

Appendix 8 – Representations received during the formal consultation stage and an assessment of how these have informed the final SHLAA report

General Comments

Consultee	Comment	Council's Response
Miss Carla Jackson Natural England	Standing (consultation) advice note.	No change required – Comments noted.
Stephen Faulkner Norfolk CC	2 Brandon sites are now included within the SHLAA exercise (B/29 and B/31). Both these sites are under 1 ha and would potentially deliver only 20 and 10 dwellings respectively. On this basis these sites do not raise any significant cross boundary issue/s. However, if any strategic sites are brought forward the County Council expects to be consulted/involved in any new housing allocations as there are likely to be strategic cross boundary issues.	No Change required – Comments noted. The Councils have/will consult NCC on any development proposals that have significant cross-border implications in accordance with their duty-to-co-operate.
James Meyer Suffolk Wildlife Trust	<u>Forest Heath</u> - Support the deferral of sites which are already designated for their biodiversity value, including those designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS). We note that the entire area of Mildenhall Airbase is proposed for inclusion in the SHLAA, although the amount and type of development remains unknown. Whilst this area does include a small CWS, designated for its floristic value, the biodiversity value of the wider site is largely unknown. We recommend that, prior to determining that the whole site is suitable for development, further investigation of the biodiversity	No change required – Comments noted. Further assessment of the ecological value of the airbase site will be undertaken in due course if/when it is released.

	<p>value of the area is undertaken. This should help ensure that areas of biodiversity value are appropriately protected and secured in the long term.</p> <p><u>St Edmundsbury</u> - We support the deferral of sites which are already designated for their biodiversity value, including those designated as County Wildlife Sites (CWS).</p>	
Elizabeth Mugova Environment Agency	We have not reviewed any of the sites in the SHLAA. We agree with the constraints that have been identified as reasons for deferring sites. We will review individual sites during the formal stages of Local Plan or Site Allocation preparation process.	No change required – Comments noted.
Fiona Cairns Suffolk Preservation Society	<p>A) Dalham – FHDC/D/01 – the assessment sheet for this site lists its location within the conservation area as a constraint but the proximity of listed buildings is also relevant. This is a large site but is suitable for a maximum of 5 houses only. The design and siting of future development within this site should be designed to minimise impact on these heritage assets.</p> <p>B) Freckenham – FHDC/F/04 – it should be noted that this site is adjacent to the conservation area and that any development of the site could impact upon the character of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>C) Mildenhall – FHDC/M/27 – the site assessment sheet lists the location within the conservation area as a constraint but needs to also list the historic wall and the scheduled medieval Dovecote as important considerations which will inform the</p>	<p>Change required –</p> <p>A) The development potential of this site is already limited to 5 dwellings. Reference has been made to the proximity of listed buildings within the context of the relevant site proforma.</p> <p>B) Reference has been made to the proximity of the conservation area and setting of the listed buildings within the context of the relevant site proforma.</p> <p>C) The site proforma now identifies the medieval Dovecote (Scheduled Ancient Monument) as a specific site constraint.</p>

	suitability of the site for development.	
--	--	--

Forest Heath Specific

Consultee	Comment	Council's Response
Vince Coomber, Mildenhall Parish Charities	Both sites submitted for consideration for inclusion within the SHLAA document by Mildenhall Parish Charities, namely WR01 and part of M19, remain viable.	Change required – Site proforma have been amended to reflect the latest situation, i.e. site WR/01 and part M/19 are available and viable.
David Barker Evolution Town Planning	Submission of new site details, part of which pertains to 'existing' and 'included' site K/10.	Change required – The submission partly relates to a portion of site K/10 that was 'included' within the context of the consultation draft SHLAA. In response to the submission, the site K/10 will be subdivided into parts (a) and (b). Part (a) will correspond to that part of the site that is the subject of extant permission F/2013/0061/HYB and is 'included' within the context of the final SHLAA report. Element (b) that is not the subject of the existing permission will be 'deferred' until such a time as mitigation for the SPA has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of Natural England and the LPA, (i.e. should the current application has be approved).
David Barker Evolution Town	L/13 – The resolution to grant planning permission for application reference F/13/0345 demonstrates that the	No change required – In the case of site L/36, the site is 'included'

Planning	site is suitable and available for development. The site will be developed within 1-5 years. L/36 – We consider that in view of the officer's recommendation on the current application and the draft allocation in the April 2016 preferred options (Site Allocations) consultation that the SHLAA should continue to support the delivery of 375 homes and a new primary school on this site.	within the context of the SHLAA and reference is already made to a potential capacity of 375 (including a primary school). In the case of site L/13, the site is already 'included' within the context of the SHLAA with delivery anticipated in the 1-5 year period.
David Barker Evolution Town Planning	WR/07 - The planning application DC/14/2047/HYB demonstrates that the site is suitable, available and achievable for the development proposed. The SHLAA plan should be amended to reflect the boundaries of the current application site.	No change required – The site boundaries are consistent with those as they appear within the context of the emerging (Preferred Options) Site Allocations Local Plan document.
Aitkens and Irons Evolution Town Planning	Request to merge 'existing sites' BR/05 & BR/23 (both 'included' within the context of the consultation draft SHLAA).	Change Required – Merge boundaries of 'included' sites BR/05 & BR/23.
Andrew Garnett Mill House Homes	Re-submission of 'existing' site, (reference W/03).	No change required – The submitted site already features within the context of the SHLAA with a status of 'deferred', (the site lies within flood zones 2/3). It is considered that the status of the site ought to be retained within the context of the final version of the SHLAA report.
David Barker Evolution Town Planning	Submission in support of 'inclusion' of site N/10 within the context of the final SHLAA document.	No Change required – The site is subject to equine policy constraint and as such it is appropriate that it retains a status of 'deferred' within

		the context of the final version of the report.
Mr J N Bullen	Please amend details on the draft SHLAA document (Page 77 - Site ref. FHDC/E/08) - Road name should read North End Road not Bridge End Road.	No change required – Road name reads 'North End Road'.
S. Chalwin Gerald Eve	<p>Comments submitted in respect of four sites in Lakenheath:</p> <p>L/35 - The suitability, availability and achievability, including viability, is not in doubt.</p> <p>L/12 - There are no constraints identified that could prevent or delay comprehensive residential development of this site. Bennett Homes believe that the site could be brought forward in the earlier timeframe than that shown in the SHLAA having regard to their experience and knowledge of testing the viability of the adjacent site (L/35).</p> <p>L/28 - This land is in the control of Bennett Homes and is available for development in a short timeframe. Bennett Homes is preparing a planning application for which purpose they have undertaken various site investigations. None of these have identified any constraints that might prevent or delay development.</p> <p>L/03 - Bennett would be keen to bring this site forward in the 1-5 year timetable indicated. There are no constraints or ownership issues that would prevent such development.</p>	No change required – Comments noted.
Richard Tilley CgMs	Comments submitted in respect of sites L/26 & ER/04: L/26 – Site is in a sustainable edge of settlement location, within a reasonable distance of medical centres and the existing primary school, and is not subject to any	No change required – Comments noted

	<p>specific ecological, landscape or heritage designations. An appropriate layout and design quality will be able to mitigate the very limited flood risk issue at the NW corner of the site and noise considerations.</p> <p>ER/04 - The site is currently deferred in the draft SHLAA for the reasons of being within the 1,500m buffer zone for the SPA (Stone Curlew) and considered an unsustainable location in policy terms.</p> <p>The (forthcoming) application will address these two reasons within the submission.</p>	
Rob Hopwood Bidwells	Minor amendment to proforma for site N/20 submitted by agent (in respect of the date the site was submitted).	Change required – Amendment made to relevant proforma as proposed by the agent.
Herringswell Parish Council	<p>Support the 'status' afforded to site RL/12, RL/7, RL/11, RL/19, RL15b, H/01.</p> <p>RL/06 – Would prefer that the site remains two separate entities (RL/06a & RL/06b). The supporting text refers to the site as RL/06 but the accompanying map identifies the site as RL/06b</p> <p>RL/15a – We do not believe this site should be included.</p>	Change required – It is not considered appropriate to 'split' site RL/06. In the interest of consistency, the site will be labelled 'RL/06' on the settlement plan as opposed to RL/06b. It is considered that site RL/15a should be 'included' in conformity with the emerging ('Preferred Options') Site Allocations Local Plan consultation document.
Ben Woolnough Evolution Town Planning	Submission of information in support of 'existing' site M/13.	No Change required – Site M/13 was afforded a 'status' of 'deferred' within the context of the consultation draft SHLAA (the site lies within flood zones 2/3) and it is not considered that this status should be amended in light of the

		submission.
Jake Nugent Bidwells	<p>It has clearly been evidenced through the submission of the outline planning application that Site M/27 is available and suitable for residential development which could be delivered within the next five years.</p> <p>The applicant is committed to continuing to engage with the LPA throughout the determination of the outline planning application to ensure that all matters are addressed and the most appropriate forms of mitigation brought forward where necessary.</p>	<p>No change required – Comments noted. Site M/27 was 'included' within the context of the consultation draft SHLAA report.</p>
Pegasus Group on behalf of the Newmarket Horseman's Group	<p>A) The NHG considers that the HRI should be identified by the Council as a legitimate constraint that could prevent it from meeting its housing need in full. The NHG considers that this is not currently being acknowledged by the Council or adequately addressed in its assessment of potential sites.</p> <p>B) The NHG is disappointed to note that consideration of HRI impact is not automatically applied to any sites within Dalham, Exning, Gazeley, Kentford, Moulton or Newmarket as previously requested. The NHG considers that this disregards a very important consideration for the economic health of the District as a whole and repeats its request for this to be included in all sites in these settlements.</p> <p>C) A number of 'site-specific' comments are also made by the Pegasus Group.</p>	<p>No change required:</p> <p>A) It is considered that the HRI is considered a 'legitimate' constraint and has indeed influenced the 'status' of individual sites as there appear within the consultation draft SHLAA.</p> <p>B) Equine policy constraint has been considered for sites lying outside of Newmarket, for example Meddler Stud (Kentford, K/02) & White Star Stables (Red Lodge, RL/07). The cumulative impact of development on the HRI will be further considered within the context of the emerging Site Allocations Local Plan document. The SHLAA</p>

		<p>considers constraints on an individual site basis.</p> <p>C) All site specific comments have been noted although it is not considered that the 'status' of any of the sites identified by Pegasus Group should be altered as a consequence of their submission.</p>
Stewart Patience Anglian Water	Submission of a comprehensive RAG (Red, Amber, Green), assessment of sites in Forest Heath in terms of the water/wastewater infrastructure required to facilitate development.	No change required – Details as submitted have been considered and will inform the emerging Site Allocations Local Plan process.
Don Proctor Ltd.	Comments submitted in support of 'inclusion' of sites M/41 & M/42 within the context of the SHLAA. A request has been made to merge the sites as they will be promoted jointly and a legal agreement has been entered into to reflect this fact.	Change required – Merge sites M/41 & M/42. It is not considered that the status of the site(s) should be amended as a consequence of the submission (both sites are currently 'deferred').
K. Slater (Eclipse Planning) on behalf of Crest Nicholson	A) Confirmation that site RL/06 is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. It is noted that the Council regard the capacity of RL/06b as 97 dwellings at 30dph over 60% of the developable area allowing for the on-site provision of open space. Given that any development on this site would include a proposal to extend the permissive path on the eastern boundary proposed as part of the planning application relating to RL/06a and the proximity of the site to the existing playing fields and recreational area to the south, it is considered that the developable area of RL/06b should	<p>No change required –</p> <p>A) The capacity as this appears within the context of the SHLAA is indicative. The actual yield will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>B) Comments concerning other sites in Red Lodge have been duly noted. It is not considered that the 'status' of any of the</p>

	be increased to a minimum of 80% and 129 dwellings. B) A number of comments on other sites within Red Lodge have been made.	sites should be altered as a consequence of this submission.
K. Slater Eclipse Planning On behalf of the Animal Health Trust	I can confirm that Site K/11 is suitable, available and achievable for residential development and my client's support its inclusion in the SHLAA 2016.	No change required – Comments noted and reflected in a revised site proforma.
Thomas Smith (AECOM) on behalf of Meddler Properties Ltd.	Comments submitted in support of the 'inclusion' of Meddler Stud (site K/02) within the context of the SHLAA.	No change required – It is considered that site K/02 should retain the 'status' of 'deferred' as a consequence of the flooding and equine policy constraints.
Richard Tilbrook	Comments submitted in respect of the suitability of sites BM/01 & BM/02 for development.	No change required – Comments noted. Sites BM/01 & BM/02 are 'included' within the context of the SHLAA.
Stuart Willsher Boyer	Comments submitted in support of the 'inclusion' of site RL/13 for residential development within the context of the SHLAA.	No Change required – It is considered that the status of 'deferred' should be maintained (there is an extant and emerging employment policy designation pertaining to this site).
Richard Sykes- Popham	Site ref: FHDC/RL/05 (Land adjoining public house, Turnpike Road and Lane, Red Lodge). The site is included – confirmation that the site remains suitable, available and achievable	Change required – Site Proforma revised in response to submission.

St Edmundsbury Specific

Consultee	Comment	Council's Response
A Turner Lacy Scott & Knight	Submission of two new sites/parcels of land – Land north (SEGB01) and south (SEGB02) of Mill Road, Great Barton.	Change required – The two new sites have been allocated unique references SEGB01 & 02 and will be 'included' within the context of the final SHLAA report.
A Thompson Savills	Submission of site details pertaining to land at Mosley's Farm Yard, Fornham All Saints	No change required – Land at Mosley's Farm, Fornham All Saints has previously been considered and deferred within the context of the SHLAA (site reference SS043) on the basis that it is in an unsustainable location. Fornham All Saints is defined as an 'Infill Village' within the context of the Core Strategy and as a consequence it is an unsuitable location for any significant new development. It was also (previously) considered that the site has poor access. It is not considered that the 'status' of this site should be amended as a consequence of this latest submission.
A Thompson Savills	Submission of site details pertaining to land on the east side of Tut Hill, adjacent to junction 42 of the A14.	No change required – This site has previously been considered within the context of the SHLAA and was afforded the unique reference SS040. The site was previously

		deferred on account of its scale and location. It is not considered that the 'status' of this site should be amended as a consequence of this latest submission.
W Nichols Strutt & Parker	Submission of site details pertaining to land west of Bardwell Road, Ixworth	Change required – The site has been afforded the unique reference SEIX01 and will be 'included' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA report. That part of the site that is already 'allocated' within the context of the St Edmundsbury Vision Local Plan document (reference RV4g) will be excluded.
B Woolnough Evolution Town Planning	Submission of site details pertaining to land north of Campiegne Way, Bury St Edmunds	Change Required – The site has been afforded the unique reference SEBSE06. The site will be 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the report on the basis that it lies in a relatively unsustainable and unsuitable location given existing or potential surrounding land uses.
B Woolnough Evolution Town Planning	Submission of parcel of land between Culford Road, the B1106 and A143, Fornham St Martin.	Change required – The site has been afforded unique reference SEFSM01 but has been 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA report on the basis of its scale and the fact it lies in an unsustainable location

		(Fornham St Martin is defined as an 'Infill Village' within the context of the Core Strategy and as a consequence an unsuitable location for any significant new development).
B Woolnough Evolution Town Planning	Submission pertaining to land south-east of Barton Hamlet.	No change required – This site is known to the Council (site reference AS10) and has previously been 'deferred' on the basis of it being unsustainable in terms of scale and location. It is not considered that the site's status ought to be altered as a consequence of this latest submission.
R Sykes- Popham Carter Jonas	Site submission pertaining to land north of Heath Road and west of Genesta Drive and Heather Close, Thurston.	No change required – The site lies within St Edmundsbury Borough but adjacent to the settlement of Thurston. The strategic allocation of sites in and around Thurston will be considered by Mid Suffolk DC (and the West Suffolk Councils in due course under their duty-to-cooperate).
M Haslam Abbotts Countrywide	Re-submission of four parcels of land at Stanton	No change required – The parcels of land were considered and 'deferred' within the context of the consultation draft SHLAA (SESTAN02, 03, 04 & 05). The sites were afforded the status of

		'deferred' and it is not considered that the status of these sites should be altered as a consequence of this latest submission.
C Smith Hopkins Homes	<p>Site SS21 (Stanton) - The site remains eminently suitable to accommodate a residential development of 75 - 80 dwellings that would provide both affordable housing and new open space, without detriment to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Availability - On behalf of the landowners, Hopkins Homes can confirm that the site is available for residential redevelopment.</p> <p>Achievability - On behalf of the landowners, Hopkins Homes can confirm that the residential redevelopment of the site can be viably achieved, with the development of 75 - 80 dwellings within a five-year timeframe. Safe vehicular access can be achieved via the Wyken Road frontage, with pedestrian links also available via Bury Lane to the north-west and through the existing Honeymeade Close development to the north-east.</p>	Change Required – Site proforma (SS21) updated in accordance with the submission.
C Smith Hopkins Homes	<p>Site WS2 (Clare) – <u>Availability</u> - On behalf of the landowners, Hopkins Homes can confirm that the site is readily available for residential redevelopment within a five-year timeframe. <u>Achievability</u> - On behalf of the landowners, as an experienced residential developer within the Borough of St Edmundsbury, Hopkins Homes can confirm that the residential redevelopment of the site can be viably achieved, with the development of 80 dwellings within a five-year timeframe.</p>	Change required – the site plan has been amended as the site area under consideration has increased. The site proforma (WS2) will also be updated in accordance with this latest submission.
A Turner	Submission of parcel of land to the west of Mill Lane,	Change Required – The new

Lacy Scott & Knight	Barrow.	submission has been afforded the unique reference SEBAR04 and has been 'included' within the context if the final version of the SHLAA review report.
N Akerman Akermans	Site SS90 is the subject of a legal agreement between the landowner and a national housebuilder to sell the land in the event that all or part of the site obtains planning permission for residential development (subject to detailed discussions on potential housing capacity). There are no legal or technical reasons why the site should not be developed and therefore if the site was allocated, development would take place as soon as possible upon receipt of planning permission.	Change required – Site proforma (SS90) has been updated to reflect details in submission.
N Akerman Akermans	SS91 - According to the agent, the land is the subject of a legal agreement between the landowner and house builder to sell the land in the event that all or part of the sites obtains planning permission for residential development (subject to detailed discussions on potential housing capacity). The agent is unaware of any legal or technical reasons why the site should not be developed. The agent confirms that should the site be allocated, development will take place within a reasonable period of time after planning permission is granted.	Change required – Site proforma (SS91) has been updated in accordance with the submission.
E. Burt Berkeley Strategic Land Limited	Site BV6: <u>Suitability</u> - The site is identified in the St Edmundsbury Council Core Strategy for residential led development and allocated in the Vision 2031 document for around 1,250 dwellings. The site has been found sound at Examination for a residential led development and allocated for this purpose. The site is on the north	Change required – Site proforma (BV6) has been updated in accordance with the submission.

	<p>eastern edge of Bury St Edmunds adjoining existing built development to the west and south. This is a suitable site for strategic residential development and will provide a significant contribution towards meeting the Council's housing requirements as set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Availability</u> - The site is in the control of Berkeley and is available for development.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> - The site is identified in the Core Strategy for residential led development under policy CS11 and allocated by Policy BV6 of the Vision 2031 document which identifies the site for around 1,250 dwellings and associated infrastructure.</p>	
S. Chapman Rapleys (on behalf of British Sugar Plc.)	<p>Request that their comments on the suitability of the Sites (SS56, SS87 and SS107) are reflected in the final SHLAA. These sites are not considered suitable for residential use on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The sites are located in the countryside designation in the adopted Development Plan, and residential use is contrary to the adopted policy; b) The sites are outside the settlement boundary, and do not have a connectivity to the existing services; and c) The sites are adjacent to, or in close proximity to existing / proposed industrial /commercial operations. 	<p>No change required –The sites identified have not been allocated within the current Local Plan but could come forward as windfall sites or within the context of a future Local Plan document. Any application submitted ahead of the Local Plan process would be considered within the context of the extant development management policies that would take into account consideration of surrounding land-uses in addition to other factors.</p>
R Davison Lacy Scott & Knight	<p>Comments submitted in respect of site SS73: Ownership – the land is freehold and unencumbered. Current use: Agriculture. History: The site was submitted to the SHLAA assessment in May 2008. The adjoining area to the west has received planning</p>	<p>Change required – Site proforma (SS73) has been updated as a consequence of this submission.</p>

	<p>permission for residential development forming part of the CS11/SS94 allocation subsequently approved for a total of 500 homes. <u>Viability</u>: The site is eminently viable for development lying adjacent to an area now with planning permission for some 500 homes close to the proposed Eastern relief road, an extensive future employment area, a new school and neighbourhood centre. There are no known issues in supplying services, ground conditions, archaeological or conservation factors. <u>Availability</u>: The site is immediately available for residential development and offers potential for continuation of development with adjoining land to the east.</p>	
S. Gilbey Brown & Co.	<p>Comments submitted in respect of 'existing' site SS56. Agent contests the statement within the SHLAA that the site is 'remote from services and facilities in the town'. The site is more sustainably located than the Council's adopted vision 2031 strategic allocations. Further, there is considerable 'developer' interest in the site and now that 'legals' are now at an advanced stage with a national house builder and as such the site could be delivered earlier than currently estimated within the context of the SHLAA.</p>	<p>No change required – The site is relatively, remote from services and facilities. Further, sufficient sites have been identified within BSE to fulfil the requirement of the Vision 2031 Local Plan and therefore it is not considered appropriate to phase development any earlier, particularly as legalities have yet to be completed.</p>
W. Lusty Savills	<p>Comments in respect of site SS061 (Land at Bury East II). Submission of a plan indicating land which is available for housing development. The site is located to the south of the A14 and is 40.8 hectares in size with a potential capacity to provide around 500 houses. Given the size and character of the site, it is expected to be deliverable within a 6-10 year time frame. Given the</p>	<p>Change required – Site proforma (SS061) updated to reflect details in submission.</p>

	location of the site, it also presents the opportunity for development which integrates with the 'Bury East' site, as well as the ability for the provision of a link to the Suffolk Business Park to the north. In addition, the location of the Suffolk Business Park to the north would provide the opportunity to create a proportionate extension of and gateway to the town to the south of the A14.	
W. Lusty Savills	Comments in respect of site SS128. The site has the potential to accommodate 50-100 residential units on the southern part of the site which extends to 5.2 hectares in area. Environmental enhancements are also intended to form a significant part of any future proposal. This would include the provision of extensive areas of amenity space for the benefit of the existing and the newly created communities. It is anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	No change required – This site was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the status should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty Savills	Comments in respect of site SEBSE03. It is proposed that the site could provide around 100 houses and a Care Home. It is anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	No change required – This site was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the site status should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty Savills	Site SEBSE05 - The site extends to approximately 23.9 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate around 500 dwellings as well as other uses. It is anticipated that aspects of the development of the site could be completed within 5 years and the remainder between 6-10 years.	No change required – This site was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the status should be altered as a consequence of the submission. The re-submission shows an extended

		site area.
W. Lusty Savills	SEBSE04 - The site extends to 0.06 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate up to 10 dwellings. It is anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	No change required – This site was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the status should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty Savills	Site WS67. The site extends to approximately 5.8 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate around 150 dwellings. It is therefore anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	Change required – Site proforma (WS67) updated to reflect details in submission.
W. Lusty Savills	The site extends to approximately 1.8 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate around 50 dwellings. It is anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	No change required – This site (SESTAN01) was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the status should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty Savills	SEBARN01, SEBARN02 & WS20 - The area of the site totals 10.8 hectares. The land between the site and Hopton Road is the subject of planning permission for the development of 21 houses (reference SE/13/0210/FUL) which has now been completed. The site has the potential to bring forward a package of community benefits and around 75-90 new homes. It is considered that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	Change required – The agent has submitted a revised site area pertaining to 'existing' sites SEBARN01, SEBARN02 & WS20. The 'new' site will be labelled SEBARN01 and a new site plan produced. The proforma for site BARN01 will be amended to reflect the submission. References to sites SEBARN01 and WS20 will be removed.
W. Lusty Savills	Option 1 (SEBAR02) - The land identified Under Option 1 extends to 4.1 hectares in area and has the potential to	Change required – Site proforma of this 'existing' site updated to

	accommodate around 100 dwellings. Completion could be achieved within 1-5 years.	reflect details within submission.
W. Lusty Savills	Option 2 (SEBAR05) - The land identified Under 'Option 2' extends to 3.3 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate around 80 dwellings.	Change required – This 'new' site has been afforded site reference SEBAR05 but will be 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA on the basis that it lies in a relatively unsustainable location and there would be potential coalescence issues (with Denham End) were the site to be allocated.
W. Lusty Savills	Option 3 (SEBAR06) - The land identified Under 'Option 3' extends to 3 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate around 75 dwellings.	Change required – This 'new' site has been afforded site reference SEBAR06 but will be 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA on the basis that it lies in a relatively unsustainable location and there would be potential coalescence issues (with Denham End) were the site to be allocated.
W. Lusty Savills	Option 4 (SEBAR07) - The land identified Under 'Option 4' extends to 2.4 hectares in area and has the potential to accommodate around 60 dwellings.	Change required – This is an extension of 'existing' site WS75 that was 'deferred' within the context of the draft version of the SHLAA on the basis that it lies in a relatively unsustainable location. The sites allocation could lead to coalescence issues (with Denham End).
W. Lusty Savills	Submission of parcels of land north (SEBSE07) and South (BSESE08) of Olding Road, BSE. The sites are	Change required – These 'new' sites has been afforded site

	submitted to highlight their availability for housing development. The site to the south of Olding Road totals 0.8 hectares and the land to the north, 2.1 hectares. At a density of 40 dwellings per hectare, these sites could accommodate approximately 30 and 80 dwellings respectively. Development of the both sites could be completed within 5 years.	references SEBSE07 and SEBSE08 but both will be 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA on the basis that they lie within existing Bury Vision 2031 Local Plan (employment) allocations – see BV14(l) and BV15(g).
W. Lusty Savills	Submission of two parcels of land east (SEFSM02) and West SEFSM03) of Thetford Road, Fornham St Martin.	Change required – These 'new' sites has been afforded site references SEFSM02 and SEFSM03 but both will be 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA on the basis that they lie adjacent to an 'Infill Village' (see Core Strategy 2010) and as such a relatively unsustainable location for any significant new development.
W. Lusty Savills	SS89 - The site is located to the east of the A14, and to the south of recent housing development and its associated open space. The site extends to 2.3 hectares in area has the potential to accommodate up to 50 dwellings. It is anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	No change required – This site was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the status should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty Savills	SS006 - The site is located off Fornham Lane and is 2 hectares in area. It is proposed that development would comprise of up to 10 dwellings. It is anticipated that development of the site could be completed within 5 years.	No change required – This site was 'deferred' within the context of the previous version of the SHLAA and it is not considered that the status should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty	SS107 - The site extends to approximately 8 hectares in	Change required – Site proforma

Savills	area and has the potential to accommodate around 200 dwellings. It is anticipated that development could be completed within 5 years.	(SS107) updated to reflect details in submission.
W. Lusty Savills	Re-submission of known sites in Risby – SERIS01 & SERIS02. SERIS02 was 'included' in the previous version of the SHLAA. SERIS01 was discounted on conservation/wildlife grounds.	No Change required – It is not considered that the status of either site should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
W. Lusty Savills	Submission of additional parcel of land in Risby (SERIS03 – Land South of School Road – Option 4).	Change required – This 'new' site has been afforded site reference SERIS03 although it will be 'deferred' within the context of the final version of the SHLAA on the basis of conservation/wildlife grounds.
R. Metcalfe Savills	Land to the west of Horsecroft Road (Site SEBSE01) - The site was afforded a 'deferred' status in the previous SHLAA on the grounds that it relates poorly to the settlement boundary of Bury St Edmunds and it is a relatively large expanse of land designated as Special Landscape Area. We strongly disagree with this assessment.	No Change required – It is not considered that the status of this site should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
R. Metcalfe Savills	Land to the west of Hardwick Middle School (Site SEBSE02) - The site was included within the context of the final SHLAA report but afforded a 'deferred' status on the grounds that it is a relatively large expanse of land designated as a Special Landscape Area. We strongly disagree with this statement for the reasons set out below.	No Change required – It is not considered that the status of this site should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
P Reeve	A number of comments provided in respect of sites that	No Change required – Comments

Great Barton Parish Council	were both included and deferred within the context of the consultation draft SHLAA.	noted. It is not considered that the status of this site should be altered as a consequence of the submission.
C Smith Hopkins Homes	<p>Site SEBAR01 – <u>Suitability</u> - The totality of the 3.98Ha area as shown upon the published Site Location Plan is suitable for residential development, together with associated landscaping and open space. Acknowledging the sites edge-of-settlement location, the site could comfortably accommodate a low-density development of approximately 100 - 120 dwellings, which would provide both affordable housing and new open space, without detriment to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. <u>Availability</u> - I can confirm that the site is readily available for residential redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Achievability</u> - I can confirm that the residential redevelopment of the site can be viably achieved, with the development of 100 - 120 dwellings within a five-year timeframe. Safe vehicular access can be achieved via both the C660 Bury Road frontage, and that recently permitted onto the U7024 Stoney Lane, with pedestrian links also available via existing footway along the northern side of Stoney Lane into the centre of the village.</p>	Change required – Site proforma updated to reflect details in submission.
L Voyias Savills	Fully support the inclusion of Site SECHED01 in the SHLAA. It is well related to the existing settlement boundary and there are no development constraints which would prevent it from coming forward in the next 1-5 years.	No Change required – Comments noted.
L Voyias Savills	Land north of Bury Road (Site SECHED02) - The site has been “deferred” on the basis that it relates poorly to the	No Change required – It is not considered that the status of this

	<p>settlement boundary and, as a result of this, is considered to be in a relatively unsustainable location. However, developed alongside Site SS29, it is considered that development of the site would be a suitable extension to the village following the redevelopment of the Former Fireworks Site which has planning permission for 51 units (reference DC/14/1869/VA) and is nearing completion. The land sits adjacent to the east of the Former Fireworks site fronting Bury Road and a large employment site. The site is connected by pavement to the centre of village and its services and facilities are considered safely accessible. There are no known environmental or infrastructure capacity constraints which would prevent the site from coming forward. It is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and deliverable in the next 1-5 years. It is therefore considered that the site should be included in the SHLAA and identified for future development in conjunction with Site SS29.</p>	<p>site should be altered as a consequence of the submission.</p>
L Voyias Savills	<p>Land to the south west of site allocation RV17a, Queens Lane (Site SECHED03) - We fully support the inclusion of this site in the SHLAA. The site and adjacent site allocation RV17a are within the sole ownership of our client and are considered suitable, available and achievable for development in the next 1-5 years. It is not considered that St Edmundsbury's adopted Development Plan has identified sufficient housing sites to meet its housing needs and the needs of rural communities. We thus disagree with the Council's summary for this site which states that sufficient sites</p>	<p>No Change required – Comments noted.</p>

	have been identified in the Vision 2031 plans to meet the housing requirement to 2031. The allocation of this site would be a logical extension to site RV17a and it is considered both should be permitted to come forward for development in the immediate future.	
L Voyias Savills	Land to the north of Elizabeth Drive (Site SS47). We fully support the inclusion of this site in SHLAA. The site is well related to the settlement boundary are there are no known environmental or infrastructure constraints which would prevent the delivery of this site. Site RV17a, the only site to be allocated in Chedburgh, also fronts Queens Road and development of Site SS47 would continue the frontage along Queens Road. The site is well contained by its surroundings and access is readily available from Queens Lane. The site is within the sole ownership of our client and is considered suitable, available and achievable in the next 1-5 years.	No Change required – Comments noted.