



Forest Heath
District Council

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Forest Heath Site Allocations Local Plan



SA Report Erratum
January 2017

REVISION SCHEDULE

Rev	Date	Details	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1	Jan 2017	SALP SA Report: Erratum	Mark Fessey Principal Consultant	Steve Smith Technical Director	Steve Smith Technical Director

Limitations

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited (AECOM) has prepared this Report for the sole use of Forest Heath District Council ("the Client") in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment (2016). No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by AECOM. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Where any conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others, it has been assumed that all relevant information has been provided by those parties and that such information is accurate. Any such information obtained by AECOM has not been independently verified by AECOM, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited
 2 Leman Street, London E1 8FA
 Telephone: 020 7061 7000

INTRODUCTION

This erratum replaces Appendix IV (“Site options appraisal”) of the SA Report published alongside the proposed submission version of the Forest Heath Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) on 10th January 2017. No other parts of the SA Report are affected by this erratum. Equally, no other published documents are affected, including the Council’s ‘Omission Sites’ document (November 2016).¹

What does Appendix IV of the SA Report deal with?

Appendix IV of the SA Report presents an appraisal of proposed site allocations (i.e. those sites allocated housing and assigned policy within the Proposed Submission SALP) and non-allocations (i.e. those sites not proposed for allocation within the SALP, but rather listed within the Omission Sites document).

Specifically, within Appendix IV sites are appraised using a strict ‘criteria-based’ methodology. In summary, the methodology involves: 1) classifying the sensitivity of sites in respect of biodiversity and landscape/heritage constraint; and 2) querying location of sites in relation to features mapped digitally within a Geographic Information System (GIS).

What changes are made to Appendix IV by this erratum?

This erratum -

- 1) Adds some sites to the analysis that were previously omitted, and removes several sites²
- 2) Corrects a number of site reference numbers
- 3) Corrects the analysis for several sites, to reflect the most up-to-date understanding of site boundaries
- 4) Supplements the methodology (and its explanation), with the addition of three new criteria.

Structure of this erratum

A revised version of Appendix IV is presented below, comprising introductory text and three tables.

Within the introductory text, and within Tables A and B, changes made through this erratum are highlighted using underlined text.

Within Table C, which presents the outcomes of the criteria-based appraisal, changes are not highlighted. In short, within Table C -

- a number of site references have been updated or amended;
- several rows have been added, and several removed;
- three columns have been added; and
- some of the red/green/amber (RAG) coding has been amended.

¹ The Omission Sites document is available on the Council’s ‘Background Evidence’ webpage - http://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/local_plans/forest-heath-local-plan-background-evidence.cfm

² Sites at Secondary Villages are removed from the analysis on the basis that they are not ‘reasonable’ site options. The Council has established that allocation of sites at Secondary Villages would not be in accordance with plan objectives.

APPENDIX IV - SITE OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Introduction

As explained within Chapter 7 of the SA Report, 'reasonable' site options have been subjected to appraisal using a bespoke criteria-based methodology. The aim of this appendix is to

- 1) explain the methodology; and then
- 2) present the outcomes of site options appraisal.

Developing the site options appraisal methodology

It was not possible to simply apply the SA framework (i.e. the list of SA topics/objectives presented in Table 4.1 of the SA Report) given the number of site options and limited data availability. As such, work was undertaken to develop a criteria-based methodology suited to site options appraisal.

The site options appraisal criteria are introduced in **Table A**. The table aims to demonstrate that the criteria reflect the SA framework as closely as possible, recognising data limitations (and given that there is a need to appraise site options 'on a level playing field', i.e. ensure a situation where consistent data/evidence is used to inform the appraisal of all competing site options, and avoid any risk of bias).

Table A explains that there has been limited potential to draw on qualitative analysis, e.g. taking into account what will or will not be delivered on each site. Rather, there is a need to rely mostly on quantitative analysis, i.e. location / distance analysis, utilising Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software.

Table B then lists the criteria concisely alongside the rules that have been applied to categorise the performance of sites. Specifically, Table B explains how, for each of the criteria employed, the performance of sites is categorised on a Red/Amber/Green scale.³

³ It is important to be clear that the aim of categorising the performance of site options is to aid differentiation, i.e. to highlight instances of site options performing relatively well / poorly. The intention is not to indicate whether a 'significant effect' is predicted.

Table A: Scope of the site options appraisal methodology

SA topic	Relevant criteria (location in relation to...)	Comments
Housing		No GIS data exist to inform the appraisal of housing site options in terms of contribution to housing objectives. It would not be appropriate to suggest that a large site performs better than a small site simply because there is the potential to deliver more homes. Housing objectives could be met through the delivery of numerous small sites, or through delivery of a smaller number of large sites (albeit it is recognised that financial viability, and hence potential to deliver affordable housing, can be higher at large sites).
Crime		No GIS data exist to inform the appraisal of site options. Whilst the Index of Multiple Deprivation does identify areas of overall deprivation, this is not considered to be a suitable proxy for levels of crime.
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary school • <u>Secondary school</u> 	<u>Good GIS data</u> exists to inform the appraisal.
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of health deprivation • Medical/health facilities 	Limited GIS data exists to inform the appraisal. Proximity to community infrastructure is important, particularly for residents who are less mobile (e.g. the elderly); however, there is little or no potential to take into account the potential for development at a particular site to put 'strain' on community infrastructure locally, or the potential for development to fund new community infrastructure.
Sports and leisure		No GIS data is available to inform the appraisal of site options. No data is available to show the location of sports and recreational facilities, <u>beyond the location of leisure centres in Newmarket, Brandon and Mildenhall.</u>
Poverty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of overall deprivation 	Limited GIS data is available to inform the appraisal. Development in an area of relative deprivation is assumed to be a positive step given that it can lead to developer funding being made available for targeted local schemes/initiatives; however, it is difficult to draw strong conclusions.
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to MoD noise zone 	Good GIS data is available to inform the appraisal. Approximately 17% of the district suffers noise pollution above 70 dB, predominantly caused by the RAF bases at Mildenhall and Lakenheath. Two noise contour zones have been designated (72dB and 66dB).
Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newmarket AQMA 	Limited GIS data exists to inform the appraisal. NO ₂ is monitored by the council at 42 locations throughout the district; however, there is no potential to draw on this data as part of site options appraisal. An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been designated along Newmarket High Street, and this does highlight an issue that can be taken into account.

SA topic	Relevant criteria (location in relation to...)	Comments
Water		<p>No GIS data is available to inform appraisal in terms of water quality. Whilst water pollution sensitivity may vary spatially (including issues associated with the capacity of Waste Water Treatment Works), there is no mapped data. It is also the case that issues can often be appropriately addressed through masterplanning/design measures, and so are appropriately considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>It is unnecessary to seek to appraise site options in terms of groundwater ‘source protection zones’ and ‘primary aquifers’. The presence of a groundwater source protection zone or aquifer does not represent a major constraint for most (non-polluting) types of development.</p> <p>No GIS data is available to inform appraisal in terms of water resources. The entire East of England is ‘water stressed’; however, the 2016 Water Cycle Study found that: <i>“It has been concluded following consultation with Anglian Water and reviewing of the 2015 WRMP [Water Resources Management Plan] that there are adequate resources to supply Forest Heath DC’s preferred development option.”</i></p> <p>Also, it is not possible to appraise site options in terms of the potential to support water efficiency. It might be suggested that large development schemes (i.e. developments on large sites) might be more able to deliver high standards of sustainable design, which in turn support water efficiency; however, this assumption will often not hold true.</p>
Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural land classification⁴ • Agricultural land under Environmental Stewardship⁵ 	<p>Limited GIS data is available to inform the appraisal.</p> <p>There is data to show the location of high quality agricultural land, and agricultural land that has been entered into an Environmental Stewardship scheme. However, it is important to note that the agricultural land quality dataset is of very low resolution.</p> <p>There is no dataset showing the location of contaminated land; however, this is not a major problem, given that detailed investigations can be undertaken at the planning application stage, and remediation set as a condition of planning permission.</p>
Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk zones 	<p>Good GIS data is available to inform the appraisal. However, the available data relates to river flood risk only. Data on surface water flood risk is not available.</p>
Climate change resilience		<p>No GIS data is available to enable conclusions to be reached on the relative merits of numerous site options in terms of this objective.</p>
Renewable energy		<p>No GIS data is available to inform appraisal of site options. Whilst some site options may well have inherently greater potential to incorporate on-site low carbon energy, or link to a decentralised source of low carbon energy, there is insufficient evidence to enable analysis. As for the potential for development to support building integrated renewables (such as solar PV and solar heating), this is not location-dependent; and whilst terrain / aspect can have some bearing on the potential for solar gain, this is not a clear relationship that can be taken into account.</p>

⁴ Agricultural land is classified into five grades, with grade one being of the best quality. High quality agricultural land is a finite resource, in that it is difficult if not impossible to replace it.

⁵ Environmental Stewardship is an agri-environment scheme which provides funding to farmers and other land managers in England who deliver effective environmental management on their land. ES land is likely to be of relatively high biodiversity value and ‘well farmed’ in general terms.

SA topic	Relevant criteria (location in relation to...)	Comments
Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special areas of conservation (SAC) • Special protection areas (SPA) • Ramsar sites • Sites of special scientific interest (SSSI) • National nature reserves • County wildlife sites • Local nature reserves • Designated common land • Forestry Inventory woodland • Sensitivity of the site, as classified through the Wildlife Audits (2015) 	<p>Good GIS data is available to inform the appraisal.</p> <p>It is fair to assume that development in close proximity to sensitive biodiversity sites can lead to impacts, including indirect recreational impacts; however, it is recognised that this assumption will not always hold true.</p> <p>The specific buffers for SPAs, SACs, Ramsar sites and SSSIs vary between each designated site and can vary across different parts of a designated site. At this stage of the SA process, the upper limit of the relevant buffer zones have been used in order to appraise the sites. This equates to 7,500 m for SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites and 2000m for SSSIs.</p> <p><u>In addition to GIS data</u>, the site options appraisal methodology has been supplemented, since the Preferred Options stage, drawing upon the Wildlife Audits (2015).⁶</p>
Accessible natural greenspace	<p>Limited GIS data is available to inform the appraisal although accessible natural greenspace performance has been mapped across the district (see Appendix 1 <u>of the SA Report</u>), the dataset is not available to inform site options appraisal.</p>	
Built environment	<p>No GIS data is available to inform appraisal of site options. There is no reason to suggest that any scheme is more or less able to support maintenance/enhancement.</p>	
Landscape character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitivity of the site, as classified through the Landscape and Heritage Study (2017) 	<p>Good data is available to inform appraisal of site options. The Landscape and Heritage Study identified the main landscape and heritage constraints in each of the market towns, key service centres and primary villages, and assesses all SHLAA sites. The study took account of all designated and non-designated sites of heritage, archaeological, landscape or ecological importance; considered the characteristic features of the landscape character types surrounding each settlement and any relevant guidance; and identified features considered to be of local cultural importance.</p>

⁶ The wildlife audits comprised of a phase 1 extended habitat survey of all the SHLAA sites in those settlements proposed for growth; namely Brandon, Mildenhall, Newmarket, Lakenheath, Red Lodge, Beck Row, Exning, Kentford and West Row. All sites were ranked using an existing system of ranking developed for use in Suffolk by the Local Wildlife Trust. The aim was to understand the relative biodiversity value of sites so that those with least value can be prioritised for development and whether sites play an important role in biodiversity networks e.g. as stepping stones.

SA topic	Relevant criteria (location in relation to...)	Comments
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Railway station with a frequent service 	<p>Limited GIS data is available to inform the appraisal. Car dependency, distance travelled by car and 'modal shift' to walking/cycling and use of public transport is dependent on numerous factors beyond proximity to public transport.</p> <p>The site options appraisal methodology has been amended, since the Preferred Options stage, to ensure that a positive score is only assigned to sites in proximity to a train station with a frequent service, which rules-out sites at Lakenheath.</p> <p><u>Also, proximity to a bus stop has been removed as a criterion, because it has not been possible to account for the nature of the service (e.g. in relation to bus frequency) at any given stop, which is known to vary considerably (see discussion within Chapter 3 of the Forest Heath Site Allocations Cumulative Traffic Impact Study (2016)).</u></p>
Waste	<p>It is not possible to appraise site options in terms of the potential to support good waste management. It would not be fair to assume that larger schemes, or residential development in close proximity to household waste recycling centres, will necessarily lead to better waste management.</p>	
Historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Area of archaeological importance or potential</u> <u>Conservation Area</u> Listed building Scheduled Monument Building of Local Interest Sensitivity of the site, as classified through the Landscape and Heritage Study (2017) 	<p>Good GIS data is available to inform the appraisal.</p> <p><u>In addition to GIS data</u>, the Landscape and Heritage Study identified the main landscape and heritage constraints in each of the market towns, key service centres and primary villages, and assesses all SHLAA sites. The study took account of all designated and non-designated sites of heritage, archaeological, landscape or ecological importance; considered the characteristic features of the landscape character types surrounding each settlement and any relevant guidance; and identified features considered to be of local cultural importance.</p>
Unemployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment sites⁷ Area of employment deprivation 	<p>Limited GIS data exists to inform the appraisal.</p> <p>It is possible to identify instances where development would lead to the loss of an employment site (i.e. the employment use would be lost to another use); however, it is difficult to draw strong conclusions (e.g. because employment site may be vacant or underperforming).</p> <p>It is also possible to consider the implications of development (whether housing or employment) in proximity to existing employment locations; and development within areas of existing employment deprivation (as defined by the Index of Multiple Deprivation). However, again it is difficult to draw strong conclusions.</p>

⁷ Employment sites were taken to be areas containing significant employment (e.g. factories or office space) and did not include smaller premises such as public houses and convenience stores with only one or two employees.

Table B: Site appraisal criteria with performance categories

Criteria	Threshold
1) Area of overall deprivation	G = Within quintile 1 (more deprived) within the district
2) Area of health deprivation	G = Within quintile 1 (more deprived) within the district
3) Employment deprivation	G = Within quintile 1 (more deprived) within the district
4) Nearest employment site	R = >1.5 km A = 1 – 1.5 km G = <1 km
5) Nearest railway station	R = >1.5 km A = 1-5 km G = <1 km
6) Nearest healthcare facility	R = >2 km A = 400 m - 2 km G = <400 m
7) Nearest primary school	<u>R = >1.6 km</u> <u>A = 800 m-1.6 km</u> <u>G = <800 m</u>
<u>8) Nearest secondary school</u>	<u>R = >3.2 km</u> <u>A = 1.6 km – 3.2 km</u> <u>G = <1.6 km</u>
9) Agricultural land classification ⁸	R = Grade 1 or 2 A = Grade 3 G = Other / ungraded
10) Flood risk zones	R = Flood risk zone 3 A = Flood risk zone 2
11) Environmental Stewardship ⁹	A = Intersects Environmental Stewardship
12) Forestry Inventory woodland	R = Majority of the site intersects woodland A = Part of the site intersects woodland
13) Newmarket AQMA	R = < 100m from an AQMA A = 100m - 2km from an AQMA
14) MoD noise zone	R = Intersects the 72 dB zone A = Intersects the 66 dB zone
15) Designated common land	R = <10m of designated common land A = <100m of designated common land

⁸ Agricultural land is classified into five grades, with grade one being of the best quality. High quality agricultural land is a finite resource, in that it is difficult if not impossible to replace it.

⁹ Environmental Stewardship is an agri-environment scheme which provides funding to farmers and other land managers in England who deliver effective environmental management on their land. ES land is likely to be of relatively high biodiversity value and 'well farmed' in general terms.

Criteria	Threshold
16) Special area of conservation (SAC)	R = <1.5 km A = 1.5 km – 7.5 km
17) Special protection area (SPA)	R = <1.5 km A = 1.5 km – 7.5 km
18) Site of special scientific interest (SSSI)	R = <500 m A = 500 – 2000m
19) Ramsar site	R = <1.5 km A = 1.5 km – 7.5 km
20) National nature reserve	G = <2km
21) Local nature reserve	G = <1km
22) County wildlife site	R = Intersects or adjacent A = <400 m
23) Wildlife audit	R = More sensitive A = Sensitive G = Less sensitive
24) Listed building	R = Intersects or adjacent A = <50m
25) Scheduled monument	R = Intersects or adjacent A = <50m
26) Building of local interest (where known)	A = Intersects or adjacent
<u>27) Conservation Area</u>	<u>R = Intersects or adjacent</u> <u>A = <50m</u>
<u>28) Area of archaeology</u>	<u>A = Intersects or adjacent</u>
29) Landscape and Heritage Study	R = More sensitive A = Sensitive G = Less sensitive

Site options appraisal findings

Table C presents an appraisal of all site options in terms of all the appraisal criteria introduced above, within Table B.

Within the table -

- Proposed allocations are highlighted green, and assigned a reference number according to the policy assigned to the site within the Proposed Submission SALP. Specifically –
 - Sites without planning permission, or resolution to grant, are highlighted **light green**;
 - Sites with resolution to grant planning permission, or planning permission / resolution to grant planning permission on part of the site only, are highlighted **green**; and
 - Sites with full planning permission are highlighted **dark green**.¹⁰
- Non-allocations are not highlighted, unless
 - they are listed in the Omission Sites document as ‘omitted sites’. These are sites that have been a particular focus of attention. As explained within the Omission Sites document: *“They are those sites that the development of which could have been expected to offer some level of benefit to counteract or offset any negative impacts associated with sustainability.”* Omitted sites are highlighted in **yellow**.

Limitations

It is recognised that only limited understanding can be gained from strict GIS analysis; and equally it is recognised that presenting appraisal findings for all site options in tabular format is in practice of limited assistance to those interested in the spatial strategy.

The spreadsheet containing the underlying data is available upon request. The spreadsheet allows for more effective interrogation of the data as it is possible to examine sub-sets (e.g. sites around a particular settlement, or sites above a certain size) and contrast particular sites that might be alternatives.

For example, from the spreadsheet it is possible to ascertain that proposed allocations are on average 1,133m from a medical facility, whilst non-allocations sites are on average 1,621m.

¹⁰ The status of sites, in respect of planning permission, is recorded as it was on 1st September 2016.

Table C: Site options appraisal findings

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage				
Beck Row	SA11(a)	Lamble Close	2.31	Res																																	
	SA11(b)	Land adjacent to and south of the Caraven Park on Aspal Lane	4.15	Res																																	
	SA11(c)	Land East of Aspal Lane	0.55	Res																																	
	SA11(d)	Land adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm	0.6	Res																																	
	BR/06	Land south of Rookery Drove	5.34	MU																																	
	BR/17	Land east of Skeltons Drove	25.16	Res																																	
	BR/02	Land adjacent to RAF Mildenhall	28.76	Res																																	
	BR/04	Land to rear of 31-45 The Street	0.38	Res																																	
	BR/05	Land off The Grove	1.48	Res																																	
	BR/09	Land at corner of Wilde Street/Aspal Lane	1.3	Res																																	
	BR/11	Land between Aspal Lane and Wildmere Lane	22.39	Res																																	
	BR/12	Land Adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm, St John's Street	2.75	Res																																	
	BR/13	Land west of Aspal Hall Road	1.53	Res																																	
	BR/18	Formaer coal yard, Wilde Street	0.65	Res																																	
	BR/19	Land adjacent to Moss Edge Farm and west of the A1101	6.07	Res																																	
	BR/20	Land at The Yard, The Grove, Stock Corner	1.71	Res																																	
	BR/21	Aspal Nursery, Aspal Lane	3.14	Res																																	
	BR/23	Land at White Gables, Stocks Corner	0.9	Res																																	
	BR/24	Land between Wildmere Lane and Johns Street	6.29	Res																																	

*Res= residential; Emp = Employment; MU = Mixed use; Ret = Retail; Sch = School expansion site; Cem = Cemetery

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage				
Brandon	BR/28	Land at Junction of Aspal Lane and Johns Street	1.89	Res																																	
	BR/30	Land north of St Johns Street	3.72	Res																																	
	BR/31	Land north of Wilde Street	1.65	Res																																	
	BR/32	Crowground Farm	1.26	Res																																	
	N/A	Land Off Wilde Street	3.1	Res																																	
	N/A	Land at Stock Corner Farm	11.92	Res																																	
Brandon	SA2(a)	Land at Warren Close	0.66	Res																																	
	SA2(b)	Land off Gas House Drove	0.31	Res																																	
	SA3	New Cemetry Site (Land off Manor Road)	1.81	Cem																																	
	B/02	Land to rear of the High Street	0.4	Res																																	
	B/04	Land rear of London Road St Peters Place and Park View	0.5	Res																																	
	B/05	Land to the rear of 9907 Thetford Road and Webbs Row	0.41	Res																																	
	B/06	Land off School Lane	1.2	Res																																	
	B/07	Land to the rear of Bury House	0.23	Res																																	
	B/09	Land at Station Way	1.22	Res																																	
	B/10	Land South West of Station Way	1.76	MU																																	
	B/11	Land North of Gas House Drove	3.35	Res																																	
	B/12a	Land off Manor Road	1.81	Res																																	
	B/12b	Land off Manor Road	7.7	Res																																	
	B/13	Omar Homes	5.46	Emp																																	
	B/14	Land off Green Road	18.07	Res																																	
B/15	Riverside Lodge off High Street	0.51	MU																																		

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage				
K	K/01	Land east of Moulton Road	5.88	Res																																	
	K/03	Land north of the A14	7.76	Res																																	
	K/04	Land north of Bury Road	5.46	Res																																	
	K/05	South and east of Flint House, Bury Road (Near village hall)	0.49	Res																																	
	K/06	Site opposite 1-4 Bury Road	2.89	Res																																	
	K/09	Fothergills, Gazeley Road	1.46	Res																																	
	K/10b	Land east of Kentford Lodge	5.96	Res																																	
	K/13	Land to rear of Flint House	6.78	Res																																	
	K/14	Land east of Gazeley Road	3.63	Res																																	
	K/18	Land south of Bury Road	6.41	Res																																	
Lakenheath	SA8(d)	Land north of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way	9.22	Res																																	
	SA7(b)	Land west of Eriswell Road	5.25	Res																																	
	SA8(a)	Rabbit Hill Covert, Station Road	3.47	Res																																	
	SA8(b)	Land at north Lakenheath	22.33	MU																																	
	SA8(c)	Land off Briscoe Way	2.78	Res																																	
	SA7(a)	Matthews Nursery	1.86	MU																																	
	L/14	Land of Maids Cross Way	2.1	Res																																	
	L/03	Land rear of 65, 69, 73 Station Road	0.81	Res																																	
	L/06	Land to rear of Chalk Farm and Gatehouse, High Street	0.72	Res																																	
	L/07	3 Cemetery Road	0.59	Res																																	
L/15	Land of Cover Way and Maids Cross Hill	4.62	Res																																		
L/18	Near Broom Road, off Eriswell Drive	1.79	Res																																		

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage				
	L/19	Land north-east of South Road	3.87	Res																																	
	L/22	Land South of Broom Road	5.79	Res																																	
	L/25	Land east of Eriswell Road and south of South Road	21.49	Res																																	
	L/27	Land south of Broom Road	20.52	MU																																	
	L/28	Middle Covert, land south of Station Road	6.98	Res																																	
	L/33	Land opposite New Bungalow, Sedge Fen	0.45	Res																																	
	L/34	Land at Sedge Fen, North of Skeltons Drove	4.14	Res																																	
	L/37	Land north of cemetery	1.88	Res																																	
	L/38	Land to north of Maids Cross Hill	2.65	Res																																	
	N/A	Land off Smeeth Drove	0.68	Res																																	
Mildenhall	SA17(a)	Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre site	4.05	Emp																																	
	SA4(a)	Land West of Mildenhall	97.69	MU																																	
	SA5(b)	District Council Offices, College Heath Road	2.01	Res																																	
	SA5(a)	Land at 54 Kingsway	0.76	Res																																	
	M/30	The Old Railway Station Site	6.24	Res																																	
	M/01	South of Glonfield Close	2.19	Res																																	
	M/03	Land to the rear of 9105 Folly Road	0.65	Res																																	
	M/04	Land to the rear of 9808 Folly Road	0.75	Res																																	
	M/06	Land to the rear of 7-23 North Terrace	0.62	Res																																	
	M/10	Land off Finchley Avenue	1.16	Res																																	
	M/11	Land Adjacent to College Heath Road	2.44	Res																																	
	M/12	Woodlands Park of Brandon Road	2.45	Res																																	

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage		
	M/13	Land between the River Lark and Worlington Road	1.48	Res																															
	M/14	Former builders yard north of Worlington Road	0.55	Res																															
	M/15	Land South of Lark Road/Raven Close	3.31	Res																															
	M/16	Land North of Brandon Road	16.74	Res																															
	M/17	Land North of Thetford Road	16.08	Res																															
	M/18	Land South of Lark Road	1.14	Res																															
	M/20	Land South of Pine Trees Avenue	2.06	Res																															
	M/22	Land South of Mildenhall to River Lark	15.16	Res																															
	M/23	Land East of Mildenhall to A1065 and Fiveways Roundabout	68.3	Res																															
	M/24	Land North of M'hall, East of A1101 (Inc airfield landing lights)	70.0	Res																															
	M/25	Precinct	0.46	MU																															
	M/26	Land South of Bury Road and East of A11	7.55	Res																															
	M/27	Site adjacent to Parkers Mill	1.73	Res																															
	M/33	Land to West Folly Road	8.06	Res																															
	M/41	Land at Meadow View Cottage	3.86	Res																															
	M/42	Rose Forge, South of Worlington Road	1.37	Res																															
	M/43	Land between A11 & A1101	3.14	Res																															
	M/44	Mildenhall Academy and Dome Leisure Centre site	9.41	Res																															
	N/A	Land to the west of Fred Dannatt Road	17.12	Emp																															
M	SA15	School expansion site, Moulton	0.79	Sch																															

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage			
Newmarket	SA17(b)	St Ledger, Newmarket	1.09	Emp																																
	SA6(a)	Land at Brickfield Stud, Exning Road	2.91	Res																																
	SA6(b)	Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive Junction	3.57	MU																																
	SA6(c)	Leaders Way/Sefton Way/Philips Close	4.26	Res																																
	SA6(d)	Former St Felix Middle School Site	4.95	Res																																
	SA18(a)	Retail Site, Newmarket	1.59	Ret																																
	SA6(e)	Jim Joel Court	0.23	Res																																
	SA6(f)	146a High Street	0.27	Res																																
	N/14	Hatchfield Farm	65.85	MU																																
	N/03	Former Gas Works, Exning Road	1.59	Res																																
	N/07	Land at Studlands Park, Parkers Walk	0.76	Res																																
	N/08	Allotments Studland Park	1.48	Res																																
	N/09	Brickfield Stud	18.23	Res																																
	N/10	Land at Balaton Stables, Snailwell Road	1.49	Res																																
	N/12	Coronation Stables, Station Approach	0.45	Res																																
	N/15	Old Newmarket Station Site Car Park	0.52	Res																																
	N/18	George Lambton Playing Fields	9.48	MU																																
	N/21	Land south of Exning Road and adj Hamilton Road	20.47	Res																																
	N/31	Scaltback Middle School	1.43	Res																																
	N/A	Land at Studlands Park, Parkers Walk	0.76	Res																																
N/A	Land south of Aureole Walk, Studlands Park	0.6	Res																																	
N/A	Land north of Hyperion Way Studland (Part of N/08)	0.81	Res																																	

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage			
Red Lodge	SA10(a)	North Red Lodge	27.4	MU																																
	SA9(a)	Land off Turnpike Road and Coopers Yard	9.01	Res																																
	SA9(b)	Land east of Red Lodge	5.5	Res																																
	SA9(c)	Land east of Red Lodge: South	14.97	Res																																
	SA9(d)	Red Lodge Approach, Red Lodge	4.13	Res																																
	RL/08	Land to rear 44b Turnpike Lane	5.45	Res																																
	RL/01	Land to rear 2-4 Elms Road	1.06	Res																																
	RL/02	Land to rear 146 Turnpike Road	0.91	Res																																
	RL/05	Land adj. public house, Turnpike Road and Turnpike Lane	0.89	Res																																
	RL/07	White Star Stables, Warren Road	6.8	Res																																
	RL/09	Land at Greenhays Farm	1.5	Res																																
	RL/10	Land west of Elderberry Road, Kings Warren	0.46	Res																																
	RL/11	Land east of Turnpike Road	0.91	Res																																
	RL/12	Land east of Warren Road	11.88	Res																																
	RL/15b	Land north and east of Red Lodge either side of A11	303.0	Res																																
	RL/18	Land south of the Carrops	1.37	Res																																
	RL/19	Land south of Green Lane	10.21	Res																																
West Row	SA14	School expansion site, West Row	1.02	Sch																																
	SA14(a)	North West Row	7.81	Res																																
	WR/01	Land south of Chapel Road	2.6	Res																																
	WR/25	Land off Pott Hall Road	5.79	Res																																
	WR/02	Land off Pott Hall Road	0.59	Res																																

Settlement	Site ref	Site name	Size (ha)	Proposed use*	1) IMD overall	2) IMD Health	3) IMD Employment	4) Employment site	5) Train Station	6) Health facility	7) Primary school	8) Secondary school	9) Agricultural land	10) Flood Risk	11) Env Stewardship	12) Woodland/Forestry	13) AQMA	14) Noise	15) Common land	16) SAC	17) SPA	18) SSSI	19) Ramsar	20) NNR	21) LNR	22) CWS	23) Wildlife Audit	24) Listed Building	25) Sched Monument	26) BLI	27) Conservation area	28) Archaeology	29) Landscape/Heritage			
	WR/04	Land at the junction of Jarman's Lane and Beeches Road	0.92	Res																																
	WR/10	Land off Chapel Road	0.86	Res																																
	WR/11	Land off Parkers Drove	0.42	Res																																
	WR/13	Land behind St Peter's Church, Church Lane	0.55	Res																																
	WR/14	Off Friday Street, behind Williams Way	1.77	Res																																
	WR/15	Popes Farm, Church Lane	0.43	Res																																
	WR/16	Land to north of Ferry Lane	3.17	Res																																
	WR/17	Access between 114 & 118 Eldo Road	0.62	Res																																
	WR/19	Land at junction of Mildenhall Road and Jarman's Lane	0.52	Res																																
	WR/23	Land off Friday Street	0.27	Res																																
	WR/26	Land off Parkers Drove	0.43	Res																																
	WR/27	Land south-west of Jarman's Lane	0.78	Res																																
	WR/33	Land at Popes Farm	4.15	Res																																
	WR/34	Land south of the 'Gables' Chapel Road	0.28	Res																																

*R= residential; E = Employment; M = Mixed use; R = Retail; S = School expansion site; C = Cemetery; ? = Uncertain or various.