is unsound because it has not identified land adjoining Fiveways Roundabout, Barton Mills as an allocation for residential use. The site had previously been identified by the Council as a site for residential development in the SHLAA. The site would be a suitable location for large self-contained nursing home. The site can be considered as previously developed (brownfield) land having previously been put to commercial use during the construction works to widen the A11.  <i>Allocate the land adjoining the Fiveways Roundabout, Brandon for residential purposes.</i>	All sites in the 2016 SHLAA adjacent to the Fiveways roundabout are deferred for reasons of sustainability and impact on the SPA.	No action required
24873 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	4.8  The Plan unreasonably ignores the development potential of RAF Mildenhall and provides no firm commitment to the early review planning in early 2018 that is intended to address this issue.  <i>The plan should allow for the development potential of this site to be identified.</i>	The comments are noted. Until there is certainty from the MOD over the future uses at RAF Mildenhall and their deliverability and timescales for bringing the site forward, it is not possible to include the site in the Site Allocations Local Plan or consider it as a reasonable alternative. See core document CD:D29 for updated statement from USAF confirming closure no earlier than 2024.	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>
24882 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Support	See attached letter.  Natural England is satisfied that the current proposed submission does not require any further changes (in accordance with our remit). Your authority will be aware that Natural England provided comments at the Preferred Options stage and furthermore has provided advice and often had detailed discussion with the council regarding any of the allocations within sensitive areas. Therefore we have no further comments on the site allocations document itself but have commented in detail on the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the site allocations below, which we consider would benefit from additional text to improve clarity.	The comments are noted. The comments in relation to HRA are dealt with in respect of that document.	No action required.
24872 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Support	4.9  The NHG supports the deletion of Hatchfield Farm from the Plan following the recent Secretary of State decision on this site.  <i>The NHG is not seeking a change but would wish to be involved in any discussion regarding this site as it is keen to ensure that the concerns of the horse-racing industry are properly understood by the Inspector.</i>	The comments are noted.	No action required.
24811 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Support	4.9 Newmarket Town Council has consistently objected to the planning applications for Hatchfield Farm and hence supports the deletion of the site from the plan	The comments 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>
24828 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>(See attached letter)</p> <p>Natural Environment Public Rights of Way Landscape</p> <p>The use of landscape information in the new Landscape and Heritage Study to assess sites appropriately and give due weight to their landscape and historic landscape context is very welcome, as is the continued recognition of the importance and sensitivity of the Brecks landscape, as set out in Policy DM13.</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>The wildlife audit of allocated sites, undertaken by the Suffolk Wildlife Trust in 2015, which set out a ranking of allocated sites in terms of biodiversity value, provides a thorough evidence base to support the SALP policy to secure green infrastructure requirements. Furthermore accessible natural greenspace study (2017) which identified a deficiency of accessible natural greenspace at neighbourhood level, is a useful and important evidence base for the development of the open space standard and the SALP policy wording to secure green infrastructure requirements. Detailed consideration will need to be given to the policy mechanism for delivering accessible greenspace in the immediate vicinity of developments and particularly through providing connections and corridors to other open spaces. This will help mitigate recreational impacts on designated sites with the District, but importantly will also help to mitigate impacts on undesignated County Wildlife Sites in the areas of the proposed developments, which are also an important part of the biodiversity resource.</p>	The comments are noted. Accessible natural greenspace issues are dealt with in SALP policies where necessary and appropriate.	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>
<b>5. The settlements and site allocations</b>				
<i>Policy SA1 - Settlement boundaries</i>				
24874 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	Policy SA1 - this policy refers to housing proposals within settlement boundaries. For clarity and consistency the policies should clarify the Council's approach to such proposals in locations outside of settlement boundaries.	There are policies in the Joint Development Management Policies document to guide proposals for development outside settlement boundaries and in the countryside.	No action required.
24925 - The Brandon Strategic Land Development Limited Company [13124]	Object	*****LATE SUBMISSION*****  see attached  *****LATE SUBMISSION*****  <i>Amend Policies SA1 and SA2 to include land west of Brandon within the development boundary</i>	Policy SA1 defines the settlement boundaries on the Policies Map and sets out parameters for where development will be permitted within these boundaries. The land west of Brandon objection is dealt with under Policy SA2 - Brandon.	No action required.
24769 - Elveden Farms Ltd. [13111]	Object	RPS CgMs, on behalf of Elveden Farms Ltd, seek to object to the settlement boundary of the village of Icklingham.  <i>Extend the settlement boundary of the village of Icklingham to the south east to incorporate land which currently forms the car park of The Plough public house.</i>	The settlement boundaries have been reassessed in the 2017 Settlement Boundary Review document.  The settlement boundaries of secondary villages have not extended to allow residential growth as this would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy which states '...2. No urban expansion will be considered for these villages...'	No action required.
24889 - Gladman (Mr Richard Crosthwaite) [13119]	Object	The Policy should not be used as a mechanism to restrict otherwise sustainable development from coming forward in rural areas.	The settlement boundary is a line on a plan which denotes the boundary between a settlement and the countryside. Applications outside the settlement boundary will be assessed on their own merits in terms of sustainability in relation to policies in the adopted Joint Development Management Policies document.	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>
24712 - The Earl of Derby [5831]	Object	<p>The SA1 boundary at Preferred Options stage included the Hatchfield Farm allocation. The only reason why the allocation has been deleted is due to the recent Secretary of State refusal. This decision is the subject of a High Court challenge and the decision should be known prior to the public examination.</p> <p>- If the decision is quashed or circumstances change, the Preferred Options allocation (and SA1 boundary) should be reinstated in its entirety</p> <p>- If the decision is not quashed, the SA1 boundary should still be amended to provide for 5 hectares of employment land at Hatchfield Farm in order to allow the CS1 employment requirement at Newmarket to be met.</p> <p><i>The appropriate modification depends partly on the outcome of the High Court hearing in early April 2017. However, the decision should be known by the time of the public examination. The alternative options are</i></p> <p><i>- The High Court challenge succeeds and the Secretary of State's decision is quashed or other circumstances change (such as the resolution of the Rayes Lane crossing issue). In these circumstances, the full Hatchfield Farm allocation as proposed at the Preferred Options stage can be reinstated. This will modify the Policy SA1 boundary to that shown at Preferred Options stage (see Plan SS060854.21B)</i></p> <p><i>- The High Court challenge fails, but the need for additional employment land in Newmarket remains. Employment development at Hatchfield Farm was not part of the Secretary of State's decision and the SA1 built up area boundary should be amended as shown on Plan SS060854.21C to provide for 5 hectares of employment land in accordance with Policy CS1.</i></p>	<p>See the council's updated statement D:15b on Hatchfield Farm. In light of guidance in paragraph 47 (and its footnotes) of the NPPF, there is no 'reasonable prospect' at present that the site will be available for development and can be delivered/developed within the Plan period. There are sufficient alternative available, suitable and deliverable sites to meet the district's housing needs to 2031.</p>	No action required.

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
24625 - Mrs W Vale [12861]	Object	<p>Clearly villages further down the settlement hierarchy, such as Barton Mills, a secondary village, can provide modest residential growth through the plan period which will enable the village to remain vibrant and prosperous and also contribute to housing needs. In this instance the whole rationale behind the proposals has been misunderstood</p> <p><i>A minor alteration to the Barton Mills framework as proposed will enable small scale, controlled residential development to be brought forward.</i></p>	The settlement boundaries of secondary villages have not extended to allow residential growth as this would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy which states '...2. No urban expansion will be considered for these villages...'	No action required.
24622 - Mr & Mrs R Lewis [5666]	Object	<p>Clearly villages further down the settlement hierarchy, such as Barton Mills, a secondary village, can provide modest residential growth through the plan period which will enable the village to remain vibrant and prosperous and also contribute to housing needs. In this instances the whole rationale behind the proposals have been misunderstood</p> <p><i>A minor alteration to the Barton Mills framework as proposed will enable small scale, controlled residential development to be brought forward.</i></p>	The settlement boundaries of secondary villages have not extended to allow residential growth as this would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy which states '...2. No urban expansion will be considered for these villages...'	No action required.
24627 - Mr Stephen Griffiths [12866]	Object	<p>Moulton is a secondary village with a school, a pub, a shop and a church.</p> <p>It is right and proper (and positive planning) for the settlement boundary to reflect the form of the village on the ground. It is also positive planning to allow modest and appropriate growth in secondary villages to help meet the District's Objectively Assessed Housing Need.</p> <p>The settlement boundary shown on Map 14 Moulton does not reflect the settlement boundaries found on the ground. That part of Moulton lying east of the brook (the River Kennett) comprises 19 houses and should be included in the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The Conservation Area designation will protect the form of development that can take place within this new settlement.</p> <p><i>Amend Map 14 in accordance with amended Map 14 submitted herewith.</i></p>	The settlement boundaries of secondary villages have not extended to allow residential growth as this would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy which states '...2. No urban expansion will be considered for these 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>
<i>5.4.1-5.4.11 and Brandon settlement map</i>				
24798 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Object	Another constraint on development in Brandon, is the proximity of Lakenheath air base which is due to expand with the closure of Mildenhall base. The MoD have advised that the level of noise pollution is too high to allow further new housing to be built as the potential noise levels that the future occupants of the proposed dwellings will be exposed to are too high.	The comments are noted. See the Statement of Common Ground signed between the DIO and FHDC on 18.8.17 which withdraws the DIO's objections to the plan.	No action required.
24767 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	With regard to section 5.4.8, I would suggest that the traffic congestion in Brandon is largely limited to holiday periods and predominately Friday evenings and possibly Saturday mornings. Traffic congestion has greatly improved since the dualling of the A11 from Barton Mills to Thetford. I do not think that the traffic situation is worse than for any other market town on a holiday route (to Norfolk north coast for instance)	The comments are noted.	No action required.
24934 - Breckland District Council (Stephen Ottewell) [12936]	Support	<p><b>**LATE SUBMISSION**</b></p> <p>Breckland Council raises no concern in respect of Forest Heath District Council's housing distribution options now propose a low scale of growth, 2% (70 dwellings) for Brandon.</p> <p>Breckland Council welcomes that approach and the acknowledgment that before any more ambitious scale of development is proposed significant further evidence is required to address such matters as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Environmental impact on the Brecks and other ecologically sensitive habitats</li> <li>* Flooding</li> <li>* Landscape impact and the issues of avoiding any coalescence between Brandon and Weeting or undue harm to the landscape setting of either settlement</li> <li>* Analysis of the need for a relief road for Brandon post the dualling of the nearby A11</li> </ul>	The comments are noted.	No action required.
24618 - Norfolk County Council (Ms Laura Waters) [11365]	Support	5.48-5.4.10 - Norfolk Council will expect to work closely with adjoining authorities on the delivery of major infrastructure with particular focus at Brandon.	The comments 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>
24763 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Support	I support the limits proposed to development in Brandon - 71 more dwellings up to 2031. I agree that the constraint zones of the local SPAs (for stone curlew, night jar and woodlark) could not be overcome should development extend the settlement boundary (as has been proposed in the past).	The comments are noted.	No action required.
24830 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	See attached letter.  Primary School Provision Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document. Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage. Brandon: 33 dwellings/8 children Both sites allocated by Policy SA2 fall within the catchment of The Glade Primary, which forecasts suggest will not have sufficient capacity to accept the children emanating from the development. Developer contributions will be required to ensure provision for the children arising from the development can be made at the local primary school.  RoW Brandon No major strategic requirements are envisaged to support this scale of development, though rights of way improvements are likely to make an important contribution to reducing disturbance to designated habitats and species. Should significant development come forward, in line with previous development proposals to the north west, major improvements to the network would be required as mitigation. These would be expected to include enhancing the river corridor access and links to RSPB Lakenheath Fen.	The comments 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>
<i>5.4.12 - Site SA2(a) - Land at Warren Close and map</i>				
24751 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  SA2(a)  Lakenheath: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review. Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. 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/>				
<i>5.4.13 - Site SA2(b) - Land off Gas House Drove and map</i>				
24752 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. 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>
<i>Policy SA2 - Housing allocations in Brandon</i>				
24926 - The Brandon Strategic Land Development Limited Company [13124]	Object	****LATE SUBMISSION****  see attached	The site subject of this representation has been deferred for the following reasons (see the Omissions Sites Document 2016, B10 in the Core Documents library):  * SPA impacts. * The site would significantly advance the line of development towards the SPA. * There are additional issues relating to the impact of recreational pressure and the high value of the site for nature conservation, impact on the River Little Ouse green/blue corridor, landscape and heritage issues (listed buildings and conservation area). * Development would lead to the loss of many landscape features including the feeling of remoteness and peacefulness in the countryside and urban fringe areas.	No action required.
		****LATE SUBMISSION****  <i>Amend Policies SA1 and SA2 to include land west of Brandon within the development boundary</i>		
24794 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	Within this document the MOD, on the basis of the Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath (24th February 2017) objects to the following;  Policy SA2 Housing Allocations in Brandon.  It is DIO's contention that the Council should reconsider the allocations listed above in line with the requirements of the NPPF Paragraph 123, the supporting Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 3 and in line with the requirements of the Explanatory Note of the Noise Policy Statement for England.	Noted. The DIO has withdrawn this objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC dated 18.8.17.	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>5.4.14 and map</i>				
24775 - Mrs Anita de Lotbiniere [6677]	Object	I understand that this is a site of significant archaeological interest but that due to huge movements of sand in the past, evidence of such is likely to be very deep below the current ground surface. I would like the 'programme of archaeological work' mentioned in this section to include reference to this constraint so that there is no risk that any research is detailed and comprehensive enough to be of value.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.	No action required.
<i>Policy SA3 - Brandon Cemetery</i>				
24750 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 15.2m height zone, therefore any development exceeding this should be referred to this office for review.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24927 - The Brandon Strategic Land Development Limited Company [13124]	Support	The Applicant is supportive of this allocation and the land proposed for the cemetery falls within the red line boundary of the west of Brandon planning application. The land would be safeguarded for cemetery uses.	The comments 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>
<i>5.5.1-5.5.19 and Mildenhall settlement map</i>				
24921 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	<p>The Old Station Site, Mildenhall</p> <p>We have not seen sound evidence from the Council that demonstrates that our client's site is not appropriate as an allocation. We have had independent technical assessments undertaken to challenge the high-level points made by the Council, which demonstrate that the Council's assessment of the site is not justified in terms of paragraph 182 of the NPPF. These technical assessments accompany this consultation response. We have included further information about our client's site, demonstrating that it is in a suitable location for development, as well as deliverable in the short term, therefore can make an early contribution to meeting housing needs.</p> <p><i>We trust that our response to the consultation is helpful and that the necessary changes will be made to the emerging plan before it is submitted for Examination. We ask that this is addressed before the Plan is submitted for Examination and that our client's site is included as an allocation by making a proposed focused change to the Plan.</i></p>	<p>The district's housing requirement to 2031 can be met through the sites allocated in the plan. The site proposed is omitted in the Omission Sites evidence base document (CD ref B10).</p> <p>The site is considered to be in an unsustainable location.</p> <p>* There is the strong potential of coalescence with Barton Mills.</p> <p>* There is the potential for landscape impacts to the south of the town.</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>
24645 - Miss Jennifer Hall [13035] Object		<p>Infrastructure in Mildenhall: Mildenhall is a service centre for surrounding villages and communities, whose residents need to be able to access facilities such as libraries, clinics, dental practices and shops, so it is important to provide adequate parking facilities for the greatly increased population. Villages such as Barton Mills and Freckenham have a very reduced bus service, and there are no buses running on Sundays, so residents need to use cars to drive to Mildenhall, and they need to have adequate parking when they arrive. The car parks in Sainsbury's and Wilco have limits on parking time. The Jubilee Fields car park is some distance from the shops and is an uphill walk to the town centre, which is difficult for those with reduced walking ability. It would be helpful to provide additional parking at the swimming pool site when it is transferred to the hub site.</p> <p>Access to the Mildenhall hub. Traffic control at the junction of Queensway and Mildenhall High Street needs to be considered, also smooth traffic flow to the shopping area. The Courthouse Veterinary Clinic has a one-way traffic flow with an exit on to Queensway. Clients need to exit this site without excessive delays waiting for a gap in the traffic flow. It is important to provide pedestrian crossings in Queensway to allow residents to cross a road with increased traffic.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged in paragraph 5.5.12 of the SALP that development in the town will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</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>
24831 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>Primary School Provision</p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Mildenhall: 1412 dwellings/353 children Site SA4(a) is of a sufficient scale to justify a new primary school and the reference to this within the policy is welcomed. The sites identified within Policy SA5 are likely to contribute to the cost of the new school. Despite the fact that they fall within different catchments, the new school can create capacity by relieving pressure on the existing schools.</p> <p>RoW Mildenhall Significant improvements will be required to support development in Mildenhall, not least to reduce impacts on the SPA and SAC designations to the East. The County Council is already working with the District in order to identify the Rights of Way requirements for the Mildenhall Hub. Two existing rights of way will need to be rerouted and access to the services to be provided at the site will need to be provided. In 2014, the County Council completed substantial improvements to encourage people to walk and cycle between West Row and Mildenhall. This improved route has enhanced the level of accessibility to the Mildenhall Hub site, but further improvements will be required in order to ensure that the services based there can be easily accessed by sustainable modes from surrounding villages. Rights of Way within the housing element of site SA4</p>	<p>The comments regarding the support for a primary school on SA4(a) are noted.</p> <p>Permeability and rights of way will be one component for consideration in the production of the masterplan for 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>
		would ideally be located within green corridors. As identified in the policy, permeability with adjacent development will need to be established along with routes to key services in Mildenhall town centre and existing employment to the north.		
<i>5.5.20-5.5.21 - Site SA4(a) Focus of growth - Land west of Mildenhall and map</i>				
24899 - Anglian Water (Ms Hannah Wilson) [13062]	Object	Asset Encroachment Site SA4, Land west of Mildenhall, is in close proximity to a mains sewer and sites SA8 c and d are in close proximity to a sewer. Where there are sewers or water mains crossing the site, the site layout should be designed to take these into account; this existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The sewers or mains should be located in highways or public open space. If it is not possible to accommodate the existing sewers or mains within the design then diversion may be possible under section 185 of the of the Water Industry Act 1991 or entering into a build over/near agreement may be considered. I would draw your attention to Anglian Water encroachment policy <a href="http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/encroachme nt.aspx">http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/encroachme nt.aspx</a>	The comments are noted. See the statement of common ground (2 October 2017) between the Council and Anglian Water. One main and one additional modification are suggested to overcome the concerns.	See modifications schedule and Statement of Common ground for details of suggested and main and additional modifications to overcome concerns.
24753 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 15.2m height zone, therefore any development exceeding this should be referred to this office for review.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  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>
24916 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	The site does not have a planning consent, and a planning application should not come forward until it is confirmed as an allocation through the Examination of the Plans. The precise numbers and distribution of uses and access arrangements will be informed by a detailed masterplan for the site, with policy SA4 confirming that applications for planning permission can only be determined once the masterplan has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. It is therefore uncertain if as many as 1300 dwellings are actually achievable.	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that 1300 dwellings are not achievable on this site. See the statement of common ground between the Council and Suffolk County Council Corporate Property (19.9.17) and the attached delivery plan.</p> <p>The site is predicted to come forward in the latter two years of the 5 year land supply to allow for the preparation of the masterplan and planning application.</p>	No action required.
24682 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	<p>This site is outside the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but is within a highland area that drains into it</p> <p>Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed</p>	The comments are noted. These issues will be dealt with through the production of the masterplan for the site and any subsequent planning application.	No action required.
<i>Policy SA4 - Focus of growth - land west of Mildenhall</i>				
24718 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Object	<p>It is unrealistic and unachievable to deliver 1,300 houses on this site by 2031 along with the other infrastructure proposed. There is no trajectory to demonstrate how the Council expects the site to be delivered. The site does not currently have planning permission nor has an application been submitted. Realistically, if the development is to be properly planned and delivered, then a maximum of 500 houses could be achieved during this plan period. Site SA4 should be allocated to deliver 500 houses. Sites such as RL/07 which are deliverable should be allocated to deliver the shortfall.</p> <p><i>Reduce the housing from 1,300 to 500 houses on site SA4 during the lifetime of this Local Plan and include other sustainable and deliverable housing sites to meet the shortfall, such as site RL/07.</i></p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that 1300 dwellings are not achievable on this site. See the statement of common ground between the Council and Suffolk County Council Corporate Property (19.9.17) and the attached delivery plan.</p> <p>The site is predicted to come forward in the latter years of the 5 year land supply to allow for the preparation of the masterplan and planning application.</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>
24821 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	Given the scale of the site, this policy seems appropriate. The intent is to ensure that the design and layout can consider the need to preserve complex remains in situ, hence it would be helpful to carry out archaeological evaluation in time to inform the masterplan.	The comments are noted. Archaeological evaluation will be carried out an early stage as indicated in requirement 'F' to Policy SA4a.	No action required.
24760 - Suffolk County Council [13110]	Support	PLEASE SEE UPLOADED REPRESENTATION LETTER AND ATTACHMENTS.	See the statement of common ground between the Council and Suffolk County Council Corporate Property (19.9.17) which withdraws the request for a modification.	No action required.
<i>5.5.22 - Site SA5(a) - Land at 54 Kingsway and map</i>				
24611 - Mrs Millar [12847]	Object	I have marked in red the correct boundary between my property, 56 Kingsway, and 54 Kingsway. Please not the remaining boundary is correct. If you require verification of the amendment, the Land Registry will be able to provide the necessary details. <i>boundary change</i>	The comments are noted. A modification is required to amend the site boundary.	A modification has been suggested to amend the site boundary around 54 and 56 Kingsway in accordance with land registry details.
24755 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  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>5.5.23 - Site SA5(b) - District Council Offices, College Heath Road and map</i>				
24756 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 15.2m height zone, therefore any development exceeding this should be referred to this office for review.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  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>
24917 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	There is considerable uncertainty relating to when the decision to make these sites available will occur during the plan period. Despite this, the Council has included the full 89 units within the current 5-year housing land supply. This is completely unrealistic given that a number of public buildings need to be closed and relocated.	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>Policy SA5 - Housing allocations in Mildenhall</i>				
24813 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	The archaeological requirement referenced in this policy could potentially be moved to supporting text. It is Site SA5(b) (District Council Offices), rather than Site SA5(a), which will require desk based evaluation. This is in order to locate (and so avoid) any former Work House cemetery. Even if the District does not wish to move the requirement to supporting text, this policy needs amending to refer to the correct site.  <i>The archaeological requirement referenced in this policy could potentially be moved to supporting text. It is Site SA5(b) (District Council Offices), rather than Site SA5(a), which will require desk based evaluation. This is in order to locate (and so avoid) any former Work House cemetery. Even if the District does not wish to move the requirement to supporting text, this policy needs amending to refer to the correct site.</i>	The comments are noted. A modification is required.	A main modification has been suggested to clarify it is site SA5(b) which requires a pre determination desk based assessment.
<i>5.6.1-5.6.17 and Newmarket settlement map</i>				
24875 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	5.6.11  The Plan fails to refer to the constraints to the north east of the settlement despite the clarification of this issue in the recent Hatchfield Farm decision and the information in the Council's existing and emerging evidence base.  <i>Acknowledge that development to the north east of the settlement is constrained by its potential impact on the horse-racing industry, particularly along the horse crossings</i>	The comments are noted. Paragraph 5.6.8 adequately explains that settlement expansion is significantly constrained by the HRI.	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>
24848 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	<p>See attached letter on surface water management.</p> <p>The following sites have some specific issues which will require significant consideration at the planning application stage.</p> <p>SA6 (d) and SA6 (e): Flood Risk Assessment will be required in order to consider the relationship with the Number 1 Drain. All development proposals will need to consider the County Council's Flood Risk Management Strategy for Newmarket. Development proposals outside this plan should not compromise the implementation of this strategy, and reference to the Strategy could helpfully be included in the supporting text, within or alongside paragraphs 5.6.15 or 5.6.16. A minor modification should be made to state</p> <p>'The Newmarket Surface Water Management Plan is developing proposals for reducing flood risk in the town. Development proposals should have regard to whether they impact on the emerging strategy.'</p>	<p>The comments are noted - A minor modification has been suggested to paragraph 5.6.8 to reference the Newmarket Surface Water Management Plan. See signed statement of common ground between FHDC and SCC.</p>	<p>Para 5.6.8 - Insert new 11th bullet point:</p> <p>the Newmarket Surface Water Management Plan is developing proposals for reducing flood risk in the town. Development proposals should have regard to whether they impact on the emerging strategy.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24632 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Object	<p>East Cambridgeshire District Council objects to the lack of a policy (and associated Policies Map allocation) which safeguards the route of the 'Newmarket Curve' for future re-opening as a railway.</p> <p>The failure of a district-wide 'allocations' Local Plan (which is what is being prepared) to not allocate the curve as a safeguarded route for potential future re-opening as a railway (despite the wealth of support for such a scheme in a variety of documents) means the Local Plan is unsound, because it is not effective.</p> <p><i>Policies Map 15 (Newmarket) needs to appropriately geographically illustrate the safeguarded route</i></p> <p><i>To overcome this soundness issue, the plan needs to:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Include a new section in the plan entitled 'Allocations for safeguarding land for future infrastructure', within which a short policy should be included as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Policy X: Land Safeguarded for Future Infrastructure Needs</i>  <i>The Policies Map identifies land which is safeguarded for the following future strategic infrastructure requirements:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Newmarket Curve - safeguarded for future re-opening as a railway.</i></p> <p><i>Any proposal, either within or near the above safeguarded area, which would prejudice the future delivery of the identified infrastructure item, will be refused.</i></p> <p><i>(b) Policies Map 15 (Newmarket) needs to appropriately geographically illustrate the safeguarded route</i></p>	Noted. Objection withdrawn by ECDC email of 18.09.17.	Objection withdrawn by ECDC email of 18.09.17.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24832 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>Primary School Provision</p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Newmarket: 321 dwellings/80 children</p> <p>Whilst this figure is challenging as it is so small, it is noted that site SA6(b) is likely to provide additional dwellings. The preferred approach is to establish a new primary school, in order to provide greater flexibility for any future development and, given existing pressures, to manage population growth. The former Scaltback Middle School is reasonably well related to the proposed development sites.</p> <p>The allocation of the former St Felix Middle School site (SA6(d)) for housing is appropriate, given the inclusion of a school site within the Hatchfield Farm Section 106 agreement. However, until the final outcomes of the Hatchfield Farm judicial review are known the site may not be immediately available for residential development.</p> <p>RoW Newmarket</p> <p>A key strategic pedestrian and cycle link in Newmarket is the 'Yellow Brick Road' which runs north to south through the town as a blue/green corridor as well as walking and cycling route. As development comes forward, sites will be considered in respect of any necessary and proportionate contributions which could be made to improving this route, in addition to any specific requirements. The reference in Policy SA6 to the role of Site SA6(d) in protecting/enhancing this route is welcomed.</p>	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>5.6.18 - Site SA6(a) - Land at Brickfields Stud, Exning Road and map</i>				
24649 - Mr R Rix [12585]	Object	Both of the Newmarket proposals would use racing stud land which if allowed would make the appeal decision not to all the Hatchfield Farm development hypocrisy	The comments are noted. Policy DM49 allows allocation of land in HRI use to other uses through the local plan adoption process.	No action required
24757 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.  Cambridge: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
24876 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	The allocation raises concerns about the potential adverse impact of the development on the horse racing industry. The importance of this industry to both Newmarket and the wider area is well-documented in the Council's existing and emerging evidence base.  <i>Deletion of allocation</i>	DM49 allows allocation of HRI uses. Sufficient land remains for an operational HRI use with only 2.9ha proposed as a site allocation to the East of Exning Rd. Any specific impacts on the HRI generated by development can be dealt with at the planning application stage by policies in the Joint Development Management Local Plan Document, including DM45 and DM50.	No action required.
24814 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	This site is covered within the horse racing industry and hence it is contrary to policy. However, NTC notes that part of the stud is proposed for development only, and can see that there is merit in the land to the east of Exning Road being split from the remainder of the stud.	Policy DM49 allows allocation of land in HRI use to other uses through the local plan adoption 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>
24680 - RWS Ltd [12659]	Support	<p>This representation is made of behalf of the owners of the site identified as SA6(a), to support the allocation of the site for residential development.</p> <p>The site does not have any environmental, historic or physical constraints that would prevent development for housing. The site is suitable, available and achievable for development. It is immediately adjacent to the current settlement boundary for Newmarket and is in close proximity to a wide range of services. The site is therefore in a sustainable location for housing.</p> <p>The proposal also accords with the aims of the Housing White Paper, published February 2017.</p>	The comments are noted.	No action required.
<i>5.6.19 - Site SA6(b) - Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction and map</i>				
24815 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	<p>NTC is concerned that whilst this site is identified for mixed use there is no clarification in the policy as to the nature of uses. However NTC is encouraged to see a development brief is to be developed for this site and that the brief is to be developed in conjunction with the landowner, public and horse racing industry. NTC would welcome participation within this brief.</p>	The comments are noted. Uses will be determine by a feasibility study and development brief.	No action required.
24758 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p> <p>Cambridge: Site Outside of Safeguarding Area.</p>	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with safeguarding procedures.	No action required
24918 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	<p>We understand that whilst this site is vacant it has a long and complex planning history. No capacity is indicated for this site as it is subject to a design brief which casts doubt on what the site will deliver given the range of factors to be met, which include the need to retain a horse racing industry related use on the site. We do not consider that the site is a justified choice for inclusion in the plan as there is absolutely no certainty about whether anything can be delivered on it, or when.</p>	No dwelling capacity is indicated and the site is not counted as contributing towards meeting the district's OAN.	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>
24933 - Historic England (Alice Eggeling) [13126]	Object	<p>We have specific comment to make with regard to Site SA6(b) Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive (also known as Queensbury Lodge Stables), a site with a long and complex planning history. We note that the site has been allocated for mixed-use development without any specified quantum of development. We are pleased to note that development at the site will be guided by a development brief which should seek to retain and reuse listed buildings and equestrian uses on the site, which combine to contribute to Newmarket's local distinctiveness.</p> <p>We are concerned however that appropriate retention of openness of the paddock fronting Rowley Lane would be difficult to reconcile with an allocation for mixed use development washing over this valued open-space as a 'mixed-use' allocation with the Local Plan. As noted in the Evidence paper for SIR of Core Strategy Policy CS7 the paddocks are considered to make an important contribution to the character of the conservation area and listed buildings. Any development must facilitate the sympathetic restoration and viable reuse of the listed buildings, have regard to their setting, retain a horse racing industry related use on the site and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (Para 10.14)</p> <p>We understand that refurbishment of the listed stables is likely to need to be associated with a financially viable scheme which may include an increase in the capacity of the site to accommodate horses via the creation of more stables. This in turn may rely on the provision of residential housing within the site.</p> <p>We suggest that a pragmatic solution is to exclude the paddock at the north of the site where it borders The Rows and Black Bear Lane. Retention of the three parcels of land around Nos. 200- 214 High Street would allow for development of the stable yard (into the piece of land at the rear) and redevelopment of the land fronting the High Street (currently supporting the derelict White Lion Public House).</p>	See statement of common ground between Historic England and Forest Heath District Council.	Additional and main modifications required to paragraph 5.6.19 and policy SA6 as proposed by the statement of common ground between Historic England and Forest Heath District Council.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>By focusing development onto these three parcels of land, there would be no uncertainty as to the continued status of the paddock. If this piece of land were to be included as an allocated site, there would be an unacceptable degree of development pressure on this important open space within the Newmarket Conservation Area, a heritage asset already identified to be at risk.</p> <p>We strongly urge that the site allocation is amended to exclude the paddock at an appropriate point north of Falmouth Avenue. Without this amendment we are unable to support the allocation as sound.</p> <p><i>We strongly urge that the site allocation is amended to exclude the paddock at an appropriate point north of Falmouth Avenue. Without this amendment we are unable to support the allocation as sound.</i></p>		
24877 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	<p>Lack of clarification about the nature of the uses proposed or the quantum of development. Absence of any consideration of potential impacts giving rise to the potential for adverse impacts on the horse racing industry. The importance of this industry to both Newmarket and the wider area is well-documented in the Council's existing and emerging evidence base.</p> <p><i>The allocation needs to specify the appropriate range of uses and the scale of development that is acceptable at this site so that the impacts can be identified and appraised as part of the cumulative assessment for all sites in Newmarket.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted. Uses and the scale of development will be determined by a development brief and informed by existing constraints and the need to return the listed buildings at risk on the site to a viable use. Impacts can be accessed in the preparation of the brief and when determining any subsequent application.</p>	no action required.
24681 - The Unex Group (Mr Stephen Walsh) [5804]	Support	<p>This is a highly sustainable site on the High Street which includes brownfield land, derelict and redundant buildings and vacant and unused former paddock land. The proposed allocation for a mixed use development is supported. The site can deliver much needed market and affordable homes together with creating jobs and employment in new offices. In addition, the owners of the Queensbury Lodge site, the Gredley Charitable Trust, are proposing to provide and run a care home for the elderly on a not-for-profit basis. This proposed allocation is to be welcomed and supported.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p>	No action required.



## 5.6.20 - Site SA6(c) - Land at Phillips Close and grassland south-west of Leaders Way/Sefton Way and map

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.6.20 - Site SA6(c) - Land at Phillips Close and grassland south-west of Leaders Way/Sefton Way and map</i>				
24878 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	Land at Phillips Close etc. - The NHG continues to support this allocation but is concerned to see the removal of the intention for this site to deliver housing for those involved in the horse racing industry. This was included in the early draft of this plan and supported by the NHG. The removal of this requirement conflicts with the statement at para 5.6.4 of this document.  <i>Reinstate the reference to the site delivering housing for those employed in the horse-racing industry.</i>	Occupancy is a matter for the land owner / developer. Para 5.6.4 recognises the need for affordable housing within the town noting the HRI is the largest employer and that 65% are not employed in the HRI.	No action required.
24605 - Lesley Maclaren [13007]	Object	The issues are the impact on the horse racing industry . Extra traffic on the already busy Hamilton road where there are many training yards, also Churchill Avenue is busy enough without any added through traffic there might be.!	The comments are noted. These issues will be addressed through the production of the development brief / any subsequent planning application.	No action required.
24607 - Mrs Christine Carter [13010]	Object	I am writing to express my views as I do not agree with the proposed plans put forward by the Jockey Club to building 145 dwellings on the above land. I feel that any extra traffic using this road would be a nightmare, this road is already a very busy road even more so when it is racing. Surely it makes sense to build houses which I totally understand we need, but on the outskirts of the town re Hatchfield Farm or such like to keep the traffic to the minimum on the roads that are already busy. Also the comment about most of the residents in the new houses would walk or use bikes where does that come from most people have a car these days don't they ???	The comments are noted. These issues will be addressed through the production of the development brief / any subsequent planning application.	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>
24602 - Mrs Shirley Gallagher [12846]	Object	<p>I do not agree with the proposed plans put forward by the Jockey Club to the building of 145 dwellings on the above land. The reasons being that the site Leaders Way/ Sefton Way are :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An area of natural beauty whereby this will be to the loss of birds and wildlife, these green areas must be protected.</li> <li>2. The building of 145 dwellings will naturally increase the road traffic to Hamilton Road, an already busy and dangerous corner, with many training yards already in situ, which will become hazardous to horse and rider and to the general public.</li> <li>3. Also from the plans, some of the proposed units will have entry and exit onto Churchill Avenue, a few years back when this was proposed I understand that Suffolk Highways reported that the road was not wide enough, especially for rescue vehicles to negotiate should this be necessary, we now understand the number of units proposed have increased!!</li> <li>4. I fear that parking could spill onto Churchill Avenue, already a narrow roadway, as each unit has only one parking lot and as we know there will no doubt be at least two cars per household!! This could prove very hazardous!!</li> </ol> <p>(I note that your Local Plan states access via Hamilton Road, no mention of Churchill Avenue) please could you explain!!!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. I also understand that there could be a flooding problem when surface water is going to be directed to soakaways instead of naturally over the grassland. It already floods at the western end of the paddock.</li> <li>6. I am very concerned that the proposal to connect to the existing Foul Drainage, which has to go to the Pumping Station and pumped to the Exning Road main Foul Drain, will not cope with the extra amount of foul waste from all the extra units.</li> </ol> <p>The issues are exactly the same, as the Hatchfield Development that was rejected, as much as the impact on the horseracing industry, extra traffic on an already busy Hamilton Road; where there are many training yards which will also be disturbed by increased traffic. Close proximity of horses training in the very same area will undoubtedly put human and horses lives in danger.</p>	The comments are noted. These issues will be addressed through the production of the development brief / any subsequent planning application.	No action required.

## 5.6.20 - Site SA6(c) - Land at Phillips Close and grassland south-west of Leaders Way/Sefton Way and map

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24919 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	This is a very similar position to SA6 (b) with a development brief required, and the associated timescales for this to be progressed. Additionally, the archaeological position is uncertain and needs to be addressed at an early stage. However, 117 dwellings are indicated, with the delivery of the entire site being assumed within the next 5 years, with delivery beginning as early as 2018/19.	Occupancy is a matter for the land owner / developer. Para 5.6.4 recognises the need for affordable housing within the town as a whole, noting the HRI is the largest employer but that 65% are not employed in the HRI.	No action required.
24819 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	NTC is concerned that the previous restriction on occupation of any residential property by the horse racing industry has been removed and question why this has occurred  <i>The planning issues for Newmarket are complex and hence it is appropriate NTC attend any hearing sessions</i>	Occupancy is a matter for the land owner/developer.	No action required.
24606 - Mr Reginald Bailey [12838]	Object	The scope of their proposals contradicts that proposed for area N1(d) as part of the discussion process now in hand as follows:  A More than one access from Hamilton Road i.e. new access from Churchill Avenue.  B removal of bushes (including its associated wildlife) !	The comments are noted. These issues will be addressed through the production of the development brief / any subsequent planning application.	No action required.

## 5.6.20 - Site SA6(c) - Land at Phillips Close and grassland south-west of Leaders Way/Sefton Way and map

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24908 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [12903]	Object	<p>The site was previously identified in the Preferred Options version of the SALP (under site reference (d) and (f)) as an allocation for residential use to meet the needs of those employed in or retired from the Horse Racing Industry. This reference has now been omitted and the allocation is solely for an unrestricted residential use.</p> <p>Our client objects to the current wording at paragraph 5.6.20, and under Policy SA6 itself, of omitting the reference to the site delivering housing for those employed in or retired from the Horse Racing Industry and requests that this is reinstated.</p> <p>The removal of this requirement conflicts with the statement at para 5.6.4 of the SALP. Furthermore, it should be noted that given the site's location and interaction with existing, adjoining racehorse training assets then the site is not considered suitable for development which is not racing related. It should also be noted that the site is currently subject to pre-application discussions with Forest Heath District Council (FHDC) for a residential development to meet the needs of people employed in or retired from the Horse Racing Industry. There is an identified local housing need to develop the site for racing related housing and discussions are now well progressed with officers at FHDC.</p> <p>It is anticipated that an application will be submitted in April 2017. Therefore, a development brief will not be necessary</p> <p><i>Our client requests that paragraph 5.6.20 is reworded as follows:</i></p> <p><i>This site has two distinctive elements: Phillips Close to the south is an existing residential area which has been developed at a relatively low density. This site is allocated to meet the needs of people employed in the Horse Racing Industry. To the north the site comprises a strip of grassland with an associated access track from Hamilton Road. Residential uses are predominantly to the north and east and a gallop and stables to the west</i></p>	Occupancy is a matter for the land owner / developer. Para 5.6.4 recognises the need for affordable housing within the town as a whole, noting the HRI is the largest employer but that 65% are not employed in the HRI.	No action required.

## 5.6.20 - Site SA6(c) - Land at Phillips Close and grassland south-west of Leaders Way/Sefton Way and map

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24603 - Mr K Hugman [13003]	Object	<p>I have been walking this field for 25 years and find it most upsetting that the land has been earmarked for new homes at the expense of the natural habitat.</p> <p>Churchill Avenue is not wide enough to cope with an increased volume of traffic if used as an access road.</p> <p>The corner of the field near the pumping station is prone to flooding.</p>	The comments are noted. These issues will be addressed through the production of the development brief / any subsequent planning application.	No action required.
24759 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.</p> <p>Cambridge: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.</p>	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
<i>5.6.21 - Site SA6(d) - Former St Felix Middle School site and map</i>				
24879 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	<p>Inadequate consideration of the impact of residential development at this site on the movement of horses in the vicinity. This gives rise to potential for adverse impacts on the horse racing industry. The importance of this industry to both Newmarket and the wider area is well-documented in the Council's existing and emerging evidence base.</p> <p><i>Delete allocation or provision evidence to confirm the assertions made.</i></p>	Proposed residential use unlikely to generate more traffic than former school use. 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>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24881 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Chris Phillips) [13118]	Object	<p>Corporate Property agrees with the allocation of the site SA6(d) (Former St Felix Middle School Site) for housing purposes and also agree the need for suitable open spaces within any future development. Our comments relate to the assumptions made on the open space as in the wording highlighted below.</p> <p>"5.6.21 This site comprises playing fields, hardstandings and some other outbuildings associated with the former school and lies to the north-east of the town within the settlement boundary. The site comprises the footprint of the former school, outbuildings, sports pitches, courts and playing fields. The site is allocated in its entirety although the suggested residential capacity reflects retention of the open space."</p> <p>This suggests that any development would be restricted to the area where the school itself stood with the open spaces including hard play areas and playing field area all retained as open space. We would propose that any future development would be served by retaining open space in an organic way and in accordance with relevant planning policies relating to open space requirements and green infrastructure strategies for the town. It is acknowledged that any development/disposal of school playingfield (including former school playingfield) will be subject to consent under Section 77 of the School Standards and Frameworks Act. We understand that due to uncertainty on the outcome of any Section 77 application the plan needs to make assumptions about the residential capacity. SCC as landowner will work with FHDC to understand how the open space planned to come forward at this site fits into the green infrastructure strategy for the town as a whole.</p> <p>However, not to restrict the capacity in planning policy terms we would suggest alternative wording such as: "The site is allocated in its entirety although the suggested residential capacity currently reflects retention of the open space. Appropriate development of any of the open spaces will be assessed through the detailed planning process and other relevant statutory processes."</p>	<p>It is considered desirable to retain the playing fields and tennis courts for public access and use on this site. The wording as submitted allows design flexibility at the application stage. Capacity assessments carried out at the preferred options stage have shown that the policy criteria are achievable.</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>We would suggest alternative wording such as: "The site is allocated in its entirety although the suggested residential capacity currently reflects retention of the open space. Appropriate development of any of the open spaces will be assessed through the detailed planning process and other relevant statutory processes."</i>		
24824 - Newmarket Town Council (Mr John Morrey) [12910]	Object	NTC consider it is premature to consider this site for housing when the neighbourhood plan is recommending its use as a sports hub with the adjacent George Lambton playing fields.  Furthermore the Fordham Road on which this site is located is frequently congested with traffic and hence any development of this site must fully assess the traffic impact prior to any housing allocations.	See Suffolk County Council response re school sites. There is a restrictive Covenant on Scaltback so site is not available or deliverable.	No action required.
24761 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.  Cambridge: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
<i>5.6.22 - Site SA6(e) - Land adjacent to Jim Joel Court and map</i>				
24762 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with safeguarding procedures.	No action required.
<i>5.6.23 - Site SA6(f) - Land at 146a High Street and map</i>				
24766 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with 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>
<i>Policy SA6 - Housing and mixed use allocations in Newmarket</i>				
24638 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Liz Marchington) [5853]	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Housing numbers too low</li> <li>* Does not follow sequential approach to development</li> <li>* Affordable housing provision at risk</li> <li>* Newmarket has a good level of infrastructure which is underutilised.</li> <li>* Contrary to local planning policy CS1 Red Lodge point 4.</li> <li>* The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.</li> </ul> <p><i>* The majority of development for the district should be placed in and around the 3 market towns.</i></p> <p><i>* Development across the district needs to follow a sequential approach especially at Newmarket which is readily able to accept more growth if the developer ensures adequate steps are taken to mitigate against the impact to the horse racing community.</i></p> <p><i>* The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.</i></p>	<p>Noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints within each settlement. The council is satisfied that the housing distribution is consistent with the Core Strategy's vision for the district, its settlement specific visions, spatial objectives and settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>In light of guidance in paragraph 47 of the NPPF (and its footnotes) there is no 'reasonable prospect' at present that the Hatchfield site will be available for development and can be delivered/developed within the Plan period. There are sufficient alternative available, suitable and deliverable sites to meet the district's housing needs to 2031.</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>
24713 - The Earl of Derby [5831]	Object	<p>The SALP Preferred Options included the Hatchfield Farm site as allocation N1(c) for 400 homes, a minimum of 5 hectares of employment land and a 1.5 hectare primary school site. The only reason why the allocation has been deleted is due to the recent Secretary of State refusal. This decision is the subject of a High Court challenge and the decision should be known prior to the public examination. If the decision is quashed or other circumstances change, the Preferred Options allocation at Hatchfield Farm should be reinstated in its entirety.</p> <p><i>The appropriate modification depends partly on the outcome of the High Court hearing in early April 2017. However, the decision should be known by the time of the public examination. If the High Court challenge succeeds and the Secretary of State's decision is quashed, the full Hatchfield Farm allocation as proposed at the Preferred Options stage can be reinstated. This will modify the Policy SA6 boundary to that shown on Plan SS060854.21B and add the site to Policy SA6 as allocation SA6(g) for 400 homes, at least 5 hectares of employment land and a 1.5 hectare primary school site. The proposed text for the modified Policy SA6 is attached. Even if the High Court challenge fails, the sustainable credentials of the site mean that it could be identified as a reserve site pending the resolution of the horse crossing issues identified by the Secretary of State.</i></p> <p><i>See attached sheets B1 and B2</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Secretary of States decision of 31st August 2016 regarding Hatchfield Farm was quashed in the High Court in May 2017 and permission to appeal that decision was refused in August 2017. The Hatchfield Farm planning application for 400 dwellings and associated development remains with the Secretary of State to re-issue a decision. It is not known when that decision will be issued, or what that decision will be.</p> <p>In light of guidance in paragraph 47 of the NPPF (and its footnotes) there is no 'reasonable prospect' at present that the Hatchfield site will be available for development and can be delivered/developed within the Plan period. There are sufficient alternative available, suitable and deliverable sites to meet the district's housing needs to 2031.</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>
24909 - Jockey Club Estates Ltd [12903]	Object	<p>Jockey Club Estates Ltd requests changes to the wording of Policy SA6: Housing and mixed use allocations in Newmarket.</p> <p>As referred to previously in these representations, a development brief is not necessary.</p> <p>The reference to an archaeological evaluation being required should also be deleted as will be dealt with in the determination of the planning application for the site. Furthermore, land at Philipps Close is a previously developed site with 31 existing houses in situ. JCE Ltd would question why an archaeological evaluation would be required on this site as no doubt copious dwelling foundations and road, pavements etc, which exist on site would not be appropriate to be able to conduct any meaningful archaeology investigations.</p> <p><i>change SA6 site c wording to read:</i></p> <p><i>Site (c) is allocated for residential use to meet the needs of those employed in or retired from the Horse Racing Industry.</i></p>	<p>The reference to archaeological evaluation in Site SA6(c) is suggested for deletion through a main modification. See statement of common ground between SCC and the Council and the modifications schedule.</p>	<p>The reference to archaeological evaluation in Site SA6(c) is suggested for deletion through a main modification.</p>
24672 - Rural Parish Alliance (Mr Bill Rampling) [12706]	Object	<p>Does not follow sequential development</p> <p>Infrastructure exists in Newmarket to support greater housing numbers</p> <p>The allocation of the Hatchfield farm site should be retained</p> <p>Housing numbers for Newmarket are too low</p> <p>Such a small amount of market housing at Newmarket will not provide the affordable housing levels required there.</p> <p><i>Greater levels of growth need to be allocated to Newmarket and the market towns within the district.</i></p> <p><i>Housing should follow a sequential approach to development.</i></p> <p><i>The Hatchfield farm site should be retained.</i></p>	<p>Noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints within each settlement. The council is satisfied that the housing distribution is consistent with the Core Strategy's vision for the district, its settlement specific visions, spatial objectives and settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>In light of guidance in paragraph 47 of the NPPF (and its footnotes) there is no 'reasonable prospect' at present that the Hatchfield site will be available for development and can be delivered/developed within the Plan period. There are sufficient alternative available, suitable and deliverable sites to meet the district's housing needs to 2031.</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>
24737 - The EG Lambton 1974 Settlement (Mr George Lambton) [13104]	Object	<p>Policy SA6 is unsound. It is not positively prepared because it does not meet Newmarket's OAN and Affordable Housing Requirements. The removal of Site N1(c) from the list of allocated sites and the consequential reduction in the level of housing provision demonstrates that Policy SA6 is not justified because an alternative, allocating additional sites to insure against non-delivery has not been considered. It is not effective because the deliverability of other sites is questioned. Reinstating Site N18 as an Allocation Site subject, to satisfactory replacement sports facilities will make Policy SA6 positively prepared, more effective and consistent with national policy.</p> <p><i>Site N18 should be removed from the List of Omission Sites and re-instated as an Allocation Site for Mixed Use under Policy SA6, subject to a satisfactory strategy being advanced in relation to the replacement sport and recreation facilities as with the previous allocation in the 1995 Local Plan. This will increase the certainty of delivery of the overall housing provision for Newmarket, thereby ensuring that Policy SA6 is positively prepared, more effective and consistent with national policy.</i></p>	<p>Noted. Site N/18 is deferred in the November 2016 Omission sites document, as the site would result in the loss of valued community open space (designated formal open space).</p> <p>There are sufficient sites identified in the Site Allocations Local Plan to meet the distribution set out in Policy CS7.</p>	No action required.
24816 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	<p>At present, an archaeological condition is identified in policy as a requirement for site (c). Conditions are likely to be required for sites (b), (c), (d) and (f). It may be more appropriate to identify this requirement in supporting text, but if conditions are to be identified in policy, an amendment is required to cover more sites.</p> <p><i>At present, an archaeological condition is identified in policy as a requirement for site (c). Conditions are likely to be required for sites (b), (c), (d) and (f). It may be more appropriate to identify this requirement in supporting text, but if conditions are to be identified in policy, an amendment is required to cover more sites.</i></p>	A main modification suggested to SA6(c). See the statement of common ground between SCC and the Council and the modifications schedule.	A main modification suggested to SA6(c).
24897 - Sport England (East) (Mr Philip Raiswell) [5825]	Support	Sport England supports allocation SA6 (d) (Former St Felix Middle School) provided the allocation seeks to protect the existing sports facilities and former playing fields for community use, and provides connectivity to the adjoining George Lambton Playing Fields.	Comments 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>
<i>5.7.1-5.7.8 and Lakenheath settlement map</i>				
24647 - Ms Toni Mitchell [13068]	Object	<p>I am writing as I am concerned regarding the above plans for the village of Lakenheath.</p> <p>We do not need any more homes built in the village when driving around there are always several houses with "To Let" signs.</p> <p>Our doctors surgery would not be able to cope with extra residents - it recently took me 2 weeks to see a doctor so how much longer will it take if we have more people coming to the village? More cars on the roads, the average person has at least two per household, - meaning at least another 160 cars on the roads which are congested enough (especially when roadworks are carried out).</p> <p>Another school under the flight path of RAF Lakenheath would hardly be good for children trying to learn??</p> <p>Please planners rethink your plans!!</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p>	no action required
24652 - Diane Poplawski [13070]	Object	<p>increase traffic parking police station roads money infrastructure public transport Lakenheath's future cost of new homes jobs</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery 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>
24906 - M Burroughs [8509]	Object	<p>Please accept this e-mail as our representation for all the planning applications being considered for Lakenheath. We strongly do not agree with any of the proposals, Lakenheath is a small village and should be kept small. Far too much is being considered for Lakenheath. Our roads, doctors surgery and school cannot cope with the amount of planning proposals you are considering. We do not agree with the school being in the USAF flight path, it is ludicrous to consider this. Consider the noise to the pupils and what if an aircraft crashed whilst trying to take off or land, think of the serious consequences this could have.</p> <p>It is bad enough as it is with the numbers of traffic in the village. What about employment too, where are all these people going to work.</p> <p>Please do not pass all these plans.</p>	<p>The IDP (CD:C19) sets out the infrastructure required to address the needs of the SIR and mechanisms how this will be delivered.</p> <p>The proposed school lies within the noise contour 66dB, the SofCG between the Council and the DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permissions for noise sensitive development.</p>	no action required
24920 - Merlion Capital [12926]	Object	In terms of the Lakenheath sites, there are significant infrastructure requirements including a primary school with a pre-school needed to facilitate the delivery of development, together with the expansion of Primary Healthcare capacity.	The IDP (CD:C19) sets out the infrastructure required to address the needs of the SIR and mechanisms how this will be delivered.	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>
24895 - Mrs Diane Donald [13120]	Object	<p>1. HEALTH</p> <p>Despite all of their best efforts, the sole GP Surgery in Lakenheath cannot cope with the existing demands of the current population. During the last year alone, there have been numerous instances when the surgery has been reduced to providing an emergency-only service. We understand that the surgery has been unable to attract Locum services. This potentially life-threatening situation has not been considered or addressed.</p> <p>2. ACCESS &amp; ROADS</p> <p>The permanent closure of Lord's Walk for USAF security purposes has left Lakenheath Village with a single, winding B-Road access. Essential utility works/accidents/police cordons have all closed the single route in to and out of the village on several occasions, necessitating a lengthy diversion onto the A1065 and Wangford Road. It is impossible to imagine that these routes could support the massive additional traffic these developments would bring.</p> <p>3. EMPLOYMENT</p> <p>There are no employment hubs in the village and the proposed plans will not generate any. This is extremely likely to influence the numbers of people who actually want to live in Lakenheath or at least impact on the demographic of the village population. Working residents will add to the volume of traffic and problems mentioned in 2 above, as well as adding unnecessarily to air pollution. An older retired population is likely to place growing demands on health care, with the associated issues described in 1 above.</p> <p>4. SAFETY and NOISE POLLUTION</p> <p>In view of the comments made by the MOD on application DC/14/2096/HYB how can any development in Lakenheath be considered appropriate or of any enhancement to the village?</p>	<p>The IDP (CD:C19) sets out the infrastructure required to address the needs of the SIR and mechanisms how this will be delivered. This includes health and highways issues.</p> <p>The employment chapter of SALP addresses employment matters.</p> <p>The proposed school lies within the noise contour 66dB, the SofCG between the Council and the DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</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>
		5. A SOLUTION		
		<p>Forest Heath is arguably in a highly enviable position with Mildenhall Air Base being handed back by the USAF at the very time the Council seeks sites for major development.</p> <p>Mildenhall AirBase already houses and employs hundreds of American Service Personnel and has the fundamental infrastructure (roads and utilities) to support this. Planning at this stage could enable a coherent project, fulfilling housing needs, support services and employment opportunities.</p> <p>Would Forest Heath not more responsibly serve all of its communities, now and in the future, by withdrawing these disjointed, unsupported and unsafe proposed plans for Lakenheath and safeguard neighbouring Mildenhall's economic future, by working constructively on plans for the development of the airbase site, post the US military withdrawal?</p>		
24654 - Mrs Sue Malina [13074]	Object	<p>The reference to noise constraints from aircraft affecting the south of Lakenheath is incorrect and based on out of date information. The current MOD noise contours map clearly show that all of the village, including the proposed development sites (and the new school) are in 66-72 dB contours, which are well above British Standards and World Health Organisation guidelines. Standards have changed; it is not acceptable to say that people already live/go to school here. We now know the health impacts of noise levels and I believe it would be morally and legally negligent to ignore this.</p> <p><i>Review site allocations in view of the unacceptable intrusion and loss of amenity caused as a result of these noise levels.</i></p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</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>
24829 - P Brunning [12600]	Object	<p>828 additional homes in Lakenheath this will have a great impact upon the village of Eriswell as most people will be travelling through it to get to work in Newmarket, Bury St Eds, Cambridge. We are already continually suffering at the two narrow parts of the B1112 at Sparkes Corner and Church Corner where the walls are continually being knocked down as two wide vehicles cannot pass. I hope the infrastructure of the area is going to be improved before the houses are ever built. The 500 houses being released by Earlsfield are already increase the traffic at peak working times.</p> <p>A new link road to the A1065 is really needed, queues build up at the B1112 A1065 junction at the moment.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p>	no action required
24667 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	<p>To ensure all points are heard, please see attached.</p> <p><i>A sequential approach to development occurring in the 3 market towns and only then followed by the Key Service Centres as per national and local planning policy.</i></p> <p><i>Improvement required to non-car modes of transport and employment opportunities..</i></p>	<p>The approach taken in distributing the number of homes required to meet the overall housing need across the district is set out in the SIR.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the SALP sets out the council's approach to planning for economy and jobs throughout the district.</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>
24922 - L & W Hinsby [13122]	Object	<p>(1) Whoever took the road use censure did not try to cross the road coming into the village via Eriswell at late afternoon, I and a friend stood at the bus stop opposite North Road for ten minutes or more, and if it hadn't been for a kindly American stopping the traffic, God only knows how long we would have stood there. Our one road cannot take any extra traffic.</p> <p>(2) Did anyone tell you about when doctor Bower had to have time off work due to his wife being very ill? Hockwolds surgery had to be closed, because our doctors also cover that surgery and another temporary doctor could not be found to cover his absence. Appointments were like gold dust, and we were asked not to ask for appointments unless really needed.</p> <p>(3) What about all the extra people coming into Lakenheath from the extended RAF Lakenheath base.</p> <p>(4) Public transport is inadequate now, let alone all these other bodies descending upon us, I'm sure there will be many none drivers amongst them similar to myself.</p> <p>(5) And where are all these extra people going to work, and don't forget. all those working on Mildenhall base will be seeking employment when that closes - are you trying to make us a stagnant village?</p> <p>(6) And as for the proposed school, how ridiculous to place a school under a fighter jet path, will the school hours extended to make up for the time pupils cannot hear whats being taught?</p>	<p>Highways mitigation measures to be addressed are set out in the IDP (CD:C19).</p> <p>Health infrastructure requirements are also addressed in the IDP.</p> <p>The employment chapter of SALP addresses employment matters.</p> <p>The proposed school will not be located directly under the flight path, it lies within 66dB contour of the new map. Mitigation measures can be implemented to ameliorate the internal noise levels within the school, so there will be no requirement to extend the school day.</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>
24839 - Mr and Mrs Derek and Marilyn Banks [13112]	Object	<p>it would appear that the comments and observations made by the DIO (MOD) in their submission to application DC/14/2096/HYB have been totally disregarded. Their observations suggest that ANY development in Lakenheath would be blighted by noise, vibration and traffic issues.</p> <p>It is totally unthinkable, surely, that a planning authority could compromise children's well being and safety and, further, that a County Council, struggling to get Suffolk schools from the bottom end of league tables, could accept such a proposal.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph109 states that development should "contribute to and ENHANCE the natural and local environment".</p> <p>NPPF paragraph120 states that development should "prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability". Pollution covers health.</p> <p>In 2014 the MOD, through RAF Lakenheath, issued both an "Emergency Instruction" and a "Major Accident Control Regulation" card to some residents and, whilst stating there was no increased risk, they acknowledged that there is some risk. These cards MUST be passed on to future occupants Regarding their observations on traffic, it was during a period of enhanced security checks at RAF Lakenheath, and resultant traffic queues, that National Express withdrew their Jetlink service (Norwich to Brighton) from the village. As the majority of buses going through the village to the "distant" town of Mildenhall (Brandon or Thetford in the other direction) are subsidised by the County Council, how long will it be before they too are axed? Without public transport how do the rural poor survive and, just as importantly, can the roads within Forest Heath cope with a proportionate increase in cars? The debacle at both Fiveways and Holmesley Green in Beck Row might suggest otherwise.</p> <p>As residents, two further observations we would make on development to the north of the village - the area in front of the former Niagri premises floods greatly during rain and Station Road, at its more northerly end of the village, has seen a number of traffic accidents.</p> <p>With regard to the tables produced by Aecom, the employment site table makes no sense to us and the noise table is incomplete. We also note that the flood</p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p> <p>A site of 6.5ha with existing buildings is considered a proportionate quantity of employment land in this Key Service Centre especially considering its proximity to employment opportunities at RAF Lakenheath, and distance from the A11 corridor.</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>risk refers only to river flooding. Lakenheath is identified as a Key Service Centre but no attempt has been made to keep the information current (or, presumably, to review it). The bank now opens for 3 days only; the Post Office has been through difficult times and possibly survives due only to the owner's business skills; similarly, the library has remained open thanks to the hard work of many but, in particular, FOLK. Finally, is there such a huge waiting list for housing in Lakenheath? With regard to "community involvement", Forest Heath stated that they arranged local events. Forest Heath are well aware that Lakenheath has a monthly newsletter distributed to each household but they failed to notify, in time for publication, details of the Lakenheath event to the Editor of the newsletter. The attendance was, by all accounts, a failure and it was only due to the insistence of the Parish Council that another event was arranged. Lakenheath is identified as a Key Service Centre, with a library, why then were no hard copies of the Plans and subsequent Erratum available for viewing there? Finally, when all other documents seem to have been posted on the website, if one can negotiate it successfully, why was the recommended (not compulsory) response form not available on the website?</p>		
24651 - L C M Clark [13069]	Object	<p>The amount of new homes we are told will increase the population of the village by 45% so issues are doctors shops transport employment children roads All of these things are a concern to the people who live in Lakenheath now plus there could be another 120 dwelling in Broom road adding to the above problems. Yes new houses are needed but the points raised need addressed before these people move in not after We want people to be happy to live here not hating and moaning about the place.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.  The Broom Road appeal was dismissed on 5 July 2017</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>
24679 - Mr & Mrs Leslie & Sally Hunt [13079]	Object	<p>We would like to put on record that we support the Lakenheath Parish Council in their objections to the proposed developments at Lakenheath as outlined in the Lakenheath Times magazine March 2017 edition. We do appreciate that more housing is needed in the country overall and that some growth is to be expected in our area, but the scale of the development proposed and the speed with which it would be implemented, would completely destroy the character of Lakenheath.</p> <p>It would also appear that, with the exception of the new school, little thought has been given to the infrastructure required to support the number of new buildings and the accompanying influx of people. The local road system is hardly adequate for the amount of traffic using it now - a further 1200 plus vehicles would cause even worse congestion than already exists at certain times of the day and major junctions such as Barton Mills and the A1065/B1112 would require further controls. The doctor's surgery as it currently stands would find it impossible to cope with the increased demand. Other factors such as sewerage, public transport, job opportunities and many more would need to be thoroughly planned out before the first bricks are laid.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p>	
24650 - Mr Colin Pigott [13054]	Object	<p>I would like to complain about the current local plan to build over 800 houses in Lakenheath: 800 houses is far too many for an already overstretched and busy village such as Lakenheath, This equates to a 45% growth from the houses in the last census, 2011.</p> <p>Traffic too many houses school doctors shops, retail and amenities public transport sports and social facilities where are the people going to work</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery 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>
24726 - Mrs Sue Malina [13074]	Object	<p>Par 5.7.6. The MOD have clearly identified, (in objections to major planning applications in the area) the nature of the increase in air traffic as a result of the expansion of RAF Lakenheath. The arrival of F35's, with their higher noise profile, and the extension from weekday only to 24/7 operation, clearly will result in an increase in noise and resulting loss of amenity. It is unreasonable for FHDC to disregard this fact. Increased personnel at Lakenheath will also have traffic implications, particularly in relation to the two key pinch point junctions already identified at Sparks Farm and Lord's Walk.</p> <p><i>Proper evaluation of noise and traffic implications related to expansion of RAF Lakenheath.</i></p>	<p>See CD:D29 statement regarding the Mildenhall airbase closure.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</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>
24903 - Ms Mary Dimond [13121]	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposals in relation to Lakenheath. Whilst acknowledging that some growth is required what is proposed in this plan is beyond excessive and gives no consideration to the very high impact these measures will have on the village.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b> Using figures available to me the minimum additional houses of 923 would, very conservatively, generate 923 cars. Where are they all going to go? The proposals for Lakenheath would end up with the village in a worse situation than Brandon. At least Brandon has a straight road through its centre, but consider how many decades it took to sort that mess out!</p> <p>In Lakenheath all the current local roads feed into the only one road (which is not straight) which runs through the village. This road copes with lorries, school coaches and farm machinery in addition to regular traffic. Congestion, certainly at different times of the day, is already a problem.</p> <p>Off road parking, in the current circumstances, is already woefully inadequate: with an increase in vehicular traffic, parking within the village will become a nightmare. We are told that Forest Heath maintains that additional traffic would not be a problem but from my own experience I seriously doubt this.</p> <p><b>Work/Transport</b> Work opportunities are scarce in his area. If a job is acquired then likely it would require travel outside the area. This, in turn, is difficult as bus services are poor, with no mention of this being improved and requires people to have their own transport (back to the first point). Any new people coming to the area, would hopefully have work, which would require them to commute (back to the first point).</p> <p><b>Health</b> These proposals will place extra pressures on the Doctors Surgery and result in a worse situation for the people of Lakenheath when trying to get an appointment. There has been no indication that additional facilities would be provided.</p> <p><b>School</b> The proposed second school has been sited directly under the returning jets flight path, despite, or should I say, in spite of the intensification of the RAF</p>	The IDP (CD:C19) sets out the infrastructure required to address the needs of the SIR and mechanisms how this be delivered.	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>
		Lakenheath airbase which we are told will ultimately be operating on a 24/7 schedule.		
		In general the infrastructure to support growth is seriously lacking. In my view these proposals are being money led with no serious consideration being given to any long term issues which could result from this plan together with a total lack of common sense.		
24644 - Mr and Mrs D & H Jones [13067]	Object	<p>Having attended the presentation in Lakenheath and looked carefully at the provided information, it would seem that there are two separate issues:-</p> <p>The compelling need to provide extra housing in Lakenheath and necessary improvements to infrastructure i.e. School and medical services</p> <p>Dramatic increase in airbase operations together with increased personnel numbers.</p> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who are the houses being built for? Currently a large number of USAF personnel rent in the village. This does have an effect on village life.</li> <li>2. Given that Lakenheath seems to be in a unique position in Suffolk i.e. Military aerodrome and the urgent need for extra housing, both of which will have a major impact on most aspects of village life, could some recognition of this be acknowledged and alleviated by providing something which will add value to village life e.g. a bypass.</li> <li>3. Given the undoubted increase in aviation noise and traffic associated with the airbase, including commuters, is it not considered likely that this will affect value and saleability of village properties?</li> </ol> <p>We hope that due consideration will be given to our comments.</p>	<p>The SIR addresses the overall housing provision and its distribution across the district. This is supported by evidence based studies.</p> <p>The additional homes planned for in Lakenheath will provide associated infrastructure.</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>
24710 - Miss Judith Squires [12916]	Object	<p>Noise and air pollution are going to increase dramatically.</p> <p>There has been no full assessment of noise since the 1980's and none at all on air pollution.</p> <p>A new and up to date noise contour study including the impact of F-35's should be completed for the whole village before any decisions are made on areas for development.</p> <p>The proposed housing development in Lakenheath is totally out of scale.</p> <p>The siting of the new school on Land North of Station Road SA8(b) is on the flight path for returning jets and for outgoing and returning helicopters.</p> <p>Capacity issues at GP surgery.</p> <p>Traffic problems given the likely increase in the number of cars.</p> <p>It should be noted that the flood risk given in the report does not include surface water flooding.</p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p>	
24805 - Elveden Farms Ltd. [13111]	Object	<p>RPS CgMs, on behalf of Elvden Farms Ltd., seek the promotion of Land to the West of the B1112, Little Eriswell, for inclusion within the Submission Draft Site Allocations Local Plan for residential development. The attached document sets out details of the site, along with the pending planning application on the site, and demonstrates that the proposed residential development is deliverable and sustainable and therefore should be allocated.</p>	<p>The site is deferred in the SHLAA 2016</p>	<p>no action required</p>
24653 - Mr Brian Swallow [13071]	Object	<p>influx of people on doctors noise buy to let to Americans does not help the housing crisis Immigration American personnel working hours</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</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>
24643 - Ms Eva Parr [13043]	Object	<p>I attended the presentation of the proposed development in Lakenheath. My concern is that we need the infrastructure in place to support a development of that size.</p> <p>Special importance I feel should be put on the extra GP's we would need, the already proposed need for another school; and traffic management. The traffic to and from the village is already stretched being so near the USAF airbase and with another squadron expected in the next couple of years will only stretch it further.</p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The additional homes planned for in Lakenheath will provide associated infrastructure.</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>
24896 - Mr Gerald Kelly [13053]	Object	<p>As a Lakenheath resident I have a number of issues with the proposals for Lakenheath described in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Plan appears to set aside the opportunities afforded by the closure of RAF Mildenhall, however....</p> <p>The starting point for Lakenheath is the number of up to 1492 additional houses; who is going to live in them ? Increasing the housing stock by three quarters is not addressing a "local need". Unless there are local employment opportunities - and even if there are - the only possibilities involve additional pressure on the inadequate road system and the already over capacity NHS.</p> <p>The road system cannot cope. Developments at RAF Lakenheath are already going to increase volumes and exacerbate issues around peak times, particularly at the roundabout feeding RAF Lakenheath's Number 2 Gate. Add something approaching two thousand extra cars (using statistical average ownership) and a difficult situation becomes wholly untenable on roads with "Low Priority" for maintenance according to Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>My other fundamental concern is around the SALP. EN 1 requires the plan to "direct residential development towards those locations not affected by chronic noise pollution". US Environmental Impact Statements (including the Air Force's Final USAF F35A Operational Basing EIS, 2013) differ only in the extent to which F35s represent a gross increase in noise levels. The MOD have not, to my knowledge, produced anything in the public domain which quantifies the expected increase but even without hard data, building a school and housing under the existing flightpath appears odd; it is beyond belief that the proposal takes no account of an increase in the number and type of aircraft, flying times and a factorial increase in noise levels.</p>	<p>Until there is certainty from the MOD over the future uses of the Mildenhall airbase, the deliverability and timescales for bringing forward the site, it is not possible to include the site as an allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The OAN (CD: C26 and C22) report sets out the justification for the overall need for new homes in the district.</p> <p>The IDP (CD:C19) sets out the infrastructure required to address the needs of the SIR and mechanisms how this will be delivered.</p> <p>The proposed school lies within the noise contour 66dB, the SofCG between the Council and the DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development</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>
24785 - Elveden Farms Ltd. [13111]	Object	RPS CgMs, on behalf of Elveden Farms Ltd., seek the promotion of Land to the West of the B1112, Little Eriswell, for inclusion within the Submission Draft Site Allocations Local Plan for residential development. The attached document sets out details of the site, along with the pending planning application on the site, and demonstrates that the proposed residential development is deliverable and sustainable and therefore should be allocated.	The site is deferred in the SHLAA 2016	no action required
24678 - R J Rolph [5462]	Object	Object to housing in Lakenheath. How can Newmarket and Mildenhall get away with less houses?  Lakenheath has no industry meaning people will have to travel to find work which means more cars on already over crowded roads. Poor bus service.  Inadequate shopping facilities. Doctor's will not cope. No infrastructure.  Aircraft noise wherever you build.	The approach taken in distributing the number of homes required to meet the overall housing need across the district is set out in the SIR.  The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.  Chapter 6 of the SALP sets out the council's approach to planning for economy and jobs throughout the district.	no action required
24843 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	See attached letter on surface water management:  Sites SA7(a), SA7(b) and SA8(d) will need to give detailed consideration to residual risk arising from the Cut Off Channel, as water levels in the Channel could be higher than in-site flood flows, having a knock on effect on surface water drainage systems. RoW  Lakenheath The County Council is working with the Environment Agency to develop a new route along the eastern side of the Cut Off Channel.	See Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk County Council.	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>5.7.9-5.7.10 - Site SA7(a) - Matthews Nursery and map</i>				
24774 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath:  This falls within the 15.2m height consultation zone and technical safeguarding zone. Therefore any development exceeding this height criteria and includes large spans of reflective material needs to be referred to this office for review.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. The Council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24683 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	This site is outside the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District.  Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed	This policy requires a substantial buffer next to the cut off channel. JDMPD policy DM6 requires all developments to detail how on-site drainage will be managed so as to not exacerbate flooding elsewhere, examples include SUDS.	no action required
<i>5.7.11 - Site SA7(b) - Land west of Eriswell Road and map</i>				
24771 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This site falls within the 15.2m height consultation zone and the vulnerable building distance. Therefore, please consult this office on development for this site.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. The Council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24684 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	This site is outside the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District.  Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed	This policy requires a substantial buffer next to the cut off channel. JDMPD policy DM6 requires all developments to detail how on-site drainage will be managed so as to not exacerbate flooding elsewhere, examples include SUDS.	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 SA7 - Housing and mixed use allocations in Lakenheath</i>				
24795 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>Within this document the MOD, on the basis of the Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath (24th February 2017) objects to the following:</p> <p>Policy SA7 Housing and Mixed Use Allocations in Lakenheath.</p> <p>It is DIO's contention that the Council should reconsider the allocations listed above in line with the requirements of the NPPF Paragraph 123, the supporting Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 3 and in line with the requirements of the Explanatory Note of the Noise Policy Statement for England.</p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p>	No action required.
24616 - Mr Simon Barton [13045]	Object	<p>Why when every one except the people selling the land and the FHDC is it going ahead the MOD object there will be major traffic congestion at busy times already it's getting harder to get out of the village, Eriswell already a well known bottle neck will become a nightmare if i can see all of the problems why can't planning , highways are not competent at their job they just bury their heads in the sand because the roads are not fit now let alone after this folly</p> <p><i>cancel the application the parish council can see that it;s a bad idea but people paid to do this job are blind to the facts no acceptable infrastructure high noise levels from the planes.poorly made decisions based on bulling from Newmarket ie no building in my back yard , history will show what a bad decision it is like the plans for the titanic titanic</i></p>	<p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p>	
24817 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	<p>Currently, no mention is made of archaeological requirements. In order to ensure consistency with other sites, it may be appropriate to refer to the fact that archaeological conditions are expected to be required on sites (a) and (b),</p> <p><i>Currently, no mention is made of archaeological requirements. In order to ensure consistency with other sites, it may be appropriate to refer to the fact that archaeological conditions are expected to be required on sites (a) and (b),</i></p>	See Statement of Common Ground between SCC and FHDC.	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>
24840 - Mr and Mrs Derek and Marilyn Banks [13112]	Object	<p>it would appear that the comments and observations made by the DIO (MOD) in their submission to application DC/14/2096/HYB have been totally disregarded. Their observations suggest that ANY development in Lakenheath would be blighted by noise, vibration and traffic issues.</p> <p>It is totally unthinkable, surely, that a planning authority could compromise children's well being and safety and, further, that a County Council, struggling to get Suffolk schools from the bottom end of league tables, could accept such a proposal.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph109 states that development should "contribute to and ENHANCE the natural and local environment".</p> <p>NPPF paragraph120 states that development should "prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability". Pollution covers health.</p> <p>In 2014 the MOD, through RAF Lakenheath, issued both an "Emergency Instruction" and a "Major Accident Control Regulation" card to some residents and, whilst stating there was no increased risk, they acknowledged that there is some risk. These cards MUST be passed on to future occupants Regarding their observations on traffic, it was during a period of enhanced security checks at RAF Lakenheath, and resultant traffic queues, that National Express withdrew their Jetlink service (Norwich to Brighton) from the village. As the majority of buses going through the village to the "distant" town of Mildenhall (Brandon or Thetford in the other direction) are subsidised by the County Council, how long will it be before they too are axed? Without public transport how do the rural poor survive and, just as importantly, can the roads within Forest Heath cope with a proportionate increase in cars? The debacle at both Fiveways and Holmesley Green in Beck Row might suggest otherwise.</p> <p>As residents, two further observations we would make on development to the north of the village - the area in front of the former Niagri premises floods greatly during rain and Station Road, at its more northerly end of the village, has seen a number of traffic accidents.</p> <p>With regard to the tables produced by Aecom, the employment site table makes no sense to us and the noise table is incomplete. We also note that the flood</p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p> <p>A site of 6.5ha with existing buildings is considered a proportionate quantity of employment land in this Key Service Centre especially considering its proximity to employment opportunities at RAF Lakenheath, and distance from the A11 corridor.</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>risk refers only to river flooding.</p> <p>Lakenheath is identified as a Key Service Centre but no attempt has been made to keep the information current (or, presumably, to review it). The bank now opens for 3 days only; the Post Office has been through difficult times and possibly survives due only to the owner's business skills; similarly, the library has remained open thanks to the hard work of many but, in particular, FOLK.</p> <p>Finally, is there such a huge waiting list for housing in Lakenheath?</p> <p>With regard to "community involvement", Forest Heath stated that they arranged local events.</p> <p>Forest Heath are well aware that Lakenheath has a monthly newsletter distributed to each household but they failed to notify, in time for publication, details of the Lakenheath event to the Editor of the newsletter. The attendance was, by all accounts, a failure and it was only due to the insistence of the Parish Council that another event was arranged.</p> <p>Lakenheath is identified as a Key Service Centre, with a library, why then were no hard copies of the Plans and subsequent Erratum available for viewing there? Finally, when all other documents seem to have been posted on the website, if one can negotiate it successfully, why was the recommended (not compulsory) response form not available on the website?</p>		
24764 - Elveden Farms Ltd. [13111]	Support	RPS CgMs on behalf of Elveden supports the extension to the west of Eriswell road to reflect the allocation of SA7(b). This site is in a sustainable edge of settlement location.	The site is deferred in the SHLAA 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>5.7.12</i>				
24724 - Lakenheath Community Primary School (Mr Mike Malina) [13089]	Object	<p>The original draft plan of 2013/14 did not have an extensive development in Lakenheath North and omitted provision of a school. This was only added when the Community and the existing School identified this. We do not believe that FHDC have demonstrated that the current plan can be delivered in the timescale because there are significant infrastructure constraints that will be difficult to overcome. Specifically, the identified school site is problematic because it is under the return flight path of fighter jets and is adversely affected by noise. Without the school, there is an unsustainable pattern of education provision.</p> <p><i>There has to be a full account of the MOD's objections and a far more comprehensive noise, vibration and environmental impact assessment before any allocation of a school is made to this area of Lakenheath.</i></p>	<p>The SALP has been refined as its moved through the local plan stages, to the submission version.</p> <p>See CD:D29 statement regarding the Mildenhall airbase closure.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p>	no action required
<i>5.7.13 - Site SA8(a) - Rabbit Hill Covert, Station Road and map</i>				
24770 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 15.2m height zone, therefore any development exceeding this should be referred to this office for review.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. The Council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.</p>	no action required
24685 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	<p>This site is outside the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District</p> <p>Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed</p>	<p>This policy requires a substantial buffer next to the cut off channel. JDMPD policy DM6 requires all developments to detail how on-site drainage will be managed so as to not exacerbate flooding elsewhere, examples include SUDS.</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>5.7.14 - Site SA8(b) - Land north of Station Road and map</i>				
24728 - Lakenheath Community Primary School (Mr Mike Malina) [13089]	Object	<p>The identified school site is problematic because it is under the return flight path of fighter jets and is adversely affected by noise. The MOD objections, highlighted in the attached letter. "It is the MoD's contention that the proposed development would represent the introduction of sensitive receptors (e.g. residential and Primary School) to the prevailing acoustic environment in the immediate locality of RAF Lakenheath". The application site is located directly underneath the approach flight path to RAF Lakenheath". It is not consistent with the NPPF. Without the school, there is an unsustainable pattern of education provision.</p> <p><i>There has to be a full account taken of the MOD's objections and a far more comprehensive noise, vibration and environmental impact assessment before any allocation of a school is made to this site in Lakenheath.</i></p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p>	no action required
24686 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	<p>This site is outside the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District</p> <p>Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed</p>	This policy requires a substantial buffer next to the cut off channel. JDMPD policy DM6 requires all developments to detail how on-site drainage will be managed so as to not exacerbate flooding elsewhere, examples include SUDS.	no action required
<i>5.7.15 - Site SA8(c) - Land off Briscoe Way and map</i>				
24776 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 15.2m height zone, therefore any development exceeding this should be referred to this office for review.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.</p>	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. 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>
24687 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	This site is outside the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District  Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed	This policy requires a substantial buffer next to the cut off channel. JDMPD policy DM6 requires all developments to detail how on-site drainage will be managed so as to not exacerbate flooding elsewhere, examples include SUDS.	no action required
<i>5.7.16 - Site SA8(d) - Land north of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way and map</i>				
24768 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 15.2m height zone, therefore any development exceeding this should be referred to this office for review.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at planning application stage. The Council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	no action required
24688 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	This site is outside the Lakenheath Internal Drainage District  Surface water from this site should be balance to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed	This policy requires a substantial buffer next to the cut off channel. JDMPD policy DM6 requires all developments to detail how on-site drainage will be managed so as to not exacerbate flooding elsewhere, examples include SUDS.	no action required
<i>Policy SA8 - Focus of growth - North Lakenheath</i>				
24739 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [13102]	Object	There might be uncertainty about the deliverability and suitability of some sites allocated on the northern edge of Lakenheath. in relation to noise impacts.  <i>We request the following changes to Policy SA8: * To undertake a detailed assessment of the housing trajectory to ensure that allocated sites are deliverable * If land on the northern edge of Lakenheath is not deliverable then alternative sites in sustainable villages are allocated.</i>	Noted. The DIO has withdrawn its noise objections. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC dated 18.8.17.	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>
24841 - Mr and Mrs Derek and Marilyn Banks [13112]	Object	<p>it would appear that the comments and observations made by the DIO (MOD) in their submission to application DC/14/2096/HYB have been totally disregarded. Their observations suggest that ANY development in Lakenheath would be blighted by noise, vibration and traffic issues.</p> <p>It is totally unthinkable, surely, that a planning authority could compromise children's well being and safety and, further, that a County Council, struggling to get Suffolk schools from the bottom end of league tables, could accept such a proposal.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph109 states that development should "contribute to and ENHANCE the natural and local environment".</p> <p>NPPF paragraph120 states that development should "prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability". Pollution covers health.</p> <p>In 2014 the MOD, through RAF Lakenheath, issued both an "Emergency Instruction" and a "Major Accident Control Regulation" card to some residents and, whilst stating there was no increased risk, they acknowledged that there is some risk. These cards MUST be passed on to future occupants Regarding their observations on traffic, it was during a period of enhanced security checks at RAF Lakenheath, and resultant traffic queues, that National Express withdrew their Jetlink service (Norwich to Brighton) from the village. As the majority of buses going through the village to the "distant" town of Mildenhall (Brandon or Thetford in the other direction) are subsidised by the County Council, how long will it be before they too are axed? Without public transport how do the rural poor survive and, just as importantly, can the roads within Forest Heath cope with a proportionate increase in cars? The debacle at both Fiveways and Holmesley Green in Beck Row might suggest otherwise.</p> <p>As residents, two further observations we would make on development to the north of the village - the area in front of the former Niagri premises floods greatly during rain and Station Road, at its more northerly end of the village, has seen a number of traffic accidents.</p> <p>With regard to the tables produced by Aecom, the employment site table makes no sense to us and the noise table is incomplete. We also note that the flood</p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements for each settlement are set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</p> <p>A site of 6.5ha with existing buildings is considered a proportionate quantity of employment land in this Key Service Centre especially considering its proximity to employment opportunities at RAF Lakenheath, and distance from the A11 corridor</p>	no action required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
	<p>risk refers only to river flooding.</p> <p>Lakenheath is identified as a Key Service Centre but no attempt has been made to keep the information current (or, presumably, to review it). The bank now opens for 3 days only; the Post Office has been through difficult times and possibly survives due only to the owner's business skills; similarly, the library has remained open thanks to the hard work of many but, in particular, FOLK.</p> <p>Finally, is there such a huge waiting list for housing in Lakenheath?</p> <p>With regard to "community involvement", Forest Heath stated that they arranged local events.</p> <p>Forest Heath are well aware that Lakenheath has a monthly newsletter distributed to each household but they failed to notify, in time for publication, details of the Lakenheath event to the Editor of the newsletter. The attendance was, by all accounts, a failure and it was only due to the insistence of the Parish Council that another event was arranged.</p> <p>Lakenheath is identified as a Key Service Centre, with a library, why then were no hard copies of the Plans and subsequent Erratum available for viewing there? Finally, when all other documents seem to have been posted on the website, if one can negotiate it successfully, why was the recommended (not compulsory) response form not available on the website?</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24833 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	<p>Primary School Provision</p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Lakenheath: 828 dwellings/207 children</p> <p>The sites identified through policies SA7 and SA8 will be mitigated through the delivery of the new primary school and proportionate contributions will be required from these development sites. The inclusion of a requirement for a new primary school within Site SA8(b) is welcomed, although an amendment to formalise the agreed amount of land to be made available would be useful. The policy could be amended to refer to SA8(b) providing 'Mixed use to include 375 dwellings and a primary school within a 3.1ha site.' This is large enough to support a 420 place school and early years setting, along with providing an opportunity for the school to expand within that site in future years.</p>	Noted. See Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk County Council	
24894 - Gerald Eve LLP (Ms Vanessa Harrison) [12885]	Object	<p>The combined sites of L/28a and L/28b should be allocated and included within this policy.</p> <p><i>Suggested change to policy in attached letter.</i></p>	Sites L28a and L28b are not allocated for reasons set out in the omission site document CD:B10	no action required
24818 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	<p>At present, the supporting text makes reference to archaeological requirements at site (d). For consistency, similar reference ought to be made to site (b).</p> <p><i>At present, the supporting text makes reference to archaeological requirements at site (d). For consistency, similar reference ought to be made to site (b).</i></p>	See Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk County Council.	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>
24796 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>Within this document the MOD, on the basis of the Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath (24th February 2017) objects to the following:</p> <p>Policy SA8 Focus of Growth - North Lakenheath.</p> <p>It is DIO's contention that the Council should reconsider the allocations listed above in line with the requirements of the NPPF Paragraph 123, the supporting Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 3 and in line with the requirements of the Explanatory Note of the Noise Policy Statement for England.</p>	<p>The DIO has withdrawn its objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC.</p> <p>The DIO and MOD agrees a form of conditions to be imposed on residential and school planning permission for noise sensitive development.</p>	No action required.
<hr/>				
<i>5.7.17 - Employment sites</i>				
24614 - Mr Andrew Ellis [13040]	Object	<p>The proposals are on good agricultural land, land liable to flooding, Traffic issues</p> <p><i>Land to the east of Lakenheath</i></p>	<p>Flood risk assessments will be required as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that development in the village will require commensurate improvements to the highway infrastructure.</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>5.8.1-5.8.8 and Red Lodge settlement map</i>				
24853 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Object	5.8.4  The Trust generally supports the Site Allocations Local Plan in its present form, and in particular Policy SA10.  The Trust supports the level of housing provision at Red Lodge. However, for clarification and the avoidance of doubt, the word "additional" should be inserted in front of "1,129 dwellings" in paragraph 5.8.4.  The references to 350 dwellings in Policy SA10 and in paragraph 5.8.23 are supported. The references in Policy SA10 and in paragraph 5.8.23 to the provision of 3 hectares for a new primary school are also supported, as the increase in the amount of land set aside for a new school will help to cater for the residential growth proposed at Red Lodge.	Support for the proposed development at Red Lodge is noted and welcomed. It is considered that the intention of paragraph 5.8.4 is clear.	No action required.
24646 - Miss Jennifer Hall [13035]	Object	Development in Red Lodge adjacent to Red Lodge Heath SSSI: According to the development plan, the lorry park on Turnpike Road is to be closed. It would benefit the SSSI if this site could be incorporated into the SSSI, providing it with a small parking area, with access for service vehicles to manage the site. With the increased housing development in Red Lodge, the SSSI is already under pressure from footfall and dog walking, some of which is detrimental to the environment and wildlife. The land in Green Lane opposite the SSSI would provide a suitable green space for cycling, dog walking and possibly horse riding, and use as a green space would protect the wildlife on the SSSI from predation by cats. Green Lane is designated as a non-through road, and housing development in this area would turn it into a rat-run from the A11 and A14, causing additional noise and pollution and an increase in littering and fly-tipping. There is a need for some enclosed dog- exercising areas in Red Lodge.	comments 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>
24846 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Object	<p>5.8.4 Crest Nicholson generally supports the Site Allocations Local Plan in its present form, and in particular Policy SA9, recognising that the scope for further change is restricted to fine tuning; the Plan is now capable of Examination.</p> <p>Crest Nicholson supports the level of housing provision proposed at Red Lodge. However, for clarification and the avoidance of doubt, the word "additional" should be inserted in front of "1,129 dwellings" in paragraph 5.8.4.</p>	Support for the proposed level of housing provision at Red Lodge is noted and welcomed. It is considered that the intention of paragraph 5.8.4 is clear.	No action required.
24834 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>Primary School Provision</p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Red Lodge: 1129 dwellings/282 children</p> <p>The sites identified through policies SA9 and SA10 will be mitigated through the delivery of the new primary school and proportionate contributions will be required from these development sites. The inclusion of a requirement for a new primary school within site SA10 is welcomed.</p> <p>RoW Red Lodge</p> <p>The County Council will work with the District Council to consider contributions towards a route within a green corridor along the eastern side of the A11.</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>
<i>5.8.9-5.8.12 - Site SA9(a) - Land off Turnpike Road and Coopers Yard and map</i>				
24780 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at the planning application stage.  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>5.8.13-5.8.16 - Site SA9(b) - Land east of Red Lodge: north and map</i>				
24777 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue will be dealt with at the planning application stage.  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>5.8.17-5.8.20 - Site SA9(c) - Land east of Red Lodge: south and map</i>				
24778 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.	Noted.	Modification suggested to paragraph 5.8.18 to reflect that planning application F/2013/0257/HYB has been approved.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24847 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Object	<p>5.8.18 Crest Nicholson generally supports the Site Allocations Local Plan in its present form, and in particular Policy SA9, recognising that the scope for further change is restricted to fine tuning; the Plan is now capable of Examination.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.18 should be updated to acknowledge that planning application F/2013/0257/HYB has now been approved following completion of a legal agreement.</p>	Noted	Amend paragraph 5.8.18 to reflect that full planning permission has been granted.
<i>5.8.21-5.8.22 - Site SA9(d) - Land west of Newmarket Road and north of Elms Road and map</i>				
24779 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.</p>	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with 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>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*Policy SA9 - Housing Allocations in Red Lodge*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24639 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Liz Marchington) [5853]	Object	<p>* Too much development is allocated to Red Lodge</p> <p>* Red Lodge saw an 18% growth in population over a 2yr period between 2011 and 2013. Needs time to absorb this large population growth before considering additional large scale development</p> <p>* Policy CS1 states "Due to the recent expansion of Red Lodge; No greenfield urban extensions will come forward prior to 2021".</p> <p>* 997 dwellings are proposed on greenfield sites in Red Lodge in the final 10 years of the plan period. That's 88% of the overall growth for Red Lodge and 22% of the growth for the district! Such massive housing numbers are an unsustainable option, with an unsustainable approach to the phasing of the housing and the deliverability of the affordable housing provision.</p> <p>* The affordable housing provision is placed at risk by allowing such large numbers of houses to be provided in Red Lodge within the last 10yrs of the plan.</p> <p>* The sewerage system is unable to cope with additional housing at Red lodge and the embargo against development in this location needs to be reinstated.</p> <p><i>* The majority of development for the district should be placed in and around the 3 market towns.</i></p> <p><i>* Development across the district needs to follow a sequential approach especially at Red Lodge which is already over developed and suffering from an infrastructure deficit.</i></p> <p><i>* Any developer needs to enter a legally binding agreement prior to the granting of planning permission to provide affordable housing at 30% to ensure an adequate provision.</i></p> <p><i>* Anglian Waters ability to provide a functioning sewerage network which is able remove waste from Red Lodge to the terminal pumping station in Tuddenham without issue, needs to be closely monitored. Residents close to the pumping station and the Parish Council need to be regularly consulted with to ensure the effectiveness of the system.</i></p> <p><i>* Re-instate the embargo placed against development at Red Lodge until adequate sewerage improvements</i></p>	<p>Noted. There is a balance to be achieved in deciding on a distribution to meet the overall district housing need in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, as well as the infrastructure and environmental constraints within each settlement. The council is satisfied that the housing distribution is consistent with the Core Strategy's vision for the district, its settlement specific visions, spatial objectives and settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The Environment Agency, Anglia Water and Natural England have not identified any capacity/flooding issues around waste water disposal that affects the proposed growth in Red Lodge.</p> <p>The viability appraisal found all sites can be fully policy compliant in terms of planning obligations including the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>In light of guidance in paragraph 47 of the NPPF (and its footnotes) there is no 'reasonable prospect' at present that the Hatchfield Farm site will be available for development and can be delivered/developed within the Plan period. There are sufficient alternative available, suitable and deliverable sites to meet the district's housing needs to 2031.</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>
		are made. * <i>The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.</i>		
24719 - Hills Residential Ltd [12651]	Object	Object-see page 3-7 of the attached representation statement.  <i>Include site RL/07 within Policy SA9 as an allocation for residential (approximately 80 homes) and Horse Racing Industry uses. Amend the Red Lodge settlement boundary to include site RL/07.</i>	Support for Red Lodge as a sustainable location for growth is noted and welcomed. It is noted that confirmation from Natural England that the site would not have any significant effect on the stone curlew in the Breckland SPA or SSSI was received after publication of the SALP. The SA is not the only factor taken into account in site selection and sites within the settlement boundary or better related to services and facilities are sequentially preferable.	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>
24901 - Strutt & Parker (William Nichols) [12701]	Object	<p>Policies SA9 (b), (c), (d) and SA10 are considered to be unsound on the basis that they are in conflict with the vision for Red Lodge set out in the Core Strategy. While the inclusion of land at Coopers Yard is strongly supported as an allocation on the basis it would remove an unfavourable use of a haulage yard from the residential area, removing the last remaining HGVs from Red Lodge, the failure to include another nearby brownfield site at land at the Carrops is inconsistent with national planning policy and the Council's Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the settlement boundary should be retained as it is currently so that it includes this brownfield site, rather than removing it from the settlement boundary as the Forest Heath Site Allocation Local Plan proposes to do. proposed a further site, land at the Carrops, to be included in the Site Allocations Local Plan as it comprises brownfield land, and thus its development would contribute to achieving Red Lodge's vision as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is developable and deliverability and an outline planning application for a scheme of 30 dwellings. The proposed scheme has already been presented to Red Lodge Parish Council who support the site coming forward for residential development on the basis that it provides an opportunity to enhance the site, which is located in a prominent gateway location on the southern edge of Red Lodge.</p> <p><i>Add a further site (land south of the Carrops) into Policy SA9: Housing allocations in Red Lodge, in order to ensure that all suitable brownfield land within Red Lodge is included in the Site Allocations Plan. This will ensure that the plan is sound through demonstrating that all viable sites have been included, as well as being in accordance with the vision for Red Lodge, as set out in the Core Strategy. Land at the Carrops is available and a Site Allocation SA9 (e) should be included for up to 35 residential dwellings. It is also recommended that Site Allocation SA9 (a) be amended to include 10 Heath Farm Road, Red Lodge, which is now within my client's ownership and is a vacant property in a poor state of repair. While it is clear that close and collaborative working between the owner of Coopers Yard (and nos 6 and 10 Heath</i></p>	<p>Red Lodge site allocations accord with Vision 1 of the FH Core Strategy which requires development to be focused in towns and key service centres. Support for site SA9(a) is noted and welcomed. Land south of the Carrops (RL/18) was deferred for a number of reasons including: elements of the site being within flood zones 2 and 3, records of protected species in the area, visual sensitive on the edge of the settlement and proposals to remove the SSSI from the settlement boundary to link with the countryside. In addition the neighbouring scrap yard and waste transfer site are likely to have a detrimental effect on residential amenity. A development brief is considered necessary to ensure a coordinated approach to the development of site SA9(a). No objection to the proposed site boundary modification to include 10 Heath Farm Road into site SA9(a).</p>	Modification to boundary of site SA9(a) to include 10 Heath Farm Road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<i>Farm Road), and the remaining part of the site will be essential, it is considered that flexibility should be built into the policy to allow both sites to come forward for development independently of each other, but taking careful heed of their respective neighbour.</i>		
24849 - Crest Nicholson (Eastern) [11393]	Support	<p>Crest Nicholson generally supports the Site Allocations Local Plan in its present form, and in particular Policy SA9, recognising that the scope for further change is restricted to fine tuning; the Plan is now capable of Examination.</p> <p>Crest Nicholson supports the level of housing provision proposed at Red Lodge. However, for clarification and the avoidance of doubt, the word "additional" should be inserted in front of "1,129 dwellings" in paragraph 5.8.4.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.18 should be updated to acknowledge that planning application F/2013/0257/HYB has now been approved following completion of a legal agreement.</p>	Support noted and welcomed.	Amendment to paragraph 5.8.18 to reflect approval of F/2013/0257/HYB.
24723 - Mr James Crickmore [13066]	Support	<p>We are acting on behalf of our client Mr James Crickmore.</p> <p>Please see the attached letter and plan that set out our representation.</p>	Comments noted. The site is owned by at least 3 landowners and it is considered a brief is necessary to ensure a coordinated development making best use of the site. The uses, layout and density of the site will be explored through preparation of the brief however it is unlikely the proposed capacities can be achieved while meeting the LPAs suitable alternative green space (SANG) requirements. The park home development should be Policy CS9 affordable housing compliant.	Modification to Policies Map 16 and site location plan SA9(a) to reflect land ownership and availability.
24822 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	The policy reference is welcomed - the potential significance of the archaeological remains at Red Lodge justify the approach.	See statement of common ground between FHDC and SCC.	Minor wording addition suggested for SA9(c). See statement of common ground and modifications schedule.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>5.8.23</i>				
24854 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Support	<p>5.8.23</p> <p>The Trust generally supports the Site Allocations Local Plan in its present form, and in particular Policy SA10.</p> <p>The Trust supports the level of housing provision at Red Lodge. However, for clarification and the avoidance of doubt, the word "additional" should be inserted in front of "1,129 dwellings" in paragraph 5.8.4.</p> <p>The references to 350 dwellings in Policy SA10 and in paragraph 5.8.23 are supported. The references in Policy SA10 and in paragraph 5.8.23 to the provision of 3 hectares for a new primary school are also supported, as the increase in the amount of land set aside for a new school will help to cater for the residential growth proposed at Red Lodge.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.	No action required.
<i>5.8.24-5.8.26 - Site SA10(a) - land north of Acorn Way and map</i>				
24781 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p>	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage. The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with 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>
<i>Policy SA10 - Focus on growth - North Red Lodge</i>				
24930 - Natural England (Cheshire) (Ms Francesca Shapland) [12637]	Object	SA10 - Even though only a small proportion of this is within the 1500 constraints zone, a development of this size at this distance from the SPA may require mitigation to offset the recreational effect to stone curlew. In our view it is therefore not possible to rule out an effect on integrity here without providing further information on the need for a project level HRA with mitigation if necessary, and regarding its position in relation to the nest attempts buffer.	The comments are noted and it is agreed a modification should be made to paragraph b).	Delete existing para b) and amend to read:  The masterplan and any future planning applications will require a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment. The development must also provide measures for influencing recreation in the surrounding area, to avoid a damaging increase in visitors to Breckland SPA. and an increase in recreational activity in adjacent farmland. Measures should include the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace which is well connected and the enhancement, and promotion of dog friendly access routes in the immediate vicinity of the development, barriers to access and/or other agreed measures

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24902 - Strutt & Parker (William Nichols) [12701]	Object	<p>Policies SA9 (b), (c), (d) and SA10 are considered to be unsound on the basis that they are in conflict with the vision for Red Lodge set out in the Core Strategy. While the inclusion of land at Coopers Yard is strongly supported as an allocation on the basis it would remove an unfavourable use of a haulage yard from the residential area, removing the last remaining HGVs from Red Lodge, the failure to include another nearby brownfield site at land at the Carrops is inconsistent with national planning policy and the Council's Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the settlement boundary should be retained as it is currently so that it includes this brownfield site, rather than removing it from the settlement boundary as the Forest Heath Site Allocation Local Plan proposes to do. proposed a further site, land at the Carrops, to be included in the Site Allocations Local Plan as it comprises brownfield land, and thus its development would contribute to achieving Red Lodge's vision as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site is developable and deliverability and an outline planning application for a scheme of 30 dwellings. The proposed scheme has already been presented to Red Lodge Parish Council who support the site coming forward for residential development on the basis that it provides an opportunity to enhance the site, which is located in a prominent gateway location on the southern edge of Red Lodge.</p> <p><i>Add a further site (land south of the Carrops) into Policy SA9: Housing allocations in Red Lodge, in order to ensure that all suitable brownfield land within Red Lodge is included in the Site Allocations Plan. This will ensure that the plan is sound through demonstrating that all viable sites have been included, as well as being in accordance with the vision for Red Lodge, as set out in the Core Strategy. Land at the Carrops is available and a Site Allocation SA9 (e) should be included for up to 35 residential dwellings. It is also recommended that Site Allocation SA9 (a) be amended to include 10 Heath Farm Road, Red Lodge, which is now within my client's ownership and is a vacant property in a poor state of repair. While it is clear that close and collaborative working between the owner of Coopers Yard (and nos 6 and 10 Heath</i></p>	<p>Red Lodge site allocations accord with Vision 1 of the FH Core Strategy which requires development to be focused in towns and key service centres. Support for site SA9(a) is noted and welcomed. Land south of the Carrops (RL/18) was deferred for a number of reasons including: elements of the site being within flood zones 2 and 3, records of protected species in the area, visual sensitive on the edge of the settlement and proposals to remove the SSSI from the settlement boundary to link with the countryside. In addition the neighbouring scrap yard and waste transfer site are likely to have a detrimental effect on residential amenity. A development brief is considered necessary to ensure a coordinated approach to the development of site SA9(a). No objection to the proposed site boundary modification to include 10 Heath Farm Road into site SA9(a).</p>	Modification to boundary of site SA9(a) to include 10 Heath Farm Road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<i>Farm Road), and the remaining part of the site will be essential, it is considered that flexibility should be built into the policy to allow both sites to come forward for development independently of each other, but taking careful heed of their respective neighbour.</i>		
24852 - R J Upton 1987 Settlement Trust [12681]	Support	<p>The Trust generally supports the Site Allocations Local Plan in its present form, and in particular Policy SA10.</p> <p>The Trust supports the level of housing provision at Red Lodge. However, for clarification and the avoidance of doubt, the word "additional" should be inserted in front of "1,129 dwellings" in paragraph 5.8.4.</p> <p>The references to 350 dwellings in Policy SA10 and in paragraph 5.8.23 are supported. The references in Policy SA10 and in paragraph 5.8.23 to the provision of 3 hectares for a new primary school are also supported, as the increase in the amount of land set aside for a new school will help to cater for the residential growth proposed at Red Lodge.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed.	No action required.
<i>5.9.1-5.9.8 and Beck Row settlement map</i>				
24904 - Mr Jim Irons [12334]	Object	5.9	<p>The site is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document. The site lies some distance from the village centre and is therefore considered an unsustainable location.</p> <p>* The site's access would be on a tight bend.</p>	no action required.
		<p>The submission site is located south of The Grove in Beck Row and off the A1101 to the west of Beck Row. The site consists of land associated with White Gables. The site has been the subject of earlier site allocations and SHLAA submissions when it was referred to as Site BR/23.</p> <p>We consider that developing the site with housing meets the requirements of planning policy at a national and local level. The development of the site can be designed to respect the local character and environment. We therefore conclude that the development of the site with housing accords with local and national requirements, and is sustainable development.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24835 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>Primary School Provision</p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Beck Row: As noted in the document, all sites identified for allocation already benefit from planning permission. Proportionate developer contributions have been sought to expand Beck Row primary school.</p> <p>RoW Beck Row No required strategic improvements are immediately apparent, although all development will contribute to demand for improved linkages and access to the existing network to the east and north.</p>	The comments are noted.	No action required.

#### *5.9.9 - Site SA11(a) - Land adjacent to St Johns Street and map*

24783 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This site falls within the All Development height consultation zone and the vulnerable building distance. Therefore, please consult this office on development for this site.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.</p>	No further 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>
24689 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	This site is outside the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but is within a highland area that drains into it.  Surface water from this site should be balanced to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed	This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.	No further action required.

#### *5.9.10 - Site SA11(b) - Land adjacent to and south of the caravan park, Aspal Lane and map*

24784 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.  Mildenhall: This site falls within the 45.7m height zone and the technical safeguarding zone. Therefore, please refer all development exceeding this criterion to this office for review.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No further action required.
--	--------	--	---	-----------------------------

24690 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	This site is outside the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but is within a highland area that drains into it.  Surface water from this site should be balanced to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed	This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.	No further action required.
--	---------	---	---	-----------------------------

#### *5.9.11 - Site SA11(c) - Land east of Aspal Lane and map*

24786 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Lakenheath: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.  Mildenhall: This falls within the 45.7m height zone and the technical safeguarding zone. Therefore, please refer to this office any development exceeding this height criterion.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No further 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>
24691 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	<p>This site is outside the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but is within a highland area that drains into it.</p> <p>Surface water from this site should be balanced to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed</p>	This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.	No further action required.
<i>5.9.12 - Site SA11(d) - Land adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm and map</i>				
24787 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 15.2m height zone and the technical safeguarding zone. Therefore, please refer to this office for any development exceeding this height criterion.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.</p>	No further action required.
24692 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	<p>This site is outside the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but is within a highland area that drains into it.</p> <p>Surface water from this site should be balanced to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed</p>	This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.	No further action required.
<i>Policy SA11 - Housing allocations in Beck Row</i>				
24797 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>Within this document the MOD, on the basis of the Military Aviation Noise Contour Report for RAF Lakenheath (24th February 2017) objects to the following:</p> <p>Policy SA 11 Housing Allocations in Beck Row.</p> <p>It is DIO's contention that the Council should reconsider the allocations listed above in line with the requirements of the NPPF Paragraph 123, the supporting Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 3 and in line with the requirements of the Explanatory Note of the Noise Policy Statement for England.</p>	Noted. The DIO has withdrawn this objection. See Statement of Common Ground between the DIO and FHDC dated 18.8.17.	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>
24905 - Mr Jim Irons [12334]	Object	<p>The submission site is located south of The Grove in Beck Row and off the A1101 to the west of Beck Row. The site consists of land associated with White Gables. The site has been the subject of earlier site allocations and SHLAA submissions when it was referred to as Site BR/23.</p> <p>We consider that developing the site with housing meets the requirements of planning policy at a national and local level. The development of the site can be designed to respect the local character and environment. We therefore conclude that the development of the site with housing accords with local and national requirements, and is sustainable development.</p>	<p>The site is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document. The site lies some distance from the village centre and is therefore considered an unsustainable location.</p> <p>* The site's access would be on a tight bend.</p>	No action required.
24660 - Mr Paul Bonnett [13065]	Object	<p>The land off Wilde Street, Beck Row (as shown in red on the attached plan) should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p><i>The land off Wilde Street, Beck Row (as shown in red on the attached plan) should be allocated for residential development.</i></p>	<p>The site is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document. The site is located outside the existing settlement boundary and there are sequentially preferable sites.</p>	No action required.
24659 - Mr Trevor Sore [13063]	Object	<p>The land at Stock Corner Farm, Beck Row (as shown in red on the attached plan) should be allocated for residential development (or part thereof).</p> <p><i>The land at Stock Corner Farm, Beck Row (as shown in red on the attached plan) should be allocated for residential development (or part thereof).</i></p>	<p>The site is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document. The site is located adjacent but outside the existing settlement boundary.</p> <p>* The site is considered to be within an unsustainable location and at an unsuitable scale.</p> <p>* The site is partly within the MOD noise safeguarding zone (70 decibels).</p>	No action required.
24823 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>No amendment is necessary, but it is worth noting that initial investigation of these sites has indicated that there is little need for preservation in situ.</p>	The comments 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>
<i>5.10.1-5.10.7 and Exning settlement map</i>				
24730 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Object	<p>It is recommended that the Council takes this opportunity to recognise that its draft Site Allocations document has been formed without the necessary supporting information. That recommendations on sites for allocations have been made without considering reasonable alternatives and what those alternatives can offer in relation to needs detailed in the evidence base</p> <p><i>The Council should not progress the plan to the next stage of the process. The Council should acknowledge that the SA does not provide the base from which to make decisions as it does not meet with the requirements of the SEA Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>We would recommend that the Council review the Exning outcomes with a fresh SA and supporting evidence which takes account of our site promotion. Failure to return to this stage of the process will result in a plan which cannot be found sound.</i></p> <p><i>It is our opinion that E16 (b) performs as well as, if not better, than site E1(a) when considered against the SA objectives.</i></p> <p><i>The Council should consider the package of benefits which we have offered and the needs detailed in the evidence base for GI, cycleways and footpaths. The evaluation of the benefits of the proposal against these matters will clearly demonstrate that E16 (b) is the correct site for allocation in Exning.</i></p> <p><i>The allocation for Exning should be awarded to Site E16 (b).</i></p>	<p>Site E/16 was deferred on the grounds of policy/unsustainable scale and location in the March 2016 SHLAA.</p> <p>The site was discounted in the April 2016 Site Allocations Preferred Options document.</p> <p>The site is deferred in the November 2016 Omission Sites document.</p> <p>The SA is one of a number of evidence base documents which helps inform on the suitability of sites for development. The site (original and revised proposals E/16a and E/16b) were assessed in an SA Erratum which was available for comment during the Regulation 19 consultation. Neither of the sites performed as well as the SA12a allocation, confirming the earlier reasons for discounting.</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>
24911 - Jockey Club Farming Co Ltd [12904]	Object	5.10.4; 5.10.5; 5.10.6  Jockey Club Farming Co Ltd requests changes to the Plan text under Section 5.10 on Exning, to seek to ensure that the Plan is in accordance with paragraph 158 of the NPPF which requires local plans to be based on adequate, up to date and relevant evidence.  <i>It should be noted that the Inspector's Report for the Forest Heath Core Strategy (2010) noted, at paragraph 5.18, that, of the Primary Villages, Exning has the most flexibility to accommodate further growth. It is a surprise to read therefore, at paragraph 5.10.5 of the SALP, that 'higher growth in the village could only be considered if these constraints can be overcome'. Exning is the least constrained settlement of the primary villages. It is important to take a flexible and positive approach (as required by paragraph 182 of the NPPF) and be clear that the Core Strategy Single Issue Review does not impose a ceiling on the amount of housing development that may come forward. The Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan to 2031 (Submission Draft 2016) confirms that no capacity issues have been identified for Exning in terms of energy, water and drainage, education, health, emergency services, community facilities, sport and recreation or green infrastructure. Paragraph 5.10.7 of the SALP states that in Exning the cumulative impact of growth may result in contributions being required for expansion and possible relocation of GP practices in Newmarket where and when appropriate in line with emerging Clinical Commissioning Group Strategic Estates Plans (SEPs). It should be noted that our client's site at Heath Road, Exning provides an opportunity to provide for a new community health centre in the village to accommodate for future growth.</i>	There is a more appropriate site to meet the district's housing need. Site E/03 is omitted in the November 2016 Omission Sites Document due to proximity to the A14 and associated noise and air quality issues, loss of allotments and road congestion and access.	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>
24836 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>Primary School Provision</p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.Exning:</p> <p>Whilst forecasts for Exning Primary School indicate that it cannot accept additional pupils arising from this development, it appears possible that the school can be expanded within its existing site. Developer contributions will be required to enable this to take place.</p> <p>RoW Exning</p> <p>A key issue is to better develop the walking and cycling route to Newmarket, to support development in Exning and Burwell in Cambridgeshire. Physical improvements will be identified.</p>	The comments are noted.	No action required.

*5.10.8-5.10.9 - Site SA12(a) - land south of Burwell Road and map*

24788 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p> <p>Cambridge: This falls within the 45.7m height zone, any development exceeding this height should be referred to this office for review.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.</p>	No further 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>
24820 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	In order to ensure consistency, it would be appropriate to include a reference to archaeological conditions within the supporting text.  <i>In order to ensure consistency, it would be appropriate to include a reference to archaeological conditions within the supporting text.</i>	The comment is noted, and a modification is proposed. See statement of common ground between SCC and the Council.	Main modification suggested to insert new requirement:  "In advance of determination, initial archaeological field evaluation must be carried out in order to identify the significance of any archaeological assets."
24608 - Mr Paul Grover [12595]	Object	My concern is because of the already very hazardous stretch of Burwell Road starting at the corner after passing through the village centre on Oxford Street. For 150 yards the road is reduced to one lane - with an occasional exception - caused by parked cars. During busy periods the road is a nightmare of cars reversing, braking suddenly, staring at oncoming drivers on your lane and frustration. This situation will, I am sure, soon culminate in a serious accident most likely caused by the tailback of vehicles towards the bends at each end of the troublesome stretch of road.  Install traffic lights or ban the parked cars will provide some relief but will not entirely solve Exnings traffic problems. The expansion of Burwell, coupled with the expansion of Exning, means that all the village roads but particularly Oxford Street, Swan Lane and Windmill Hill are struggling to cope with peak period use. Just look at the current advertisement for the new development at Burwell where easy access to the A14 road is highlighted. The road through Exning!  I hope that West Suffolk planning policy and Suffolk highways recognize what is happening just one mile across the County border as the significant new developments there impact on the residents of Exning. The proposal for Exning in the Site Allocation Plan must be considered with the highway problem clearly in in perspective.	Highway safety concerns will be addressed at the planning application stage. Policy SA12 states at point (D) that access should be provided to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority and that sustainable travel provision should be made. In addition, this site will provide land and funding for the delivery of a cycle path between Burwell and Exning.	No further action required.

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
24648 - Mr R Rix [12585]	Object	the Exning site, I am concerned about the impact such a large development would have on the village and the roads leading to it. Oxford St and lower Burwell Rd is already overcrowded. The junction at the Wight Horse corner and Windmill Hill junction onto the A142 are major issues. An additional 205 houses would add an estimate increase to the village population by 33% and an additional 400 vehicles.	Policy SA12 states at point (D) that access should be provided to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority and that sustainable travel provision should be made. In addition, this site will provide land and funding for the delivery of a cycle path between Burwell and Exning.	No further 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>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*Policy SA12 - Housing allocation in Exning*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
24912 - Jockey Club Farming Co Ltd [12904]	Object	<p>Our client objects to Policy SA12: Housing allocation in Exning.</p> <p>It is important to take a flexible approach and be clear that the Local Plan does not impose a ceiling on the amount of housing development that may come forward. In this respect it does not take a sufficiently flexible approach and is therefore not effective.</p> <p><i>The Policy needs to be reworded to include an additional allocation at Land off Heath Road, Exning, referred to in these representations as SA12 (b). Land off Heath Road, Exning is as suitable and sustainable than the existing proposed draft allocation at Land south of Burwell Road and west of Queens View (Reference SA12 (a)). Land south of Burwell Road and west of Queens View is located on higher ground and visual impact is apparent from along the Burwell Road.</i></p> <p><i>Further detail and evidence on the suitability of Land off Heath Road, Exning as a future housing allocation is provided in the enclosed Planning Representations Report.</i></p> <p><i>Rename SA12 to SA12(a)</i></p> <p><i>Add new site SA12(b) as below</i></p> <p><i>Reference - SA12(b)</i>  <i>Location - Land off Heath Lane, Exning</i>  <i>Area (Hectares) - 11.26</i>  <i>Indicative Capacity - 150</i></p> <p><i>Our suggested rewording for Policy SA12 is:</i></p> <p><i>The sites are identified on the Policies Map.</i></p> <p><i>SA12 (a)</i></p> <p><i>The following specific requirements should be met:</i></p> <p><i>A) The amount of land available for development, access arrangements, design, open space and landscaping will be informed by a Development Brief for the whole 15ha site. The Development Brief should set out how the cycle path between Burwell and the site will be delivered. Applications for planning</i></p>	<p>There is a more appropriate site to meet the district's housing need. Site E/03 is omitted in the November 2016 Omission Sites Document due to proximity to the A14 and associated noise and air quality issues, loss of allotments and road congestion and access.</p>	No further 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>permission will only be determined once the Development Brief has been adopted by the local planning authority. Any application for planning permission should be in accordance with the approved development brief;</p> <p>B) Strategic landscaping and open space must be provided to address the individual site requirements and location;</p> <p>C) There is an identified need for a dedicated cross country boundary cycle route between Burwell and the site. The site shall provide land and funding for the delivery of the cycle path;</p> <p>D) Adequate access should be provided to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority. Sustainable travel provision including facilities for pedestrians and cyclists should be made with links to existing networks.</p> <p>SA12 (b)</p> <p>The following specific requirements should be met:</p> <p>A) The amount of land available for development, access arrangements, design, open space and landscaping will be informed by a Development Brief for the whole 11.26ha site. Applications for planning permission will only be determined once the Development Brief has been adopted by the local planning authority. Any application for planning permission should be in accordance with the approved Development Brief;</p> <p>B) Strategic landscaping and open space must be provided to address the individual site requirements and location;</p> <p>C) Adequate access should be provided to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority. Sustainable travel provision including facilities for pedestrians and cyclists should be made with links to existing networks.</p>		
24741 - Persimmon Homes Ltd (Miss Sophie Waggett) [12423]	Support	<p>Please see the attached.</p> <p>Boyer Planning appointed as agent for reps 24741 and 24742 as per email received from Programme Officer on 16.05.2017</p>	<p>The comments are noted. However, a Development Brief is required to achieve a comprehensive approach to the site, and secure an area of open space.</p>	No further 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>
24631 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883]	Support	Whilst East Cambridgeshire District Council does not wish to make comments on the merits of the allocation itself, it does support the clear reference within the policy of the need for the delivery of a cycle path between Burwell and Exning.	The comments are noted, and reflected in criteria C.	No further action required.
<i>5.11.1-5.11.7 and Kentford settlement map</i>				
24900 - Anglian Water (Ms Hannah Wilson) [13062]	Object	Kentford - paragraph 5.11.2 This paragraph refers to 'the waste water treatment works' this should be changed to water recycling centre.  <i>Kentford - paragraph 5.11.2 This paragraph refers to 'the waste water treatment works' this should be changed to water recycling centre.</i>	The comments are noted. An additional modification is required to paragraph 5.11.2 to correct this factual error.	Additional modification required to paragraph 5.11.2 to correct this factual error. See schedule of additional modifications.
24800 - Heritage Developments Limited [12672]	Object	Kentford needs to have further housing allocated to provide choice beyond the next five years and to address social infrastructure issues  <i>Allocate the proposed site</i>	Noted. The sites proposed have not been allocated in the plan as there are more appropriate sites available to meet the housing need. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document (CD: B10) for further details on the reasons for the omission of sites K/05, K/06, K/13.	No action required.
24929 - Stockton Green Ltd (Mr J Gredley) [12693]	Object	SITE REFERENCE K17. EMPLOYMENT LAND. LAND BETWEEN BURY ROAD AND A14, KENTFORD  This objection is made in relation to the non-inclusion of the above site as an allocation for employment and leisure use within the Site Allocations Local Plan.  The landowner considers that there are compelling reason why the council should grant approval for development on this site and that the site should be included for development within the Site Allocations Local Plan.  <i>Allocate site and include plan showing the extent of the designation.</i>	Noted. The site proposed has not been allocated in the plan. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document (CD: B10) for further details on the reason for this site's omission.  In addition, there is no evidence of employment need in the 2016 Employment Land Review that there is a need for this 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>
24837 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>See attached letter.</p> <p>surface water management:</p> <p>In Kentford there have been proposals for SuDS discharging into chalk aquifers which are listed as a being within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Given that any discharge would need to be to a potable standard, the County Council does not allow direct discharge into principle aquifers (chalk) if the site is within an SPZ. This could affect future developments intending to use infiltration. The County Council advise all sites to submit a geotechnical assessment with infiltration testing.</p> <p><b>Primary School Provision</b></p> <p>Although schools are increasingly provided by a range of different organisations, the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a choice of school places. At primary school level (ages 5-11), significant additional provision will be required in order to manage the level and distribution of growth proposed by the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Please note - all estimates of children arising from proposed growth, based upon two-bed houses, are to be considered a minimum until a more detailed assessment is carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Kentford:</b></p> <p>Whilst forecasts for Moulton Primary School indicate that the school cannot accommodate additional pupils arising from the sites, it will be possible to expand the primary school using the land identified in the local plan. The County Council welcomes the allocation in policy SA15.</p> <p><b>RoW</b></p> <p><b>Kentford</b></p> <p>The County Council is investigating ways of improving the route to Moulton.</p>	The comments are noted.	No further action is 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>5.11.8 - Site SA13(a) - Land rear of The Kentford and map</i>				
24789 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No further action required.
<i>5.11.9 - Site SA13(b) - Land at Meddler Stud and map</i>				
24790 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with the safeguarding procedures.	No further action required.
<i>Policy SA13 - Housing and mixed use allocations in Kentford</i>				
24749 - Mrs Sue Cade [13107]	Object	Permission granted on both sites already. The previous draft of 'the plan' included Kentford Lodge (60) and land behind The Kentford (34). Now we have an extra 60 houses being built now because of the shifting sands of time. 2 further developments have crept in during this time - 116 home added since the draft plan started plus the 94 on this plan - and every time you spoke to FHDC they say we agree Kentford has had more than it's fair share and then they sneak in some more regardless of the amenities or residents views.	The sites identified have planning approval. Once adopted, this plan will provide more certainty in terms of planned growth.	No further action required.
24825 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Object	The reference to archaeology in policy is supported, but it could be moved to the supporting text.  <i>The reference to archaeology in policy is supported, but it could be moved to the supporting text.</i>	The comments are noted. See the statement of common ground between SCC and the Council.	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>
24740 - Hopkins Homes Ltd [13102]	Object	<p>There is a need for additional housing in Kentford to meet housing and affordable housing needs and to provide support for services and facilities in the village. The allocated sites have planning permission. There is no strategy for the medium and longer term. Land east of Gazeley Road in Kentford should be allocated for up to 70 dwellings.</p> <p><i>We request the following changes to Chapter 5.11: Kentford and Policy SA13:</i></p> <p><i>* Land east of Gazeley Road in Kentford allocated for up to 70 dwellings</i></p> <p><i>* Specific policy requirements for development at land east of Gazeley Road based on findings of previous technical reports e.g. landscaping, ecological mitigation, footway improvements, and ground investigation mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>* Review evidence for boundary of 1500m Stone-Curlew Constraint Zone to ensure consistency with East Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposals Map, and amend or delete boundary accordingly.</i></p>	<p>The site proposed (omission site K/14) has not been allocated in the plan as there are more appropriate sites available to meet the housing need. Please see the Omission Sites evidence base document (CD ref B10) for further details on the reason for this site's omission.</p>	No further action required.
<i>5.11.10 - Employment sites</i>				
24748 - Mrs Sue Cade [13107]	Object	<p>employment sites are diminishing rather than expanding. Further employment opportunities have been promised by developers in the recent past and taken away after the initial planning permission was granted. 2 recent in-fill developments have been permitted on land that did offer employment. The statement seems to imply false hope.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. Sufficient sites have been allocated for employment uses in the plan.</p>	No further action is necessary.
<i>5.12.1-5.12.7 and West Row settlement map</i>				
24610 - Mrs Rosalind Hamill [12625]	Object	<p>The Local Plan has been redrawn to embrace one land owner's request to build.</p> <p><i>Consultation with residents who object to this development</i></p>	<p>Site SA14(a) has a resolution to grant planning permission (3 August 2016 - DC/14/2047/HYB) subject to a S106 agreement.</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>
24615 - Mrs Beryl Watts [13029]	Object	<p>Keep LARGE housing estates out of rural villages please</p> <p><i>Just build on The White Horse site &amp; Mr Waters Not including The County Council land as this is/ was a farmers livelihood &amp; I understand left way back for this very reason NOT to have massive buildings on!</i></p>	Site SA14(a) has a resolution to grant planning permission (3 August 2016 - DC/14/2047/HYB) subject to a S106 agreement.	no action required
<hr/>				
<i>5.12.8-5.12.11 - SA14(a) - Land East of Beeches Road and map and school expansion site map</i>				
24634 - Mr Neal Entwistle [5733]	Object	<p>You have amended the settlement boundary to include the recent planning approvals, but have not done this elsewhere in the plan. EG Worlington Road Mildenhall. In particular, the land to the rear of 1 &amp; 2 Park Garden was only passed due to the lack of 5 year housing plan at the time and has yet to achieve all RM approvals. It should not be reason to amend the previous boundary plan. By amending the development boundary you give weight to future applications that become adjacent to the development boundary instead of outside it.</p> <p><i>Needs a consistent approach to boundary modifications if these are indeed legal changes within this document and should be incorporated within it. I cannot comment on all areas as only familiar with local issues. I have had to choose an element below but this objection doesn't really fit within the given options. It is just inconsistent</i></p>	<p>The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with safeguarding procedures.</p>	No action required.
24791 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	<p>See attached Safeguarding Assessment:</p> <p>Lakenheath: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height please refer to the office.</p> <p>Mildenhall: This site falls within the 15.2 and 45.7m height consultation zone and technical zone. Therefore, if any development exceeds 15.2m please refer to this office for review.</p>	<p>The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with the MOD on relevant planning applications and plans in accordance with safeguarding procedures.</p>	No further 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>
24609 - Mrs Rosalind Hamill [12625]	Object	<p>The land at Beeches Road, was originally ear-marked for 139 houses.</p> <p>The allocation for West Row over the ensuing years was to be 140, which means this development consumes our entire allocation.</p> <p>Now we hear the site is due 156 houses.</p> <p>The village lies at the heart of "C" roads and the school is at maximum capacity.</p> <p>We have neither the infrastructure or sustainability to absorb this large scale development in one hit.</p> <p>The character of the village will be ruined, as has been the experience of neighbouring villages. No control over housing design and opinions of residents never considered</p> <p><i>The Local Plan is not legal because it has only taken into account the property of one owner who has affiliations with both FHDC and the new business consortium Barley Homes who will railroad this approval regardless of residents' opinion.</i></p>	<p>The site has an indicative capacity of 152 dwellings. This part of the village has no major environmental constraints, and relates well to the existing form of the village. A larger site creates the opportunity to provide suitable alternative natural greenspace on site, and contributes to expanding the primary school.</p>	No further action required.
24598 - Mr Neal Entwistle [5733]	Support	<p>This outline development area does not include the 7 self build plots that were passed in DC/14/2047/HYB which would seem to be an omission.</p>	<p>The proposed self build dwellings are outline with the details yet to be approved. It would therefore be inappropriate to amend the site boundary until the extent of the built development is agreed.</p>	No action required
24693 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards (Mr Andrew Newton) [13087]	Support	<p>This site is outside the Mildenhall Internal Drainage District but is within a highland area that drains into it.</p> <p>Surface water from this site should be balanced to greenfield run-off rates and the principle of SUDS should be followed</p>	<p>This will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>	No further 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 SA14 - Housing Allocation and school expansion in West Row</i>				
24717 - Rockhill Investments Ltd [13095]	Object	Land off Williams Way, West Row is put forward for residential use. Policy SA14 is a draft allocation within the Forest Heath District Council Local Plan for residential use, however, the policy is unsound as it is not justified with regard to the exclusion of site WR/14. West Row is a Primary Village and can be expected to accommodate development. The Site is suitable, available and appropriate for development and its potential to be delivered later in the plan period should not be seen as a reason to preclude the Site's development.	he site is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document as the site is distanced from the existing settlement boundary (i.e. is not within or adjacent). * Other identified / submitted sites are considered to be more suitable and sustainable options in the area. * Development of the site would lead to the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. * The eastern part of the site relates poorly to the form and character of the settlement. * The site does not benefit from an existing boundary to provide screening and development would have a visual impact on the surrounding countryside, particularly in the short term.	no action required
<i>Allocate site WR/14 for residential use.</i>				
24604 - Mrs Rachel Royal [12560]	Object	Building on prime farmland!  138 of the 140 houses allocated to one individual developer and the family who are related to the head of the council is questionable!  Safety concerns over traffic access at the school.  Proposes an urban style commuter development be preferred instead of allowing the same number of houses within the envelope and the village to grow organically as a rural village.  Poor infrastructure and access and roads which are very narrow and with an unusually high number of bends making it unsafe to walk to the school without having further traffic coming through the village.  <i>Allocate a larger number of smaller plots which can be developed by villagers!</i>	Site SA14(a) has a resolution to grant planning permission (3 August 2016 - DC/14/2047/HYB) subject to a S106 agreement.	no action required
24826 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	The reference to archaeology in policy is supported. Given the potential for significant Roman remains, it is useful to remain in policy. The same approach is likely to be necessary in respect of the expansion of West Row Primary School.	The comments 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>
24838 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	West Row: West Row Primary School will need to expand in order to accommodate the growth set out in the Local Plan. The County Council welcomes the allocation set out in policy SA14.  RoW West Row A key issue will be enabling access/connectivity to services in Mildenhall.	The comments are noted.	No action required.
<i>5.13.1-5.13.2 and SA15 map</i>				
24661 - P and J Haylock Farms [13064]	Object	The settlement boundary of Holywell Row should be amended to include the land at Laurel Farm (as shown on the attached plan).  <i>The settlement boundary of Holywell Row should be amended to include the land at Laurel Farm (as shown on the attached plan).</i>	The comments are noted. A modification is required for consistency to amend the boundary in accordance with development built out as a result of application F/2007/0195/RMA. It is noted that application DC/16/1897/FUL has been granted planning permission, but a modification has not been suggested as the development has not been built out.	An additional modification is suggested for consistency to make a minor boundary amendment in accordance with development built out as a result of application F/2007/0195/RMA.
24862 - Mr and Mrs W A Hurlock [13116]	Object	See attached letter and site location plan. Site submission for 2.15 hectare site at Worlington.	The settlement boundaries of secondary villages have not extended to allow residential growth as this would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy which states '...2. No urban expansion will be considered for these villages...'	No action required.
<i>Policy SA15 - Moulton primary school</i>				
24792 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Mr Mark Limbrick) [13094]	Object	See attached Safeguarding Assessment:  Mildenhall: This falls within the 91.4m height consultation zone. Therefore if any development exceeds this height criteria please refer to the office.	The comments are noted. This issue would be dealt with at planning application stage.  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>
<b>6. Economy and jobs</b>				
<b>6.1-6.6</b>				
24880 - Newmarket Horsemen's Group (NHG) [11392]	Object	6.1  The NHG notes that the horse racing industry is not listed as one of the six employment sectors in Forest Heath that the economic geography focuses on. This is a confusing omission as the background evidence for the Plan highlights the importance of the horse-racing industry to both Newmarket and the wider area. This unfortunate downplaying of the economic importance of this industry calls into question the extent to which the employment policies of this Plan adequately support this important industry.  <i>Clarify the importance of the horse racing industry in this section of the Plan and identify it an important local employer along with the other six important local employers. The importance of this industry to both Newmarket and the wider area is well-documented in the Council's existing and emerging evidence base.</i>	The horse racing industry is noted in paragraph 6.1 as playing an important role in the local economy. However, the land and premises used, and the jobs created in the horse racing industry do not fall into the B use classes. This is similar to the other two areas of employment mentioned in this paragraph, i.e. Center Parcs and the RAF airbases at Mildenhall and Lakenheath. Policies SA16 and SA17 in Section 6 of the plan provide for the allocation of existing employment areas and new employment areas, all within the B use classes.	No action required.
24668 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422]	Object	To ensure all points are heard, please see attached.  <i>To show realistic and deliverable employment opportunities.</i>	The site SA16(j) (Policy SA16) contains substantial buildings and road infrastructure, and is situated adjacent to proposed allocation SA8(b), a mixed use site of 22.4ha. There is no evidence that this site is no longer suitable for B1, B2 or B8 uses, and no reason not to reallocate it for employment uses. A site of 6.5ha with existing buildings is considered a proportionate quantity of employment land in this Key Service Centre especially considering its proximity to employment opportunities at RAF Lakenheath, and distance from the A11 corridor.	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 SA16 - Existing employment areas</i>				
24806 - Mr Fothergill's Seeds Ltd [13086]	Object	<p>The Local Plan should support economic growth by supporting the employment allocation SA16(h) to the east of Gazeley Road by extending the settlement boundary of Kentford to include the whole of the Mr Fothergill's Seeds land and defining the settlement boundary instead along the existing clear landscaped boundaries to the south and east. This land forms the same physical parcel and land ownership and is in direct use associated with the business. Without this change it is considered that the Plan would unduly constrain the ability of this important employment site to operate into the Plan period.</p> <p><i>In accordance with Paragraph 28 of the NPPF the Local Plan should seek to support economic growth in rural areas by supporting the employment allocation SA16(h) to the east of Gazeley Road by extending the settlement boundary of Kentford to include the whole of the Mr Fothergill's Seeds land and defining the settlement boundary instead along the existing clear landscaped boundaries to the south and east. The attached plan of the site illustrates the land within the settlement boundary shaded in pink and the land that should be included shaded in blue.</i></p>	<p>The area shaded blue on the plan attached to the representation is outside the settlement boundary for Kentford and is therefore in the countryside. The current use of this land as trial grounds is compatible with the location. The council supports the sustainable growth and expansion of business and enterprise in rural areas, and Policy DM5 in the Joint Development Management Policies document specifically permits proposals for economic growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise "that recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside" where they comply with three criteria set out in the policy. It is therefore unnecessary to amend the boundary of this site and/or amend the settlement boundary to include the land shaded blue.</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>
24655 - Mrs Sue Malina [13074]	Object	<p>Land north of Station Road does not contain an existing employment area. It is an old engineering works, closed down for some time, which is only used for storage. There is no evidence that FHDC will be able to meet their Core Strategy 6 which states that 'economic and tourism growth at Lakenheath will be in broad alignment with the scale of housing development to discourage commuting and achieve a homes / jobs balance.' The location and poor transport links in Lakenheath make it a poor business proposition. Therefore development plans for Lakenheath are highly disproportionate and unsustainable.</p> <p><i>Identify how employment opportunities for Lakenheath can be created or significantly reduce level of housing development.</i></p>	<p>The site SA16(j) (Policy SA16) contains substantial buildings and road infrastructure, and is situated adjacent to proposed allocation SA8(b), a mixed use site of 22.4ha. There is no evidence that this site is no longer suitable for B1, B2 or B8 uses, and no reason not to reallocate it for employment uses. A site of 6.5ha with existing buildings is considered a proportionate quantity of employment land in this Key Service Centre especially considering its proximity to employment opportunities at RAF Lakenheath, and distance from the A11 corridor.</p>	No action required.
<hr/>				
<i>6.13 - SA17(a) - Mildenhall Academy and The Dome Leisure Centre and map</i>				
24845 - Suffolk County Council (Mr Robert Feakes) [6500]	Support	<p>See attached letter and comments on surface water management.</p> <p>The following sites have some specific issues which will require significant consideration at the planning application stage.</p> <p>□ SA17 (a): the southern part of this site is within flood zone 3, although it benefits from an existing defence. Flood Risk Assessment will be required to demonstrate how risk to people and property would be kept to a minimum. Employment types less vulnerable to flooding may need to be considered on this site.</p>	<p>The comments are noted and it is agreed they should be dealt with 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>
<i>Policy SA17: Employment allocations</i>				
24735 - Mr Philip Cobbold [7852]	Object	The Site Allocation Local Plan is unsound because the land adjoining Fiveways Roundabout, Barton Mills, provides a more sustainable alternative for B1/B2/B8 uses than other sites which the Council are proposing to allocate for those uses.	This is shown as site M/26a in the Further Issues & Options consultation document August 2015 following a SHLAA bid for residential use. This was deferred because of the SPA designation and flood risk constraints. Rep. no. 24735 was submitted as an alternative site for B1/B2/B8 uses. Although this is a brownfield site it is not considered to be a sustainable location (too distant from Mildenhall). It is adjacent to the Breckland Forest SSSI, which is a component of the Breckland SPA and within the SPA buffers. Development of the site would advance the line of development toward the SPA. The site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is not considered to be a reasonable alternative site.	No action required.
		<i>Propose the land adjoining Fiveways Roundabout, which was submitted as a land bid, as an allocation for B1/B2/B8 uses.</i>		
24640 - Herringswell Parish Council (Mrs Liz Marchington) [5853]	Object	There is an under provision of employment land identified for Newmarket following the deletion of the Hatchfield Farm site from within this planning document Policy CS1 provides for 5ha of new employment land to be allocated for new development between 2006 and 2016. With the removal of the Hatchfield Farm site there is no longer provision for any new employment land to be allocated at Newmarket. The only employment allocation in Newmarket is 1.6 hectares at 'St Leger', not only is this insufficient, but it is also not a new allocation since it is shown as being an employment area in the 1995 Local Plan. The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.  <i>The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.</i>	The Employment Land Review indicates that there is no under provision of employment land in the district in the plan period. The combination of site allocations across the B use classes is considered sufficient to meet the short and long term employment needs of the district.	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>
24715 - The Earl of Derby [5831]	Object	<p>Adopted Policy CS1 requires approximately 5 hectares of new employment land to be allocated in Newmarket. This was achieved in the Preferred Options by the allocation of a minimum of 5 hectares of employment land at Hatchfield Farm (Policy N1(c)). This has now been deleted.</p> <p>The proposed 1.6 ha of employment land at St Leger (Policy SA17(b)) does not qualify as 'new' employment land since it was identified in employment use in the 1995 Local Plan. As a consequence, the pre-submission SALP proposes no new employment land in Newmarket. In not meeting the employment requirements of Policy CS1, the SALP is unsound. The Hatchfield Farm employment allocation should be reinstated.</p> <p><i>Other representations in respect of Policies SA1 and SA6 argue that the complete Preferred Options allocation for Hatchfield Farm (Policy N1(c)) should be reinstated. If this was accepted, it would ensure that 5 ha of employment land is provided in Newmarket in accord with Policy CS1.</i></p> <p><i>However, if this was not accepted, the employment part of the former Preferred Options N1(c) allocation next to the A14 / A142 junction should be reinstated in the plan (Plan SS060854.21C) and the allocation should be identified as Policy SA17(c). Amended policy wording and plan of the employment allocation is attached to this representation.</i></p> <p><i>See attached sheet B2</i></p>	<p>The comments are noted. However, the ELR indicates that there is no under provision of employment land in the district in the plan period. The combination of site allocations across the B use classes in the district is considered sufficient to meet short, medium and long term employment needs.</p>	No action required.
24716 - Taylor Farms Ltd [13096]	Object	<p>Land off A11 at Herringswell Road, Barton Mills is put forward for employment use. We object to Policy SA17 due to the exclusion of this site and lack of evidence relating to the quantum of employment space required over the plan period. It is considered that SA17 is unsound as it is not positively prepared or justified. The site is ideally located on the A11 between employment sites at Red Lodge and Mildenhall. The site is suitable, available and appropriate for development and should be allocated for employment use under SA17 to make the plan sound.</p> <p><i>Allocate land off A11 at Herringswell Road for employment use.</i></p>	<p>This greenfield site of 25 hectares is in the countryside between the settlements of Red Lodge and Barton Mills. It is in an unsustainable location. This is not considered to be a reasonable alternative site. There is sufficient land allocated at Red Lodge 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>
24673 - Rural Parish Alliance (Mr Bill Rampling) [12706]	Object	<p>The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.</p> <p>The removal of this site has led to an under provision of employment land identified for Newmarket from within this planning document.</p> <p>Policy CS1 provides for 5ha of new employment land to be allocated for new development between 2006 and 2016. With the removal of the Hatchfield Farm site there is no longer provision for any new employment land to be allocated at Newmarket.</p> <p>The only employment allocation provided through this document at Newmarket, is 1.6 hectares at 'St Leger', not only is this insufficient, but it is also not a new allocation since it is shown as being an employment area in the 1995 Local Plan.</p> <p><i>The Hatchfield Farm decision is subject of a High Court challenge and FHDC still support the development of the site, and therefore the allocation at the Hatchfield Farm site should be retained.</i></p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review indicates that there is no under provision of employment land in the district in the plan period. The combination of site allocations across the B use classes is considered sufficient to meet the short and long term employment needs of the district.</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>
<b>7. Retail and town centres</b>				
<b>7.1-7.7</b>				
24711 - Anchor [13166]	Object	<p>Additionally paragraph 7.7 should be amended to read: The Newmarket commitment is allocated for retail proposes in Policy SA18 below and the Lakenheath commitment as a mixed use scheme under policy SA7(b). These developments will contribute to addressing convenience needs in the district. The Newmarket scheme permits 4653 sqm of A1 convenience floorspace, as stated reflected in the policy. The policy also allows for mixed use on the site as an alternative, which may incorporate C2 uses.</p> <p><i>Additionally paragraph 7.7 should be amended to read: The Newmarket commitment is allocated for retail proposes in Policy SA18 below and the Lakenheath commitment as a mixed use scheme under policy SA7(b). These developments will contribute to addressing convenience needs in the district. The Newmarket scheme permits 4653 sqm of A1 convenience floorspace, as stated reflected in the policy. The policy also allows for mixed use on the site as an alternative, which may incorporate C2 uses.</i></p>	The flexibility sought by the modification is considered acceptable in principle, although additional wording should be included to ensure a foodstore of at least 1,500sqm net is included within the scheme to ensure a scheme of an appropriate size comes forward.	Officer suggested modification is as follows: Insert at the end of para 7.7. 'A mixed use scheme could be considered for site allocation SA18 (a) provided a convenience foodstore of at least 1,500 sqm net is incorporated within the scheme'. The residual floorspace capacity will be directed to the town centre first in accordance with national and local policy
<b>Policy SA18 - Retail Allocation and map</b>				
24709 - Anchor [13166]	Object	<p>SA18 (a) should be amended to allow for additional uses and the retail floor space reflected as an 'up to' figure.</p> <p><i>See attached</i></p>	Officers do not consider it necessary to make the amendments to policy SA18 in enable flexibility. The proposed officer modification to para 7.7. will bring flexibility in the interpretation of the policy.	No action required.
24694 - ALDI Stores Ltd [13093]	Object	Please see attached letter.	Officer suggested modification	Officer suggested modification is as follows: Insert at the end of para 7.7. 'A mixed use scheme could be considered for site allocation SA18 (a) provided a convenience foodstore of at least 1,500 sqm net is incorporated within the scheme'. The residual floorspace capacity will be directed to the town centre first in accordance with national and local policy.