

Reg 25 Minerals Specific Site Allocation Issues and Options - Version 2 Responses

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response	
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties
170	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	1															Restoration of Waldringfield Quarry appears to be to agriculture. In this location restoration to heathland should be considered - especially for this site extension - in order to bring about a biodiversity gain	Noted and agreed
221	Brett Aggregates Ltd	1	Y															
323	English Heritage	1															concern about adverse effect on historic monuments and water level	Margins can be provided. Excavations would be above water table
462	GeoSuffolk	1	Y														Does the SSI need to be replaced elsewhere	Yes
491	Natural England	1																Noted
516	Highways Agency	1												Y				Noted
527	Suffolk Coastal District Council	1											Y				Concern about the impact on BT Safeguarding Zone Policy AP217, the geological SSSI proximity to BT technical facilities & the need for archaeological monitoring	BT have no objection
531	Suffolk County Council: Rights of Way	1															FP51 needs to be diverted. Appropriate screening required to mitigate visual impact on the Right of Way network	Footpath diversion should not be necessary Appropriate screening of site would be appropriate
535	Environment Agency	1															recommends that the proposer carries out the landfill gas investigative work	Agreed
562	Martlesham Parish Council	1a													Y		Concern that the site adjoins the Moon & Sixpence holiday caravan park and is too close to the Falcon Residential Park. The footpath would also run alongside the site.	Margins and screening required.
567	BT plc	1a	Y															Noted
	Kirton and Falkenahm Parish Council	1a															concerned about intention to divert footpath	No diversion of footpaths appear necessary.
	Resident: S.E. Clover	1a											Y				concerned about proximity to AONB	There is no visual link with AONB

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response	
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties
	Resident: A. Crawford	1a											Y		Y	Y	close to AONB, 'Moon and Sixpence' caravan site, houses and chapel	Agreed but these are not considered absolute constraints
	Resident: Mr and Mrs J. Smith	1a													Y	concerned about impact on water environment and public rights of way	Working is not proposed into water table. No diversion of grows anticipated	
	County Councillor: Patricia O'Brien	1a											Y	Y	Y	close to AONB, houses and water table	AONB and property are not considered to be constraints. There would be no working into water table	
	Waldringfield Parish Council	1a												Y	Y	local properties are on wells/bore holes, the site is close to houses and SSSI, it will disrupt the footpath and there has been a lack of time for discussion	Working is not proposed into water table. The geological SSSI would need to be re created. No diversion of grows anticipated.	
Total		22															(3 POS)	

171	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	2															Resoration to heathland should be considered at this location in order to bring about a biodiversity gain	Noted but land is in agricultural use. Heathland restoration of site no 1A may be more appropriate. Opportunities for biodiversity should be identified.
222	Brett Aggregates Ltd	2	Y															
324	English Heritage	2															concern about adverse effect on historic monuments and water level	Margins required to protect Scheduled Monument

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response		
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties	
	Waldringfield Parish Council	2a											Y					local properties are on wells/bore holes, the site is close to houses and SSSI, it will disrupt the footpath and there has been a lack of time for discussion	Working is not proposed into water table. Margins required to nearest property. There is no SSSI but a Scheduled Monument needs to be protected. The footpath would need to be diverted during extraction and reinstated upon restoration.

Total **13**
(4 POS)

172	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	3										Y						Concern the site would have a large impact on the County Wildlife Site	Mitigation measures would be required
223	Brett Aggregates Ltd	3	Y																Noted
325	English Heritage	3											Y					Concern about historic park and garden	There is not considered to be any impact on the historic park and garden.
349	County Councillor: John Field	3							Y	Y		Y	Y	Y				Concern about the effect on the environment, quality of life, buildings, properties, roads and visual effects on the landscape	Noted
354	County Councillor: Julia Truelove	3							Y	Y		Y	Y	Y				Concern about the effect on the environment, quality of life, buildings, properties, roads and visual effects on the landscape	Noted
361	The Needham Market Society	3												Y				68 people have concerns about the site. They are mostly concerned about heavy traffic	No increase in traffic flow would come about as a result of this development

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response		
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties	
382	The Needham Market Town Council	3																There would appear to be little or no dust impact on Needham Market as all access to this site would be through the existing quarry.	Agreed
464	GeoSuffolk	3	Y																Noted
490	Natural England	3																Shrubland Historic Park and Garden is listed as an international nature conservation designation constraint. This site does not have an international nature conservation designation (i.e. it is not an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site).	Agreed
537	Environment Agency	3																Concern about water quality as there is an aquifer under the site (SA objective 3)	Evidence that no harm to groundwater would come about would be required.

Total **10**
(2 POS)

224	Brett Aggregates Ltd	4	Y																
301	Babergh District Council	4																Also concern about groundwater and native hedgerows and an archaeological investigation is needed	These issues would need addressing in detail at application stage. They do not represent a fundamental objection to development.
326	English Heritage	4																concern the site may have buried archaeological remains and should be assessed in more detail prior to extraction.	Agreed
465	GeoSuffolk	4	Y																Noted
519	Highways Agency	4						Y										Concern that the sites should be subject to an assessment on traffic impact	No additional traffic anticipated.
525	Suffolk Preservation Society	4											Y						Noted
538	Environment Agency	4																concern there may be a negative impact on SA objective 3 (improving water quality) as the main part of the site falls within an Environment Agency Groundwater Source Protection Zone 3,	Mitigation measures would be required.

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response		
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties	
302	Babergh District Council	6																objects to Planning Application Reference B/07/00177/CMA	Noted, objections to be reported to Development Control Committee
328	English Heritage	6									Y	Y						concerned about environmental aspects and grade II buildings in Great Waldingfield	Noted, Comments to be reported to Development Control Committee
427	Resident: P.A. Whitehead	6			Y		Y								Y				Noted
428	Cornard Tye Residents Association	6										Y	Y					concerned that the geological evidence of viable mineral deposits is inadequate	Borehole results submitted with planning application
467	GeoSuffolk	6	Y																Noted

Total
7
(2 POS)

173	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	7																This site is suitable for restoration to heathland (biodiversity gain)	Noted
228	Brett Aggregates Ltd	7	Y																Noted
329	English Heritage	7																Site is to the north west of the grade II listed building, Kirton Hall	Working is considered unlikely to impact on setting of listed building.
468	GeoSuffolk	7	Y																Noted
493	Natural England	7																The application site lies approximately 1.7km from the Deben Estuary SSSI/SPA/Ramsar, but none of the designations are listed as nearby or as constraints - would like an appropriate assessment of the site	Discussions with Natural England resulted in agreement that AA is not appropriate.
517	Highways Agency	7							Y									Some improvements to A14 junction may be necessary	Noted, although site could follow completion of existing with no increase in traffic flow.

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response		
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties	
526	kirton & falkenham PC	7	Y															support is conditional, for reasons of traffic management, that no extractions are made from the site until the Bucklesham Tip is worked out.	Agreed that any extraction should only follow restoration of existing Bucklesham Quarry.
529	Suffolk Coastal District Council	7											Y						Noted
Total		8																	(3 POS)

174	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	8											Y					concerned about impacts upon Chad Brook County Wildlife Site. The text infers that restoration would be to a recreational lake, which implies this would be a fishing lake. This is unlikely to bring about biodiversity benefits and would not mitigate for im	Agreed
229	Brett Aggregates Ltd	8	Y																Noted
303	Babergh District Council	8											Y	Y	Y			Also concerned about the impact on the functional floodplain archaeological investigation would be required	Agreed
330	English Heritage	8																The site should be subject to an archaeological evaluation prior to any extraction taking place.	Agreed
469	GeoSuffolk	8	Y																Noted
494	Natural England	8	Y															believes the proposed quarrying activity at Site 8 is not likely to cause damage to the designated interest features of the Long Melford SSSI.	Noted
541	Environment Agency	8											Y					would like evidence that minerals extraction would not cause major changes to hydrodynamic flows that in turn could have adverse impacts on the adjacent County Wildlife Site and other downstream nature conservation sites and the site lies in a functional flood plain.	Agreed
Total		7																	(3 POS)

161	Resident: Mr Graham Jackson	9																Believes the site will not benefit the local community	Noted
-----	-----------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information		
304	Babergh District Council	9		Y								Y		Y	Y	Also concerned about the impact on water quality and its restoration to a golf course	Working not expected to be into water table. Understand that area was included in that given permission for use as golf course
305	Resident: Mr and Mrs G Frederick Morgan	9	Y													support if the land owner (Boxford Group) donated a more suitable site from their extensive land holdings, and provided sufficient funds to construct a replacement for St Matthew's Church, as part of the proposed development.	Church is not considered to be at risk from the proposed development
306	Resident: P Sibthorpe	9			Y		Y					Y		Y			
307	Resident: Mr Geoffrey Aldridge	9												Y	Y	Also concerned about water problems	Working not expected to be into water table.
308	Resident: Mr Brian Throssell	9													Y	concerned that the proposals are designed for commercial gain at the expense of the lifestyle of local residents	Noted
331	English Heritage	9														should ensure the archaeological implications of this site are given due consideration	Agreed
420	Resident: Mr Christopher Bridge	9		Y										Y		Also concerned about health and effect on golf course	Unlikley to be any adverse impact on health. There would be some disruption to users of the golf course.
435	Resident: Dr Mark Gurden	9			Y		Y							Y	Y	Also concerned about water problems and access to the footpath	Working not expected to be into water table. Information provided suggests that there would be no encroachment onto footpath because extraction area would be limited.

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response			
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties		
444	Mrs Shirley Salter	9														Y		Y	Also concerned about the proximity to local houses	Information provided suggests that extraction would not come close to site boundaries and therefore buffer would be provided within site.
458	Dr Jane Gurden	9										Y	Y	Y	Y				Also concerned about the effect on health and the golf course	Unlikely to be any adverse impact on health. There would be some disruption to users of the golf course.
470	GeoSuffolk	9	Y																	Noted
486	Leavenheath Parochial Church Council	9				Y						Y		Y					Also concerned about impact on golf course	There would be some disruption to users of the golf course.

**Total 13
(1 POS)**

158	Resident: Billy Richmond	10														Y				Noted
164	Resident: Mr Neil Gallagher	10			Y						Y		Y	Y						Noted
175	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	10										Y							It is a sensitive location for wildlife	Noted
232	Resident: Dr Michael miller	10			Y		Y				Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		Concerned it would disrupt the village of East Bergholt and important wildlife sites	Agreed
242	Resident: Mrs S. Jackson	10										Y	Y	Y						Noted
295	Resident: Mr G.R. Warhurst	10			Y		Y					Y		Y					The site is close to protected woodlands	Direct impact on woodland to north considered unlikely
296	Resident: Mr T.W. Brigden	10											Y	Y						Noted
297	Babergh District Council	10											Y	Y						Noted
298	Resident: Mr G.H. Cook	10												Y						Noted
299	Resident: Mrs Melissa Graves	10										Y	Y	Y						Noted

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response	
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties
300	Brantham Parish Council	10															Objects strongly to the site	Noted
316	Resident: Mrs M. Johnson	10		Y												Y		Noted
332	English Heritage	10															any extraction on this site could be hugely damaging to both the setting of the monument and the physical preservation of archaeological deposits	Agreed
423	Resident: Mr John Barford	10					Y			Y	Y	Y						Noted
451	Resident: Mr William Frankham	10		Y												Y		Noted
471	GeoSuffolk	10	Y															Noted
487	Resident: Mr Ivan Pearce	10			Y											Y		Noted
495	Natural England	10															The Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA/Ramsar is located approximately 2km from the proposal site and the Orwell Estuary SSSI is also located approximately 2km from the site and therefore an appropriate assessment should be carried out	Discussions with Natural England Have resulted in agreement that an AA is not necessary
521	Resident: Mr Leigh Hunter	10			Y		Y		Y			Y					Also concerned about the negative impact on residents, tourists and local businesses	Agreed
543	Environment Agency	10															parts of the proposed site may fall within the functional flood plain and therefore has concerns over impacts of minerals extraction on the hydrological regime of the adjacent river	Noted
Total		20															(1 POS)	

290	Resident: Mr Trevor Woolnough	11														Y		The site is within an HGV restricted zone	Material would be hauled back to existing processing plant as has been the practice for other sites off the B1113
333	English Heritage	11																Respondent is concerned about burial mound within the site boundary and Roman town of Combetovium	Full archaeological assessment would need to be carried out

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information		

Total
5
(1 POS)

159	Resident: Mrs Megan Currie	13											Y	Y			concerned about dewatering impacting on nearby housing and listed buildings and impact on local residents	Agreed
166	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	13															concerned about the impacts of dewatering on the adjacent river and stream and also on the CWS (Fen alder carr) to the north.	Agreed
233	Resident: Mrs Lynne Jardin	13			Y							Y		Y				Noted
335	English Heritage	13															could impact on the setting of a number of grade II buildings and also archaeologists should be consulted	Archaeological evaluation required.
347	Resident: Mr Mike Norris	13			Y		Y					Y		Y	Y		Also concerned about the water table	A full evaluation of dewatering and its implications would be required.
348	Suffolk County Council ??	13							Y	Y		Y	Y	Y			Concern about the effect on the environment, quality of life, buildings, properties, roads and visual effects on the landscape	Noted
352	County Councillor: Mrs Julia Truelove	13			Y		Y					Y	Y		Y		Also concerned about possible flood risk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
356	Resident: Mr N. Turner	13			Y									Y			concerned about lowering of groundwater levels	Agreed.
357	Resident: Mr J. Minter	13			Y		Y					Y	Y					Noted
358	Resident: Mr R.R. Knight	13			Y		Y			Y		Y		Y				Noted
359	The Needham Market Society	13															68 people have concerns about the site. They are mostly concerned about heavy traffic	Proposal would remove traffic from local roads for duration of operations.
362	Resident: Mr C.J. Mitson	13			Y		Y					Y		Y			Also concerned about impact on water table	Agreed
363	Resident: Mrs V.J. Mitson	13			Y		Y					Y		Y			Also concerned about impact on water table	Agreed
364	Resident: Wendy Marchant	13			Y		Y					Y	Y		Y			Noted
365	Resident: Mr E.R. Parkins	13			Y		Y					Y	Y					Noted
366	Resident: Mr Andrew Robinson	13										Y		Y			Also concerned about impact on water table, cycling clubs and horse riding, quality of life, effect on tourism etc.	Agreed
367	Resident: Mr R.D. Robertson	13															Remain previously held objections	Noted

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response		
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties	
368	Resident: Mr D.G. William	13																Also concerned about the Gipping River footpath	Noted
369	Resident: Mr S. Ball	13																	Noted
370	Resident: Mrs T. Mannell	13			Y		Y											Also concerned about footpath and that further expansion of this company would have a devastating effect on both the villages of Creeting St Mary and St Peter.	Noted
371	Mid Suffolk Friends of the Earth	13																Mid Suffolk FoE therefore ask that the Council Reject the Poundfield request that you pass this submission to the relevant decision markers.	Noted
372	Resident: Mrs L. Sadler	13			Y		Y												Noted
373	Resident: Mr Tom Pollard	13			Y		Y												Noted
374	Resident: Mr N.D. Harding	13																Represent the interests of local residents and voters who object to the application	Noted
375	Resident: MR M.L. Aldred	13			Y		Y					Y							Noted
376	Resident: Mrs Jacqui Mann	13			Y		Y					Y							Noted
377	Creeting St Peter Parish Council	13			Y		Y					Y						Also concerned about groundwater/flooding and footpaths	Noted
378	Resident: Miss F.R. Bates	13			Y		Y					Y						Also concerned about the Gipping Valley footpath.	Noted
379	Resident: Mr P.A. Yates	13			Y		Y											Also concerned about footpaths and water level	Noted
380	The Needham Market Town Council	13																concerned about traffic and flooding	Noted
383	Resident: Mrs Ruth Shelley	13			Y		Y					Y	Y					effect on water table	Noted
384	Resident: Mr A.E.J. Upchurch	13			Y		Y			Y		Y							Noted
386	Resident: Mr R. Hookham	13																His serious worry is the flooding situation and Poundfield Product's application	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
387	Resident: Mr M.J. Grimwood	13											Y					Flooding and footpath concerns	Noted
388	Resident: Mr S.A. Grimwood	13											Y					Flooding and footpath concerns	Noted
389	Resident: Mr Peter Minter	13					Y					Y	Y					footpath concerns	Noted
390	Resident: Mr P.R. Lackwood	13											Y						Noted
391	Resident: Mr N. Bentley	13						Y					Y						Noted
392	Resident: Mr D.J. Timmins	13			Y		Y					Y							Noted
393	Resident: Mrs B.E. Hookham	13																will cause a great deal of problems in the area	Noted
394	Resident: Mrs Rita Bahar	13					Y						Y						Noted
395	Resident: Mrs S.A. Mann	13			Y		Y		Y			Y						Water table	Agreed
396	Resident: Mr A.C.R. Fayers	13																Remains previously held objections	Noted
397	Resident: Mr J.M. Fayers	13																Remains previously held objections	Noted
398	Resident: Mr M.A. Fayers	13																Remains previously held objections	Noted

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response	
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties
399	Resident: Mr R.A. Fayers	13															Remains previously held objections	Noted
400	Resident: Mr M.J. Fayers	13															Remains previously held objections	Noted
401	Resident: Mrs S.R. Fayers	13															Remains previously held objections	Noted
402	Resident: Mr P.B. Scales	13			Y		Y				Y	Y					Floodrisk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
404	Creeting St Mary Parish Council	13															General objection	Noted
406	Resident: Mrs Lesley Stephenson	13			Y		Y							Y			Floodrisk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
407	Resident: Mrs B. Baillis	13															Respondents are in objection with the proposed site.	Noted
408	Resident: Mr J.P.Z Scales	13															Floodrisk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
418	Environment Agency	13									Y						Floodrisk and ground water	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
419	The Creeting Action Group	13									Y						Will effect quality of life	Noted
421	Resident: Mr Stuart Cox	13															Objects generally to application	Noted
422	Resident: Mr G.B. Stannard	13		Y										Y				Noted
425	Resident: Mrs V. Scott	13			Y		Y							Y			Floodrisk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
426	Resident: Mr Russell Stott	13															objects generally to site	Noted
429	Resident: Miss Karen Makepeace	13					Y				Y						Gipping River walk	Noted
438	Resident: Mr Robert Jardine	13										Y					The site is within a special landscape area, a Groundwater Protection Zone and a floodplain	Noted
456	Resident: Mr Ian Richard	13									Y		Y				Floodrisk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
457	Resident: Valerie Stuart	13					Y							Y			Floodrisk	Greater area/volume for flood waters would be created
474	GeoSuffolk	13	Y															Noted
489	Resident: Mrs P.J. Day	13															Site too close to home	Noted

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response	
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties
496	Natural England	13	Y														the proposed site would not be likely to cause damage to the designated interest features of the SSSI.	Noted
546	Environment Agency	13									Y						impacts on downstream habitats and negative impacts on water quality.	Noted
575	Creeting's Action Group	13									Y		Y				impact on local nature reserve	Noted
Total		88																

(2 POS)

162	Resident: Mr Adrian Edgar	14									Y		Y				The effect on a country estate of notable heritage value	Agreed
177	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	14															There should be an ecological risk assessment	Environmental Assessment would be required to be submitted with any planning application.
281	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	14		Y				Y		Y	Y						Water quality and the adjoining historic park	Noted
286	Resident: Mrs Helen Levack	14								Y	Y	Y					Quality of life, impact on character of the Culford and West Stow Conservation area, impact on Special Landscape area and Historic park and garden at Culford School	Noted
310	Resident: Mrs Christine Crees	14			Y					Y	Y	Y						Noted
311	Resident: Mr Roderick Crees	14			Y					Y	Y	Y						Noted
312	Resident: Mr J.F. Thomas	14								Y	Y			Y				Noted
313	Resident: Mr and Mrs R.I. Thomas	14								Y	Y				Y			Noted
314	Resident: Mr J.D. Harris	14			Y		Y			Y		Y					effect on water table	Noted
315	Resident: Mr F.C. Smith	14											Y				safety of children on horse back when using roads,safety of old people at old people's home	Noted
336	English Heritage	14															will cause considerable damage to the historic environment, particularly the historic park and the archaeological evidence	Agreed
424	Culford School	14			Y		Y			Y		Y						Noted
475	GeoSuffolk	14	Y															Noted
497	Natural England	14	Y															Noted
520	Highways Agency	14						Y										Noted
524	Resident: Mrs Sandie Tily	14									Y	Y						Noted

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information		

Total **16**
(2 POS)

337	English Heritage	16																could impact on the setting of the grade II* church on the opposite side of the lake	Setting of Church unlikely to be affected
476	GeoSuffolk	16	Y																Noted
498	Natural England	16	Y																Noted
533	Suffolk County Council; Rights of Way	16	Y															The revisions to site 16 do not have any direct affect upon Rights of Way	Noted
548	Environment Agency	16	Y															We recommend that the proposer carries out the landfill gas investigative work	Noted
569	Flixton, St Cross and St Margaret South Elmham Parish Council	16												Y					Noted

Total **6**
(4 POS)

338	English Heritage	17																Respondent is concerned about impact on historic environment	On completion of working there would be no change to the present landscape.
477	GeoSuffolk	17	Y																Noted
499	Natural England	17	Y																Noted
534	Suffolk County Council: Rights of Way	17																proposal affects the Angles Way (Homersfield BR1), a promoted long distance path	Noted
549	Environment Agency	17	Y															We recommend that the proposer carries out the landfill gas investigative work	Noted
571	Flixton, St Cross and St Margaret South Elmham Parish Council	17			Y								Y						Noted

Total **6**

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No (3 POS)	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information		

178	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	18																The restoration of this site is more appropriate for heathland restoration rather than woodland	Noted
317	Red Lodge Parish Council	18			Y							Y			Y			Also concerned about smell and infestations of rats and scavenging birds	Any backfilling would have to be with inert waste materials
339	English Heritage	18																the site would not impact on any designated historic assets but should be discussed with the County Archaeologist.	Noted
439	Five Villages Preservation Trust	18										Y	Y			Y		It is on a greenfield site and close to housing	Proximity of housing noted
445	Resident: Mr Ian Harris	18			Y								Y			Y		It is on a greenfield site and close to housing	Proximity of housing noted
478	GeoSuffolk	18	Y																Noted
500	Natural England	18																both of these sites are nearby to Red Lodge Heath SSSI but the SSSI is only listed as a constraint for site 18 and Restoration plans for these sites should include the recreation of heathland	Noted

Insert
7
(1 POS)

179	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	19																The restoration of this site is more appropriate for heathland restoration rather than woodland	Disagree, given position alongside existing tree belts
318	Red Lodge Parish Council	19			Y							Y			Y			Also concerned about smell and infestations of rats and scavenging birds	Any backfilling would have to be with inert waste materials
322	National Grid	19																need to take account of location and nature of both the high voltage electricity equipment and gas pipelines when planning development proposals in the vicinity of our transmission networks and contact us at the earliest opportunity for pre application ad	Noted

S. No.	Organisation/Name	Site No	Reasons for Objection													Additional Comments	Response		
			Positive Response	Road Safety	Noise	Air Pollution	Dust	Children's Play Area	Road Condition	Impact on House Prices	Light Pollution	Ecological Impact	Landscape Impact	Access to/from Site	Insufficient Information			Too Close to Residential Properties	
340	English Heritage	19																the site would not impact on any designated historic assets but should be discussed with the County Archaeologist.	Noted
440	Five Villages Preservation Trust	19									Y	Y				Y	It is on a greenfield site and close to housing	This site is some 350 metres from housing	
446	Resident: Mr Ian Harris	19			Y							Y				Y	It is on a greenfield site and close to housing	This site is some 350 metres from housing	
479	GeoSuffolk	19	Y																
501	Natural England	19															both of these sites are nearby to Red Lodge Heath SSSI but the SSSI is only listed as a constraint for site 18 and Restoration plans for these sites should include the recreation of heathland	Disagree, given position alongside existing tree belts	
Total		8																	
		(1 POS)																	

180	Suffolk Wildlife Trust	20															may be an impact upon Badingham lane County Wildlife Site, The suggested biodiversity gain of wet woodland would not mitigate for losses to Breck heathland/grassland, as it is not appropriate to substitute one priority habitat for another	Noted
319	Red Lodge Parish Council	20			Y						Y		Y				Also concerned about smell and infestations of rats and scavenging birds	Any backfilling would have to be with inert waste materials
341	English Heritage	20															the site would not impact on any designated historic assets but should be discussed with the County Archaeologist.	Noted
441	Five Villages Preservation Trust	20									Y	Y				Y	It is on a greenfield site and close to housing	Nearest housing is 600 metres away
447	Resident: Mr Ian Harris	20			Y							Y				Y	It is on a greenfield site and close to housing	Nearest housing is 600 metres away
480	GeoSuffolk	20	Y															

Total

6

(1 POS)

