

20 June 2019

Ref: RMS/DER/NEW/19003

Annette Feeney – SIR / SALP Programme Officer

**Email**

Dear Ms Feeney

**Forest Heath SIR and SALP Examinations**  
**Late Submission by Cottee Transport Planning on behalf of NHG**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the late transport material submitted by Cottee Transport Planning on behalf of the NHG. This response has been prepared on behalf of the owner of Hatchfield Farm, Newmarket.

Whilst this response could respond to the technical assertions on a point by point basis, it is not considered that this would be of assistance to the Inspectors. The Cottee submission appears to be an attempt to turn the SIR and SALP Hearings into a re-run of the recent Hatchfield Farm ‘call in’ Inquiry, where evidence has been led, cross examined upon and submissions made to the Secretary of State in respect of the planning application. This was all in the context of agreed highway positions between the Applicant, SCC (as Highway Authority) and Highways England. It is not appropriate to attempt to duplicate this development management process within the separate forum of forward planning.

The Cottee submission fails to refer to the effect of proposed modification MM18 which inserts a new criterion (B) into Policy SA6. It was agreed by all parties at the 2017 and 2018 Local Plan Hearings that this would provide a robust development plan policy test against which all new development in Newmarket would be tested at the planning application stage.

This is a well established development plan approach whereby the development plan sets policy tests which are then explored in detail in the context of individual planning applications. The recent Hatchfield Farm ‘call in’ Inquiry is an example of how, in practice, applications can be successfully tested in the context of Policy SA6(B).

Whilst the decision of the Secretary of State is awaited, the ‘call in’ Inquiry has demonstrated that Policy SA6(B) is a development management approach which is sound in practice and provides a robust framework for decisions on individual planning applications. As a

consequence, the position of Mr Cottee on highway matters, as expressed in his recent note, is irrelevant to the SIR / SALP Inspectors consideration of the soundness of the SIR and SALP and can be disregarded.

I would be grateful if this letter can be forwarded to the examining Inspectors.

Yours sincerely,

**R M Sellwood**  
Sellwood Planning Ltd