

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Proposed Submission Policies Map Book 2017 | | | | |
| <i>Proposed Submission Policies Map Book 2017</i> | | | | |
| 24662 - Mrs Sue Malina [13074] | Comment | Previous versions of the key planning constraints maps included noise contours. These are conspicuous in their absence from the map book and were therefore not provided as part of the village consultation exercise. Although there has been a recent update by the MOD, not even the old contours are shown. | The comments are noted. The updated noise contour constraints are proposed for inclusion in the SALP as an additional modification. It would not be appropriate to include these on the policies map as the maps can be updated at any time by the DIO. | No action required. |
| 24669 - Mrs Millar [12847] | Comment | I have marked in red the correct boundary between my property, 56 Kingsway, and 54 Kingsway. Please note the remaining boundary is correct. If you require verification of the amendment, the Land Registry will be able to provide the necessary details. | The comments are noted and it is agreed that a modification to the map is required. | A modification has been suggested to amend site boundary of site SA5(a) on the Mildenhall maps to reflect land ownership. |
| 24842 - Kentford Developments Ltd (Promoter) [13114] | Object | see attached report Map 11 These representations propose to change the settlement boundary of Kentford around Kentford Lodge. The boundary as currently proposed does not accord with recent planning approvals, is not justified by the evidence, and is not the most appropriate strategy for this part of the village. There are no reasons to protect the area that is currently proposed to be outside the settlement boundary from development that could happen if the area were included within the boundary. Existing Development Management Policies could provide all necessary controls over the design and siting of any proposals. <i>see attached report</i> <i>The area around Kentford Lodge that has been left out of the settlement boundary should be included within the boundary as shown in the attached report</i> | The comments are noted. It is not considered appropriate to amend the settlement boundary in this location as the area proposed for inclusion has been omitted to ensure the continued protection of the setting of Kentford Lodge and the character and setting of the landscape within which it lies. | 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> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 24907 - Mr Jim Irons [12334] | Object | <p>Map Book 2</p> <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>Site BR/23 is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document as the site lies some distance from the village centre and in an unsustainable location.</p> | No action required. |
| 24628 - Mr Stephen Griffiths [12866] | Object | <p>Polices Map Book - Mouton is a secondary village with a school, a pub, a shop and a church. 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. 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> | <p>Noted. The proposed amendments could lead to additional development within the village and an expansion that would not be appropriate or proportionate for a secondary village in line with Policy CS1 of the Forest Heath adopted Core Strategy and the council's emerging Single Issue Review (SiR) of Policy CS7. Singularly, none of the suggested amendments represent an allocated site within the SALP that would require an amendment to the settlement boundary.</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> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 24910 - Jockey Club Farming Co Ltd [12904] | Object | <p>Our client objects to the Policies Map for Exning. The Exning Policies Map needs to be amended to include an additional allocation at Land off Heath Road, Exning, referred to in these representations as SA12 (b).</p> <p>In planning policy terms, the site comprises a greenfield site immediately adjoining the defined existing urban boundary of Exning. The site is not subject to any specific ecological or heritage designations and does not lie within an Environment Agency defined flood plain.</p> <p>A series of technical assessments have also been undertaken which directly respond to the Council's comments in the Omissions Sites Document 2016 and their justification for rejecting the site as a future housing allocation. Further information on the technical work supporting the allocation of the site is included in the enclosed Planning Representations report and appendices.</p> <p><i>The Exning Policies Map needs to be amended to include an additional allocation at Land off Heath Road, Exning, referred to in these representations as SA12 (b).</i></p> | The site (E/03) has been omitted in the 2016 Omission Sites document on the basis there is a more suitable and sustainable site in the village. | No action required. |
| 24928 - The Brandon Strategic Land Development Limited Company [13124] | Object | <p>*****LATE SUBMISSION*****</p> <p>see attached</p> <p>*****LATE SUBMISSION*****</p> <p><i>include land west of Brandon within the development boundary.</i></p> | Site B/17 is deferred in the 2016 Omission Sites document due to SPA impacts. There is no evidence that mitigation can be provided to overcome impacts on the SPA. | No action required. |
| 24630 - East Cambridgeshire District Council (Mr Richard Kay) [12883] | Object | <p>The Map identifies policy measures which fall within the administrative boundary of East Cambridgeshire. These need removing from your Map. Allocations (or other policy notations) on the Policies Map within East Cambridgeshire are a matter for East Cambridgeshire District Council to determine.</p> <p><i>The Map identifies policy measures which fall within the administrative boundary of East Cambridgeshire. These need removing from your Map. Allocations (or other policy notations) on the Policies Map within East Cambridgeshire are a matter for East Cambridgeshire District Council to determine.</i></p> | The comments are noted. It is agreed that policy notations within the East Cambridgeshire area should be removed from neighbouring districts. | Additional modifications suggested to remove policy notations where they cross over into neighbouring districts' administrative areas - Map 3 and 3.1 (Brandon); Map 11 (Kentford). |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i> | <i>Council's Assessment</i> | <i>Action</i> |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 24657 - Lakenheath Parish Council (Ms C Shimmon) [12422] | Object | <p>It is almost impossible to clearly read and understand the various constraints due to an inefficient key provision and dark overlaying of some constraints. Previous editions of maps showing Lakenheath and environs has explained with overlays and key the noise constraint zones arising from RAF Lakenheath. Map 12 in the Local Plan Policy Map Book, completely omits all the noise contours, and safeguarding, either of the old or the new updated version.</p> <p><i>The policies and inset maps key should be printed on the reverse of each town or village page or as a pull out supplement so as to be available in considering the content of each of the various parishes. All constraints affecting any particular area should be added for transparency.</i></p> | <p>It is recognised that when an area is subject to numerous constraints it can be difficult to distinguish between them on a paper map. An interactive Policies Map was available online at 'Find my Nearest' which allowed the user to add and remove map layers.</p> <p>The updated noise contour constraints are proposed for inclusion in the SALP as an additional modification. It would not be appropriate to include these on the policies map as the maps can be updated at any time by the DIO.</p> | No action required. |
| 24626 - 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> | <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...'</p> | No action required. |
| 24623 - 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 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> | <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...'</p> | No action required. |