



# Infrastructure and Environmental Capacity Appraisal

## Final Report

### Appendix 7: Statement of Stakeholder Engagement

St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Forest Heath District Council

May 2009



Nathaniel Lichfield  
and Partners

## 1.0 Statement of Stakeholder Engagement

- 1.1 The consultation process has been on-going throughout the study; the schedule below provides a high level summary of the key issues discussed at workshop sessions/meetings with external stakeholders attended by NLP. Key points raised within the discussion are the inputs used within the study. They are not intended to be comprehensive reviews of all views expressed in any workshop/meetings. It should be noted that stakeholders not identified on this list may have been invited to meetings/events but were not able to attend. These stakeholders were engaged individually through conference calls and information has continued to be exchanged with technical stakeholders throughout the study process.
- 1.2 NLP undertook two formal workshop sessions; the first involved a series of six half day workshop sessions with statutory and other technical stakeholder consultees in September 2008 who were invited to discuss key issues relating to the existing level of infrastructure provision and its capacity within the study area. The discussions were focused on identifying key challenges and barriers to development and the resulting key risks and mitigating factors that need to be considered when assessing suitable locations for accommodating further growth.
- 1.3 The second stakeholder workshop took place in January 2009 where the evidence gathered to support the identified areas of potential growth were presented to stakeholders and formed the basis for wider discussion, including the testing of different choices and trade offs around infrastructure provision and different policy and delivery responses to thematic issues. The identified areas for potential growth were presented with the opportunity to discuss the suitability of these. The outputs of this were incorporated into the final stages of the study.

Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
<b>Stakeholder Workshop 1</b> <b>Date:</b> September 2008 <b>Location:</b> St Edmundsbury Borough Council	
<b>NLP</b>  <b>Group 1</b> National Trust NHS Suffolk x 2 <b>Group 2</b> Forest Heath District Council – Strategic Housing Highways Agency EDF Energy <b>Group 3</b> St Edmundsbury Borough Council - Heritage Western Suffolk LSP Jockey Club Estates <b>Group 4</b> Anglian Water Federation of Small Businesses Bury St Edmunds Art Gallery <b>Group 5</b> Defence Estates (MOD) GeoSuffolk Suffolk County Council – Minerals & Waste Suffolk County Council – Education <b>Group 6</b> Abbeycroft Leisure Drainage Board EERA	<b>Highways</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of hotspots which have capacity constraints such as:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A14 East and West</li> <li>- Duelling of A11</li> <li>- All B Roads</li> <li>- Bury to Mildenhall and Lakenheath Route</li> <li>- Newmarket has several bottleneck junctions</li> <li>- 5 Way Roundabout congestion</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>Public Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Rail Service is infrequent and unpredictable</li> <li>• Poor rural public transport with negative effects across area</li> </ul> <b>Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S106 refusals historically have led to underinvestment in facilities and uncertainty for NHS Suffolk.</li> <li>• New strategy to provide primary care locally and take pressure off secondary care facilities/services.</li> <li>• West Suffolk Hospital is coping well despite being the major hospital and A&amp;E service within the region</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently the reorganisation of schools is taking place to reduce surplus to requirements. However the situation will have to be monitored in light of growth that is anticipated and how the re-organisation will be impacted.</li> <li>• There is a possibility that there may not be surplus to new requirement.</li> <li>• Rural primary schools are struggling so growth should be considered in rural locations to retain these schools.</li> <li>• Concern around how funding would be managed, then allocated, but welcomed rather than having a reliance on traditional methods such as S106.</li> <li>• The actual number of children within the US bases is unknown – therefore there is pressure on County wide education services without knowing levels of need/population to provide appropriate levels of provision.</li> </ul>

Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
	<p><b>Energy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are hot spots – where capacity is at tipping point.</li> <li>• EDF and most utility providers have a reactive way of accommodating for additional need.</li> <li>• Same capacity issues but nothing that couldn't be overcome if given enough time.</li> <li>• Newmarket is not part of either "Network Rings".</li> </ul> <p><b>Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to be site/capacity specific until water cycle study is completed.</li> <li>• Work on reactive basis – need adequate notice to plan for growth much like EDF.</li> <li>• Uncomfortable with Hyder Consulting sharing data prior to release of water cycle study.</li> <li>• Just submitted proposals to OFWAT funding for next 5 years - Waste water – cannot deviate from OFWAT's approval.</li> <li>• Statutory infrastructure provider so are required to let residential developers be connected regardless of capacity implications. But this will not be possible up to certain point.</li> </ul> <p><b>Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Trust are not there to thwart growth/planning process they are interested in any available land, and willing to discuss and perhaps look to maintain.</li> <li>• National Trust has linkages to public health due to the promoting of open space / leisure activities etc.</li> <li>• St Edmundsbury's Heritage team has difficulty providing enough activities to last longer than a day tour.</li> <li>• Not enough choices for weekend trips (short breaks).</li> <li>• Public spaces/play areas are well utilised.</li> <li>• Transport is an issue due to costs associated.</li> <li>• Poor marketing/promotion - losing out to Suffolk Coast, Cambridge.</li> <li>• Not enough connections and coordination between Heritage aspects of areas such as Newmarket which could help promote area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Art and Culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand on services is very high.</li> <li>• Do not know how funds will stretch.</li> <li>• The area has an ageing population.</li> </ul>

Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mental health issues.</li> <li>• Poor social networking in Bury.</li> <li>• County/Borough and Arts Council funding recently increased but this is limited and there are concerns around how growth will be provided for.</li> </ul> <p><b>Corporate/Strategic Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No immediate show stoppers but Local Strategic Partnership would want to be kept in the loop regarding growth plans.</li> <li>• Reorganisation of schools important, there are health issues and skills issues to consider.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local Economy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milton Keynes was sighted as a good example of infrastructure being in place before people moved in.</li> <li>• Ability to walk to shops and work has benefits and access to local key services is crucial within walking distance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minerals/Waste</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timworth is a proposed minerals site, just north of Bury.</li> <li>• Red Lodge poses issues for SPA.</li> </ul> <p><b>MOD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £42 million spent locally from US bases in last study, very important in terms of economy.</li> <li>• Work to own plans.</li> <li>• Nothing planned in foreseeable future, cannot determine how much longer base is to be retained.</li> <li>• Base has an enormous local impact on economy.</li> <li>• No current strategy by LA's to address this risk of losing the base.</li> </ul> <p><b>Geo-diversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency work closely with partners on landscape character sensitivity to biodiversity and geo-diversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Racing Industry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport key issues - bottlenecks, no hard shoulder.</li> <li>• Sites for growth very limited around Newmarket.</li> <li>• Constrained on 3 sides</li> <li>• Heath to west - SSSI.</li> <li>• Heath to East.</li> </ul>



Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training to South.</li> <li>• Hatchfield Farm to north of Newmarket, is considered the only viable site with 1,000 homes planned.</li> </ul>
<b>Conference Calls</b> <b>Date:</b> September 2008 <b>Location:</b> n/a (NLP Offices)	
<b>NLP</b>  Environment Agency Suffolk Preservation Society English Heritage	<b>Environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Cycle Study needs to inform IECA</li> <li>• Flood Risk Issues are important considerations for the study area</li> <li>• Funding can often be a barrier to development</li> <li>• Economic downturn and fragile housing markets could have a significant impact on growth</li> <li>• Trying to minimise impact of new development on climate energy efficiency will be important as well as minimise flooding and mitigating climate change</li> <li>• Reduced water quality needs to be mitigated</li> </ul> <b>Preservation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality design and mixture of housing should be key to any development</li> <li>• New commuter belts should not be created, providing living and working opportunities is important</li> <li>• Flood risk and water conservation is a challenge</li> <li>• Villages need to maintain historical culture</li> <li>• Mobility of rural residents and access to key services is an issue</li> </ul> <b>Heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bury is a very important historical town and great care is needed to preserve its history</li> <li>• Racecourses are key to Newmarket and is a sensitive development area</li> <li>• The impact of housing on the character of Market Towns can make them vulnerable in terms of their type of build and heritage</li> <li>• The quantum of development is not necessarily the issue; it is the sensitivity to design, layout, density, land form, archaeology, urban townscape and form that is crucial.</li> </ul>

Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
<b>Transport Meeting</b> <b>Date:</b> 19 November 2008 <b>Location:</b> Suffolk County Council Offices	
<b>NLP</b>  Suffolk County Council Highways Department Officers Suffolk County Council Representatives	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to provide any indication on future capacity constraint pictures until County are aware of what the options proposed are</li> <li>• Currently the Bury to Newmarket swathe has a good rail network</li> <li>• A11 will be duelled almost certainly and Red Lodge has attracted this</li> <li>• Most of the major influences sit outside of the study area</li> <li>• Currently the only proposal is for rolling stock improvement</li> <li>• Freight improvement for Felixstowe to Nuneaton route is expected</li> <li>• Educational needs have a great impact on Transport and therefore any new development will need to consider impacts of the school run</li> <li>• Bury has a viable town bus network, no bus priority</li> <li>• Capacity for growth in Bury is obvious for sustainable development</li> <li>• In Haverhill it is difficult to provide a bus route because of its proximity to County boundary</li> <li>• Haverhill presents more opportunities for development than Clare or Kedington</li> <li>• Availability of land and capacity in Newmarket may be an issue</li> <li>• West Row Road cannot have anymore development</li> <li>• Mildenhall could be a possible show stopper</li> <li>• Brandon fairly congested</li> <li>• Lakenheath could accommodate small level of development but rail services only operate at the weekends</li> </ul>

Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
<b>Conference Call</b> <b>Date:</b> March 2009 <b>Location:</b> n/a (NLP Offices)	
<b>NLP</b>  Natural England	<b>Landscape Buffers</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of approach to landscape buffer positioning at 400m from sensitive Habitat unless other requirements apply (for example Stone Curlew protective buffer).</li> <li>• Confirmation that where existing development sits within this buffer the line of existing development forms the buffer line for any future development.</li> </ul>
<b>Conference Call</b> <b>Date:</b> January 2009 / March 2009 <b>Location:</b> n/a (NLP Offices)	
<b>NLP</b>  RSPB	<b>SSSI Designation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process for obtaining detailed Stone Curlew nesting information and RSPB preferred consultation method.</li> <li>• Recommended extent of protective buffers around SSSI designations related to Stone Curlews</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder Workshop 2</b> <b>Date:</b> January 2009 <b>Location:</b> Suffolk County Council Offices	
<b>NLP</b> Abbeycroft Leisure Anglian Water Choose Suffolk Defence Estates (MOD) EDF Energy English Heritage Environment Agency Federation of Small Businesses Forest Heath District Council – Economic Development Forest Heath District Council – Economics &	<p>The workshop was designed to be participative with the aim of securing input from key stakeholders on the interpretation, refinement and addition of constraints, infrastructure requirements and policy priorities around the opportunities identified within each settlement.</p> <p>The workshop attendees were divided into two groups to review each identified opportunity area within each settlement area. Each group was navigated through the mapping and strategic plans which NLP had produced to illustrate the environmental constraints, existing facilities and services within each settlement and the identified opportunities,</p> <p>A discussion was facilitated on the approach to strategic constraints and implications for and of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Drawing on the expertise of each respective stakeholders discipline or policy area the identified constraints were validated, and the identified opportunities were discussed in light of infrastructure implications of growth, delivery risks and identifying outstanding issues in order for NLP to utilise the</p>



Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
Tourism Geo-Suffolk Highways Agency Mildenhall Air Force Natural England St Edmundsbury Borough Council – Housing Suffolk County Council – Education Suffolk County Council – Minerals & Waste Suffolk County Council – Research & Intelligence	information gathered to refine the opportunities.  The conclusion of each settlement and issues raised are contained within the main report.
<b>Transport Meeting</b> <b>Date:</b> January 2009 <b>Location:</b> Suffolk County Council Offices	
<b>NLP</b>  Suffolk County Council Highways Department Officers Suffolk County Council Representatives	Key focus is sustainable development. Proposed housing development, in the majority of locations, needs to be supported with employment development to minimise out-commuting.  Major issue - no eastbound A14 option for traffic approaching on the A11 from Thetford, through Red Lodge.  Current Improvements to the A11 expected to alleviate some of the traffic flow issues around Brandon and Lakenheath.  Mildenhall relief road would ease traffic movement however funding is dependent on employment growth in the area.  Highways Agency will need to confirm junction capacity of A14 at Newmarket. Currently there is a requirement to slow vehicle approach to junction 37 to prevent junction queuing.  Development within Bury will need to be aware of potential impacts on the A14 particularly at junction 43 and to the south east of the town. An infrastructure investment and capacity study of the A14 is intended to be carried out by Suffolk County Council Highways department between February and May 2009.  North east relief road of Haverhill is considered possible but currently SCCs preferred option is the creation of sustainable links through the town centre.  Contributions to sustainable links should be a requirement for all new developments.

Organisations Represented	Key Issues Discussed
<b>Other Information Exchanges</b> <b>Date:</b> Ongoing <b>Location:</b> Via email, telephone and letter	
Suffolk County Council – Education Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pupil Yield Information</li> <li>• Committee Reports</li> </ul>
EDF Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub-station capacity information</li> </ul>
Suffolk County Council – Libraries Archives and Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing Library provision quantity and quality</li> <li>• Approach to quantifying required provision</li> </ul>
St Edmundsbury Borough Council – Community Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council owned community centres</li> <li>• Community Centres Review Report 2007</li> </ul>
St Edmundsbury Borough Council – Tourist Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitor data for main attractions</li> <li>• Qualitative commentary on tourism requirements</li> </ul>



---

**Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners**

14 Regent's Wharf

All Saints Street

London N1 9RL

---

T: 020 7837 4477

E: [london@nlpplanning.com](mailto:london@nlpplanning.com)

---

**[www.nlpplanning.com](http://www.nlpplanning.com)**

---