

Core Strategy Options Questionnaire Comments			
Questionnaire Number	Q27	Q29	Q36 – summarised comments
2	-		Need 1) Jobs= 2) Housing. No jobs – no building. 3)Not dormitory estates 4) The old Parker Dairy plot should be attended to (houses)? 5)Village shops/stores-or we all get in our cars 6)Query water supplies if new villages are built 7)Air Bases-noise should be considered e.g. Try phoning when a plane is overhead 8)bottom line- do we have to fill up the Fens?
4	-	The Fens	-
8	Between Wangford & Brandon	Sedge Fen Brandon	-
9	Lark Valley, linking sites such as Cavenham Heath & neighbouring sites at West Stow Country Park, Lackford Lakes. Also Kennett River Valley especially issue of low water table in summer	Brownfield sites such as areas used for Landfill at Red Lodge. Encouragement of subsidised reduced price domestic renewable energy e.g. Solar panels, small wind turbines (in process of development) in line with renewable/energy saving offers to house builders	I am strongly opposed to the Watermark scheme, which would destroy the environment, landscape character & wildlife, a Breckland area & be unsustainable in terms of water use & excessive motor traffic through adjoining settlements as well as covering a greenfield site
11	I think most wildlife areas have already been identified	-	Q22: A far better public transport system that is reliable & affordable to encourage people to use the system
12	-	-	Selecting 1 answer only gives too simplistic a view of many of these questions.
13	-	-	Q12: Surrounding area not in Mildenhall
14	-	-	Q22: Answer: Controlling the location of development & <i>public transport</i>
15	-	Chalk Hill Barton Mills	-
16	All road developments especially <i>ingoi</i> . Must include for planting of trees etc	-	Q3: Other factors may dictate why greenfield needs to be developed or why 60% deadline not met Q6: All jobs should be promoted not just office based Q10: Assume redundant sites? Q15: Not only guidance given but the quality of the built product needs vast improvement Q18: All workers in all industries/job should be considered Keyworkers, probably more people employed on USAF bases than in racing industry (I do not mean USA persons) Q22: Should include better public transport links as this will have best results in lowering car dependency Q28: Answer: no as too many old yards are left empty Q31 & 32: Depends on the scale of the facility Q36: A number of questions are too prescriptive, very narrow choice when the real answer is probably between the two choices. Some question choices are too rigid e.g. Q4 – real answer would be villages should be allowed to develop naturally.

17	Any Watermark proposal must justify the destruction of the heathland environment that the Regional Plan ENV2 says should be enhanced.	All new housing developments should only be granted planning permission if they include sustainable energy proposals. Roofing houses with photovoltaic tiles instead of clay tiles would make them energy neutral.	Q16: Answer: Yes – Over the whole district as an average Q21: Answer: Yes & No – This begs the question as to whether we should proceed with Watermark. If Watermark is GO – yes the developers should fund major transport infrastructure. But a better solution is for Watermark to be declined. Q28: Answer: Yes – but present implementation is too rigid. Some exceptions should be allowed. Q36: a) Distribution & transportation businesses shouldn't be encouraged; they will not increase number of higher paid jobs, but add to traffic problems in the immediate locality, we already have a concentration along the A142 particularly Fordham. b) To reduce traffic flows all facilities should be expanded in 3 centres- Newmarket, Mildenhall & Brandon. Centralisation as envisaged by Watermark just adds to traffic levels. c) Commuting by public transport will only increase if the necessary public transport infrastructure is improved. d) Planning consent should only be granted to greenfield sites once the 60% brownfield target has been achieved & all brownfield sites have become exhausted.
19	Lakenheath Warren, Brandon Woods	-	-
23 Exning PC	Kentford Heath	Red Lodge	Before any major development there needs to be adequate NHS services, hospitals and schools. RE Q9: Home working should be encouraged where there is:- 1) No noise 2) No traffic difficulties (delivery, parking on verges, there needs to be parking on premises only) 3) It's not blatantly obvious to the residential nature of the neighbourhood 4) Planning permission has been applied for & granted
24 Newmarket Community Church	Kentford Heath	-	Adequate NHS services & hospitals are required before any major future development
25 Mildenhall PC	Icknield Way, Pedders Way	Cavenham Heath	-
26	-	Only off the coast	Q23 & Q24: Road transport above a certain tonnage should be excluded without exception in Brandon & Mildenhall town centres.
27	Kentford Heath as SSSI	None	-
30 Unex Technical Services	-	-	1) Sympathetic development of Queensbury Lodge, Cottage & Stables should be allowed as an exception to the horse racing policies to allow the listed buildings to be preserved. 2) Due to its excellent central location & hence sustainability, the vacant bordered by Black Bear Lane & Rowley Drive should be allocated for residential development.

32	Kentford Heath designated SSSI Stone Curlew nests plus habitat for protected species i.e. bats, brown hare, 5 banded tailed digger wasps, badgers etc	None	No to Watermark. Not wanted, not sustainable – a totally destructive proposal
33	Mildenhall woods & surrounding areas of forest land	Unused farming/agricultural land – brownfield sites	-
35	Reinforcement of all existing areas	-	-
36	-	I feel that individual households should be encouraged to use initiatives provided by Carbon Trust as well as sustainable energy developments in all areas of major population. Also reuse of brown water.	1) I am a walker & believe that development of footpaths, bridleways & public rights of way can offer some alternatives to car use, encourage exercise & improve the quality of local environments. 2) I am also an employer in this area. If I am to maintain a service in rural areas (care to older people) I need good local transport to major towns including Bury St Edmunds & good local transport to get my stuff to the vulnerable people who need them. Carer's earn very little, they need affordable housing & older people need housing designed to meet their needs in later life. As many residential homes have closed this will be vital given the regions ageing population. Further retraining of people to provide a flexible workforce needs consideration.
37 Carpenter Planning Consultants	-	-	Q3: Answer: Yes, if there are sequentially preferable brownfield sites available Q11: Answer: Only if a need is demonstrated Q17: Answer: About right, but depends on individual site circumstances Q36: Update note to PPG3 'Supporting the delivery of new housing' requires local planning authorities to: "Consider favourably planning applications for housing or mixed use developments which concern land allocated for industrial or commercial use in saved policies & development plan documents or redundant land or buildings in industrial or commercial use but which is no longer needed for such use". New employment development should as far as possible be directed to existing allocated employment parks within 3 key towns or extensions to these if necessary. Employment allocations should be made on sites well connected to strategic road network to ensure heavy goods vehicles don't pass through town centres. Residential development of these allocated employment sites would not be appropriate unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required for such use. Unallocated sites which are formerly within employment use within market towns should be considered for residential development, particularly those close to town centres and services and not easily accessible for heavy goods vehicles. Paragraph 32 of PPG3 advises that residential development of previously developed land should always be undertaken in advance of greenfield allocations unless they perform "so poorly" in relation to the criteria listed at paragraph 31.

38	Links to Wicken Fen	Near edges of water reservoirs	The district is privileged to be in an area of low-density population, clean air & relatively good road network (albeit poor public transport in parts); also easy access to beautiful countryside. Change is inevitable, but I think it important to control development with great care & attention, avoid overloading a potentially fragile infrastructure (i.e. water supplies) & continue to maintain standards of good governance in a very 'civilised' part of the country.
39	-	Wind turbines on Lakenheath Warren	-
41	None of which I am aware	RAF Mildenhall/Lakenheath surrounds between Mildenhall & Icklingham	-
42	Icknield Way Path. All SSSIs	None	Opposed to single new development/Watermark. Reasons: Ruin pleasant rural environment; effect on over stretched resources for water, sewerage, power; addition of some 12,000 extra cars on inadequate & under maintained roads; new residents will mostly be commuters; effect on the area of 6,000 coming to a concert arena; debatable viability of proposed rowing lake; impact of 1.2 million visitors a year to these facilities; disruption from building work over 20 years & HGVs & plant involved; would use greenbelt land & next to an SSSI should mean that the Watermark proposal cannot be accepted
43	Ask Suffolk Wildlife Trust	Ask Suffolk Wildlife Trust	<i>Comments difficult to read</i>

<p>46 Transport 2000 (Cambridge- shire & West Suffolk Branch)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	<p><i>Comments from Transport 2000 – Additional comments on separate sheet - Includes suggestions on public transport corridors</i></p> <p>Qu1: Development which addresses the transport system in the area should be given high priority provided that it does by encouraging a modal shift away from the car.</p> <p>Qu2: Developments in areas within walking distance of important public transport node (e.g. Town centres of Brandon & Mildenhall & possibly smaller communities if well served by bus or train), should have priority over developments in outlying areas of Newmarket. All major new developments should have a direct link, running at least hourly during weekday daytimes & 2 hourly evenings & Sundays, to a key railhead where people can join the national transport network. A new settlement could be considered if it has its own rail link.</p> <p>Qu3: Site sustainability targets should have priority over the question of whether a site is brownfield or greenfield.</p> <p>Qu8: Encourage distribution depots where they enable modal shift of freight from road to rail.</p> <p>Qu10: Depends on the characteristics, inc. public transport & walk/cycle accessibility.</p> <p>Qu11: Development of existing town centres should be encouraged, but discourage out of town retail developments.</p> <p>Q16: Development densities should be as high as possible to ensure that local facilities are viable & reduce land intake.</p> <p>Q18: Can't see why racing industry needs to be protected this way. Public transport workers should be given key worker status.</p> <p>Q19: Relevant criteria includes; avoid traffic generation, promoting sharing of services between USAF personnel & local community, & avoid severance of facilities (security)</p> <p>Q20: Non car ownership should be a main factor in deciding whether a dwelling is "low impact"</p> <p>Q21: If a large scale development can fund strategic improvements to the national & regional public transport networks, this should be a factor in its favour</p> <p>Q23: Mildenhall is not a primary route, & don't see that the A1101 has enough long distance traffic to justify a by-pass. Why can't traffic using the main route through Brandon (A1065) use the A11 & A134 instead?</p> <p>Q28: Horse racing industry should be encouraged but not sure whether this should protect specific sites</p> <p>Q30: Availability of water should, if necessary, constrain the amount of residential, industrial, commercial & leisure development permitted</p> <p>Q31: Provision of a regional facilities would almost certainly exclude non-motorists</p> <p>Q32: Exclusion of non-motorists should be a key factor in developing an arts strategy</p> <p>Q33: Don't understand question. Believe that it's important to maintain existing network & develop new routes where appropriate</p>
---	----------	----------	--

47 English Nature	-	Solar panels/individual turbines for wind energy on every new building. Residential & commercial	<p><i>Comments from English Nature:</i></p> <p>Preference to restore Breckland Forest to heathland is welcomed. The restoration of agricultural land to heathland is welcomed.</p> <p>Most heaths in FH are suffering from air pollution, with nitrogen oxides causing significant loss to biodiversity. Should development be restricted, or designed to have minimal impacts upon air quality?</p> <p>Supply of water to many of the District's wetlands are inadequate. High water levels & occasional flooding can be important to maintain the wildlife of these wetlands.</p> <p>Further issue is proposal by Brecks Countryside Project/Norfolk County Council for a Breckland Regional Park, as submitted to RSS.</p> <p>Recreation in the countryside is valuable for engaging people with wildlife, and is encouraged by English Nature. At the same time the stone-curlew, a rare bird with national & international protection, is disadvantaged with even low levels of human disturbance. As FH has a nationally significant population of this bird, it is a major issue for the LDF.</p>
48	-	-	The Watermark development has plainly been shown to be unsustainable & should not be incorporated in the LDF. To include it would be perverse & contrary to the principles of sustainable development.
49	Kentford Heath should be designated as an SSSI extending from Icknield Way to protect nesting sites of rare Stone Curlew (designated Red by RSPB) & habitats of other wildlife & rare flora	None compatible with this area	If Watermark project went ahead not only would it ruin this very peaceful area of Suffolk, it would go against government's desire to reduce travel by car.
50	-	None	<p>Q4: Answer: Yes- preferably ones that allow growth, not artificially restrain it.</p> <p>Q22: Answer: Neither</p> <p>Q26: Answer: An equal balance is needed</p> <p>Q36: Some questions are not simple Yes/No answers.</p> <p>Planning frameworks need to be adaptable to take account of changes as years pass. Current plan is enforced too rigidly and doesn't give enough weighting to local/parish view.</p>
51	-	-	Kentford is surrounded by a large amount of industrial development & a new business park is starting up. Need in the village for a certain amount of extra residential accommodation to reduce commuting. Kentford is a sustainable village with a railway station, post office & shop etc. Good links to A14 & A11. Strong feeling amongst surrounding villages against Watermark scheme; virtually nobody wants it. Therefore believe we need to spread future development around bigger towns, & endemic growth within villages, without turning them into suburbs of a large town.

52	Kentford heath from Icknield way should be made an SSSI to protect the rare Stone Curlew nest sites & other habitats for important heathland wildlife & flora.	None, they would be far too obtrusive for the Breckland area	If Watermark went ahead without proper infrastructure, the whole area would be gridlocked. Problems with health facilities, schools & crime. Has a survey been carried out to find out how many people would be interested in using a non-Olympic size rowing lake? Water is a major consideration – this is 1 of the driest areas of the country & there is already massive building planned for Red Lodge & Bury area.
53	As the rare Stone Curlew (red designated by RSPB) nests on Kentford heath, this area should be designated an SSSI from Icknield way, thus protecting other abundant wildlife & rare flora.	No suitable sites in this area	If Watermark goes ahead, it will ensue the peaceful villages of Kentford, Red Lodge, Kennett & Herringswell. In due course this would then facilitate the development of the whole area from Newmarket to Mildenhall producing a new town similar to Milton Keynes. Most people who have chosen to live in this beautiful area appreciate the peaceful atmosphere, countryside & slower pace of life. They do not want increased crime, traffic jams, poor medical facilities or insufficient schools.
54	-	None	Q21 & Q34 Are impossible to answer
55 Moulton PC	Those currently in forest	Housing developers should have energy saving/generating strategies forced on them	Ticks in boxes can never reflect the careful consideration that has been taken in the completion of this questionnaire
56 Peacock & Smith on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarket plc	-	-	Wm. Morrison Supermarkets plc support the broad principal objective of Government planning policy for town centres set out at PPS6, which aims to promote & enhance the vitality & viability of town centres. With reference to PPS6 para. 1.6 – We consider the Council should follow this advice in terms of identifying existing town & district centres, assessing need for further uses & capacity & focussing new retail development within such centres. Reference to Watermark proposal in the Core Strategy – Wm. Morrison Supermarkets plc consider that an assessment of the need for a new district centre should be considered as part of such a major development in order to meet the Government’s sustainable objectives in line with PPG1.
57 GR Planning Consultancy on behalf of Budgens Stores Ltd	-	-	Reference to Doc. 1 section ‘Economic Development, Retail & Tourism’ & Issue 11: Concern that issue 11 is open-ended. It is also not based on an indication or assessment of whether there is the scope or need for further retail development in these towns. It is not possible to offer any reasonable response. In our view the Council’s approach as reflected in issue 11 is contrary to advice of PPS6. In particular, paragraphs 2.15-18 of PPS6 emphasise the role of Plans at the local level & that Local Planning Authority’s should seek to “assess the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure & other main town centre uses, taking account of both quantitative & qualitative considerations”. PPS6 continues by indicating that LPA’s in conjunction with local community/stakeholders should seek to identify “deficiencies in provision” & “assess the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development”. Paragraph 2.32 of PPS6 confirms that an assessment should be carried out as part of the plan preparation & “will provide the basis for identifying the need for additional development & appropriate scale”. Our opinion – the advice points to the requirement for “need assessments” to be undertaken in an early stage & as a pre-requisite to the Plan. The LPA must as a matter of urgency commission an independent Retail Study.

58	River Lark – walk meadow plan Icklingham area	Coast line	<p>Would like a more imaginative response to specific requests for development & allow for the occasional ‘transgression’ outside your clear boxes.</p> <p>Final conclusions should be used as guidelines not commands – particularly on smaller one off developments.</p> <p>Need more advice from Planning Officers on ill-conceived plans that fit the bill but do so badly.</p>
59	Heathland, Woodland (not forest area), Drainage Canal & Lark Valley	Old airfield Tuddenham	-
61 Sellwood Planning on behalf of Earl of Derby	-	-	<p>High priority should be given to job creation e.g. Newmarket (as it’s the largest & most sustainable town). Should seek to attract ‘spin off’ business from science/technology economy of Cambridge & equine related search companies. Land at Hatchfield Farm on northern edge of Newmarket can capitalise on favourable job growth characteristics.</p> <p>Draft RSS proposes 6400 dwellings in Forest Heath. Inclusion of Newmarket within the Cambridge sub region growth area combined with recent higher household projections point to a need for more than 6400 units.</p> <p>New town would create new infrastructure pressures. Rail enhancements more likely to be achieved by concentrating development at towns like Newmarket with established rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Minimise car use by locating new development at Newmarket the largest town with greatest range of facilities, services & public transport. Unrealistic to offer as a public option, a level of housing development that is 20% below that contained in draft RSS. It would exacerbate housing supply, increase house prices & reduce further the number of Forest Heath residents who can afford to own their own home.</p> <p>Promotion of culture is important part of any multi faceted planning vision in the district. A new settlement of 4000-5000 new dwellings would be unable to support wide range of jobs, education, retail & arts floorspace, so a high proportion of day to day needs would have to be made by car trips to elsewhere in the district.</p>

62	-	-	<p>Should retain development boundary of Dalham, it is protected by a conservation area that extends beyond the village development boundary. Removing the boundary would prevent further development that may be required to maintain the village's viability. Existing facilities are in need of extra custom as is evident from the closure of the Afleck Arms public house at lunchtimes on weekdays. Village hall & nursery are examples of services that need a thriving community to sustain them. Recent loss of Post Office & shop indicate the precarious nature of such village services. Removing potential for development by removing the development boundary will mean that the village risks being forgotten & services which exist could be lost. Removal of the development boundary could disadvantage the local community. Large-scale development in villages like Dalham is undesirable & inappropriate but there is a clear case for retention of a development boundary, in meeting the local needs of the community.</p> <p>"Promote sustainable patterns of development & sustainable communities in rural areas" (PPS7)- clearly therefore the LA is obliged to offer villages the potential to improve their sustainability through sympathetic development.</p> <p>Countryside Agency's vision of the countryside & rural communities whereby – "the countryside should be managed to conserve & enhance its rich landscape, biodiversity, heritage & local customs, while recognising the changing needs of those who live there". Removal of the development boundary offers little scope for village to adapt to changing economic or social situations. Similarly Commission for Rural Communities has a belief that "England's rural communities should be diverse, thriving & sustainable". Commitment from central government & government agencies to maintain village communities, & provide the option for suitable development in order to maintain & enhance the vitality of the area. Removal of Dalham development boundary would be contrary to such a commitment.</p>
----	---	---	---

63	-	-	<p>Should retain development boundary of Herringswell. Herringswell is attractive & somewhat under serviced settlement, removing the development boundary will prevent further development & sound the death knell of a declining village. It has lost its Post Office & school. Existing facilities are under used & village social club poorly attended. Removing any potential for development will mean that the village risks being forgotten & services which exist could be lost. Removal of the development boundary could disadvantage the local community. PPG3 paragraph 71 outlined that limited numbers of houses should be accommodated within villages however, some provision is required in order to meet the local needs. Large-scale development in villages like Herringswell is undesirable & inappropriate but there is a clear case for retention of a development boundary, in meeting the local needs of the community.</p> <p>“Promote sustainable patterns of development & sustainable communities in rural areas” (PPS7)- clearly therefore the LA is obliged to offer villages the potential to improve their sustainability through sympathetic development. A development boundary is an enabling tool in the promotion of sustainable communities & therefore essential to meeting this objective. Paragraph 4 of PPS7 explicitly states that suitably sized development within & adjacent to villages should be possible within the policies of the Local Development Comments. LAs are obliged to support “small-scale development... where it provides the most sustainable option in villages that are remote from, & have poor public transport links with, service centres” (PPS7).</p> <p>Herringswell’s isolated position & infrequent public transportation services place it firmly within such a category where small-scale development should be supported in order to ensure the sustainability of the village.</p> <p><i>Same comments as for Questionnaire 62 from Countryside Agency’s paragraph onwards</i></p>
65	-	-	<p>Q17- Answer: About right (however this is dependent upon individual site circumstances)</p> <p>Q19: As reflected in ‘Issues & Options’ document (issue 20) there is a significant need for the district council to plan specifically for the housing needs of American military personnel. This is demonstrated by USAF housing needs requirements market assessment considered by FHDC Planning Committee Members.</p> <p>Pertinently the significant need was demonstrated by some 2,300 families living outside that desired housing market area of 20-mile radius of the bases or 60-min. commute. Furthermore the current position is also at variance with the tenets of PPG3 which in terms of sustainability seeks to promote development which reduces the need to travel by car.</p> <p>Given the context of sustainability housing development for personnel should be located as close to existing bases as possible.</p>

66	-	-	Newmarket should continue to be a focal point for growth within the District Council's area. To maintain its particular urban characteristics & safeguarding the interests of the Horse Racing Industry. PPS1 paragraph 23 outlines the commitment to the delivery of jobs & prosperity for all. Specific aim to provide good quality homes in "locations that reduce the need to travel". Mixed-use development can act to facilitate these commitments & reduce the need to commute. Within this context, the argument is that The Lambton Playing Field might now beneficially be considered for 'mixed use development' in the emerging LDF if, by the time of adoption, the development in accordance with the Adopted Local Plan had not been carried out.
67	-	-	Agree with Housing Vision "this vision is focused on relieving pressure on housing demand by broadening the location, number & type of new dwellings in the District."
68	-	Area too flat & too far inland for wind farms & rivers are not large enough.	Mildenhall is commercially dead, not enough jobs being created. Insufficient to buy goods and services locally. Local population is forced out of town to earn & spend money. We are too dependent on the USAF airbase who have developed their own leisure & retail base making them independent of Mildenhall. Caused local leisure/retail facilities to be non-viable due to lack of customers. Area around Mildenhall is in decline, an area of great expansion & prosperity. This is quite an achievement for FHDC.
69	-	-	Residents of villages near proposed Watermark Development site have not been heard- or little notice has been taken. No representation from Forest Heath attended the meeting in Worlington arranged by a local Eco-Group regarding the matter even though they were invited. Residents were left to draw their own conclusions as to why.
70	Newmarket Heathland	Set-aside farming areas for fuel crops	-
71	-	-	Support identification of Red Lodge as a "sustainable village". In this regard, we consider Red Lodge is capable of accommodating further growth in the East of England Plan period given its location adjacent to the strategic road network, & centres e.g. Newmarket & facilities in the settlement itself. 60% of all new development on brownfield sites is not realistic for a predominately rural authority. We would contend that new development should be allocated to larger, more self-sufficient sustainable villages' e.g. Red Lodge. Scale of housing growth should be in line with the content of the adopted East of England Plan.

72	-	-	<p><i>Additional comments on separate sheets</i></p> <p>Brownfield developments should take priority where they can successfully be delivered within a defined time period, selective release of appropriate greenfield sites, particularly where they adjoin 3 towns, will be necessary to meet future housing need.</p> <p>Release of sustainable sites adjacent to existing settlements will provide an 'organic' development scenario; this is more appropriate than enlarged settlement on greenfield land at Red Lodge. Latter would have a negative impact on vitality & viability of existing market towns & compromise existing settlement pattern within the District. Also at odds with a number of draft RSS policies.</p>
76	-	-	<p><i>Further comments are available from Savills on behalf of Ashwell Developments Ltd.</i></p> <p>Are not aware of support from County or District level for Watermark proposal. Our view that the Council should not support Watermark because of the unsustainable nature & location & policy conflict. Reference to Watermark could allow the authority to engage in community participation, we do not see how this could be distinguished from other development proposals.</p> <p>Q3: 60% figure target for brownfield development is relatively high compared to other rural districts in the area and we would suggest a much lower figure may be more appropriate.</p>
77	-	-	<p>Brandon should be allowed to grow in line with draft regional guidance set out in RSS14, which seeks to focus development in rural areas in market towns. Policies SS2 & SS9 or RSS14 set this out clearly, emphasising the need to develop existing built-up areas.</p> <p>In accordance with SS9, Brandon should cater for: "additional housing, employment growth & economic diversification"</p> <p>Policy E3 also supports the provision of sites for industry & commerce in key market towns, to help promote sustainable communities.</p> <p>Brandon should therefore be considered as a main settlement for development & expansion in line with regional guidance.</p>
79	On the banks of the river Lark	Brandon	-
80	Kentford Heath	None	-
81	Mildenhall Woods	Heathland at Red Lodge	-
82	-	<p>This needs to be very selective, given the squandering of energy e.g. on the roads & in the air. Perhaps some wind power development might be possible & acceptable in the N. East of the District.</p>	<p>Some of the questions are difficult to answer because of the way the questions are set, & the demand for 1 answer – e.g. questions 35,32,30.</p> <p>Qu9: Such a policy needs great circumspection: residents are entitled to their traditional & sensible amenities: an insurance specialist can work from home but a jobbing plant-hire operator could cause great concern. Present Local Plan seeks to protect residents amenity & such a policy should be firmly maintained- intrusive occupation should be restricted to appropriate sites.</p> <p>I can see that working from home might save road use but will result in loss of business rates.</p>

83	Brandon – from forest between town & Wangford – behind Brandon House & Fford Farm to the river	Wind turbines Mayday Farm ridge by beacon in forest	Q4: Programme should reduce sustainability Q18: Key worker status should apply to industry resettlement Q22: Priority to over 65 free bus travel across county boundaries Q26: Any further deforestation will increase liability to flash flooding Q30: Central government or M.o.D. create new reservoirs on their land & sell water to suppliers Q35: Create a working group with South West Norfolk
85	Kentford heath – this site is known to contain the rare & threatened Stone Curlew & the 5 banded digger wasp at various locations within this area. I believe it should be given SSSI status to protect & encourage the population of these birds & insects.	I do not believe we have any sites suitable for this	<i>Further comments from Mrs E. Marchington are available.</i> Culture led vision e.g. Watermark appears in the LDF without justification for this regional leisure led proposal. Herringswell parish poll showed 100% against this proposal. 3 other villages held Parish polls indicating there was no desire for this development. I believe that any development should follow the sequential process as outlined in the RSS, firstly occurring on Brownfield sites adjacent to existing towns. Housing growth beyond that suggested in the Suffolk Structure plan should be opposed. Priority should be given for competing water resources.
86	-	-	<i>Additional comments from Suffolk County Council are available.</i> Key aspect of employment led vision is the relationship between job growth & housing development. Housing planned would be in line with the figure specified in the East of England Plan the rate of housing growth would be “strictly in step with & determined by employment growth.” If there were less employment development & job growth than that planned for the East of England Plan, the amount of housing development would probably be less than 6,400. Employment led vision is considered to be in general conformity with the draft East of England Plan.
87	-	-	<i>Additional comments are available from RPS Planning on behalf of Kennett Park LLP.</i> Vision needs to incorporate some elements of all of the 5 visions identified. First & over-arching priority should be development that enables the local economy to grow & prosper in the broadest sense i.e. including commercial & residential development. Environmental led vision of very constrained development is unrealistic & likely to lead to social & economic problems. RSS target of 60% of development on brownfield sites is fairly challenging, especially in the more rural parts of the region. District’s urban capacity study identified limited potential in the main urban areas of Newmarket, Mildenhall, Lakenheath & Brandon. Highlights limited scope for Newmarket for addressing both local & sub-regional housing needs. Newmarket has constraints imposed by its horseracing industry & heritage, which needs to be maintained.

88	-	May be opportunities in association with Red Lodge expansion proposal	<p><i>Additional comments from RPS Planning on behalf of Crest Nicholson (Eastern) & Wrenbridge Land Ltd</i></p> <p>Mildenhall in planning policy terms is an appropriate location for new housing & employment development. However the urban capacity study has demonstrated, it has limited potential for further growth. Red Lodge therefore provides the means to assist in meeting Mildenhall's future development requirements.</p> <p>2 important regional objectives in draft RSS are to improve prosperity of the region and to meet identified housing needs. It is essential that development provision in the RSS for Forest Heath District be significantly increased.</p> <p>Further work is urgently needed at regional level to convert the proposed job growth targets in the draft RSS into employment land targets at a district level.</p> <p>Expansion of Red Lodge could help facilitate the provision of a regional sport & leisure facility, such as a multi-purpose arena, in a location next to the A11.</p>
89 CgMs Consulting on behalf of Elveden Farms Ltd	None	-	<p>Support RSS objective for more intense development & consider that development should be spread throughout the towns & sustainable villages' inc. Lakenheath.</p> <p>Support employment led vision & in particular expansion of Lakenheath. Trunk roads provide the opportunity for national & regional distribution depots & warehouses. Also support farm based food processing & packaging, & the use of redundant buildings for residential purposes.</p> <p>In relation to the housing led vision – support increased scale of housing in draft RSS as is need to accommodate USAF personnel on sites close to airbases.</p> <p>Environment led vision indicates that the district doesn't have any countryside designated of being of national importance. This is not supported as it is considered that it may place undue restrictions on development within the District.</p> <p>Cultural led vision- object to provision of Watermark, as it is more sustainable to concentrate housing development on existing developments.</p>
90 Network Rail	-	-	<p><i>Additional comments by Network Rail are available:</i></p> <p>Supports regeneration of existing towns or development of brownfield sites to accommodate future development. Meets sustainable objectives in regional & national guidance and provides for the redevelopment & enhancement of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Where land is no longer required for operational railway use there is often the potential for redevelopment inc. housing.</p>
91	-	-	<p>Q5: Yes, but restricted for type of employment being considered for an area. Q21: This is not a yes or no question each 1 should be judged on its own merits. Q22: Suitable public transport would reduce car dependency. Q26: Surely a mix is more important</p>

92 Home Builders Federation	-	-	<p><i>Additional comments from HBF are available.</i></p> <p>Recently published draft document from the Planning Inspectorate 'A framework for assessing soundness & focussing representations on Development Plan Documents' – need to satisfy itself that it is in full compliance with the content of this document.</p> <p>Believe the Council ought to consider a higher overall housing figure than that set out in the draft RSS given that the final regional housing requirement is yet to be confirmed & in the context of the Barker Report & Planning for Housing Provision document.</p>
93	-	All redevelopment & renovation include renewable energy developments	<p>There are quaint individual villages & towns that it would be sad to destroy with modern development all having similar designs. Should work with your individual styles to maintain the uniqueness- your identities must not be subsumed into modern sprawl- combine the old & new.</p> <p>Countryside is beautiful but vulnerable to water shortages & erosion – don't spoil it but support it with this future in mind.</p> <p>If develop or modernise use renewable energy resources and energy conservation & help inhabitants do so as well.</p>
94	Support submissions put forward by Suffolk Wildlife Trust & English Nature.	Land near Lakenheath	<p>Q1 & Q30 do not allow for levels of priority between highest & lowest for lists of options that are all relatively important priorities.</p> <p>Where do the plans to develop Newmarket's status as the home of horseracing fit into the issues & consultation?</p>
96	All the remaining Breck should be protected. This is the oldest landscape-encouragement should be given for the replanting of some species ending their natural life. We must protect the Orchids especially the habitat of rare birds consult RSPB.	With no waterpower available we would have to look at wind farms- not suitable in an area with airfields or solar power-not hugely efficient. Forest Heath should leave this to the Region to negotiate with USAF etc.	<p>FH area is unique and the district council should be looking to defend the area from schemes that are dormitories for commuter & have negative environmental impacts & will shop on journeys too & from work in established centres. Even if a Tesco or Asda were located in Mildenhall people would still visit Newmarket or Ely for variety.</p> <p>Look at what Bury is doing – destroying the things people value- resisting change for its own sake may be hard but to stay within the development boundaries- work on the Lark Mills & Parmalat sites & offer something people can aspire to.</p>
97	All wildlife should be looked at including birds	-	-
99	Need to preserve & maintain hedges & woodland & delegate suitable areas/or new plantations of indigenous species not for commercial use.	There should be more research on wind farms. I don't believe the amount of electricity provided by wind farms can justify scenic destruction of our countryside & detrimental affect on wildlife.	
104 Environment Agency	Recommend the creation of wildlife habitats this could be undertaken through the use of planning obligations for strategic development sites, which could be used for the creation of wildlife corridors.	Suggest household efficiency measures be promoted e.g. policies such as use of water saving devices (i.e. toilets/showers) & energy efficiency measures. Policies could state the requirement for these measures to be included in all new build homes/workplaces.	Would not wish to state a preference between the Watermark development & proposal for 60% of new dwellings to be built on brownfield sites. Suggest for a strategic development in the District- a balanced approach should be applied to support both the growth of settlements around existing transport infrastructure & also towards the redevelopment of brownfield sites.

105	Yes- the proposed Watermark site	-	-
106 RSPB	The RSPB believes that the LDF should identify wildlife corridors that can be enhanced/created within Forest Heath & that these would be part of a wider ecological network of corridors linked with neighbouring regions, using the regional biodiversity opportunities map as a framework.	<p>The RSPB is supportive of renewable energy projects providing that adverse impacts upon wildlife are avoided by appropriate siting & design. The Council should encourage the development of renewable energy within the district, in suitable locations.</p> <p>Vital to encourage energy efficiency within new developments. Would be best practice if larger scale developments could be able to produce at least 10% of its power requirements, this combined with energy efficiency & renewable energy power stations/wind farms could have a significant impact on improving sustainability.</p>	<p>Q26 – Although the majority of heathland loss can be attributed to either afforestation or arable farming, all 3 land uses make a contribution to the ecological importance of Breckland & identifying 1 land-use as being more important than the others is too simplistic way of viewing the issue.</p> <p>Q30 – RSPB believes that the issue of water resources is not which competing need should have priority but how water resources can be managed sustainably.</p> <p>The potential for wetland creation has multiple benefits- water storage, prevent flooding, recreational activities & nature conservation.</p>
Forestry Commission England	-	Ensure renewable energy policies inc. energy crops (e.g. short rotation coppice, "Miscanthus"), wood from existing woodland, sawmill co-products & waste wood i.e. that would otherwise be landfilled	-