



## WOODBIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Shire Hall Market Hill Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4LP

Locum Town Clerk: Mr G E Diaper

Tel: 01394 383599

Email: [townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk)



### TO MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Cllr Bale

Cllr Lady Blois

Cllr Holdcroft

Cllr Mapey

Cllr Miller

Cllr O'Nolan

Cllr Sanders

Cllr Sutton

Cllr Walsh

You are hereby summoned to attend the **MEETING** of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** to be held **virtually** on: **TUESDAY 8<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2020 at 6PM**

Greg Diaper

Locum Town Clerk

1<sup>st</sup> September 2020

### **Public Attendance**

*Members of the public and press are welcome to join the Zoom meeting. Members of the public will be invited to give their views/questions the Town Council on issues on the agenda, or raise issues for consideration or inclusion at future meetings. This item will be limited to 30 minutes duration but may be extended at the discretion of the Mayor. The Zoom login details are provided below;*

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89783748586?pwd=QjBhR2d2M0o5T2hINFhucFpJMG16Zz09>

**Meeting ID: 897 8374 8586**

**Passcode: 495867**

### AGENDA

#### 1. APOLOGIES

To receive apologies for absence.

**2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Members and officers are invited to make any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Local Non-Pecuniary Interests that they may have in relation to items on the Agenda and are also reminded to make any declarations at any stage during the meeting if it becomes apparent that this may be required when a particular item or issue is considered.

**3. REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATION**

Councillors with a Pecuniary Interest in an item on this Agenda, who wish to remain, speak, and/or vote during consideration of that item, may apply for a dispensation in writing to the Town Clerk prior to the meeting. Applications may also be considered at the meeting itself should the nature of the interest become apparent to a Councillor at the time of the meeting.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

For the public to ask questions of the Council or raise issues for consideration at a future meeting of the Council. 15 minutes maximum.

**5. CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

To confirm the minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> August 2020 – Copies in the Members' area and the public area of the website.

**6. TO COMMENT ON APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

As set out on the attached schedule.

**7. TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLANNING SYSTEM – ATTACHED**

To comment on the proposed changes to the Planning System –

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf)

**8. TO AGREE THE STATEMENTS TO BE INCLUDED AS PART OF THE REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR SIZEWELL C INSPECTION**

**9. CLOSURE**

---

## WOODBIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of an on-line meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held on TUESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2020 at 6pm

### Councillors:

Present: S Bale, Lady C Blois, G Holdcroft, S Miller, R Sanders, M Sutton

Apologies: E O’Nolan and C Walsh

Absent without  
Apologies: C Mapey

In Attendance: Locum Town Clerk, Locum Deputy Town Clerk and no members of the public

*Action*

### 273. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Miller, O’Nolan and Walsh.

### 274. MEMBERS AND OFFICERS WERE INVITED TO MAKE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY OR LOCAL NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS THAT THEY MAY HAVE IN RELATION TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA AND WERE ALSO REMINDED TO MAKE ANY DECLARATIONS AT ANY STAGE DURING THE MEETING IF IT BECOMES APPARENT THAT THIS MAY BE REQUIRED WHEN A PARTICULAR ITEM OR ISSUE IS CONSIDERED, AND TO DEAL WITH DISPENSATIONS AS REQUESTED BY INDIVIDUAL COUNCILLORS IN LINE WITH S33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

No members declared an interest in matters on the agenda.

### 275. COUNCILLORS WITH A PECUNIARY INTEREST IN AN ITEM ON THIS AGENDA, WHO WISH TO REMAIN, SPEAK AND/OR VOTE DURING CONSIDERATION OF THAT ITEM, MAY APPLY FOR A DISPENSATION BY WRITING TO THE TOWN CLERK PRIOR TO THE MEETING. APPLICATIONS MAY ALSO BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING ITSELF SHOULD THE NATURE OF THE INTEREST BECOME APPARENT TO A COUNCILLOR AT THE TIME OF THE MEETING

There were no requests from Councillors with a Pecuniary Interest in an item on this Agenda for a dispensation.

**276. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no members of the public present.

**277. CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

The Committee agreed and approved the signing of the minutes of the meeting held 28<sup>th</sup> July 2020 as a true record.

**278. TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

Application No and Address	Committee Comments
DC/20/2585/FUL Gault House, 3A Thoroughfare	We recommend REFUSAL. There is material information missing from the application, which both fails to identify, and mediate the impact of the development on the copper beech tree in the neighbouring garden. There is also a loss of amenity value to neighbouring properties by virtue of the proposed position of the new dwelling on the site.
DC/20/2725/FUL The Crown Hotel, 2 Thoroughfare	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/2726/LBC The Crown Hotel, 2 Thoroughfare	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/2787/TCA 28 Naverne Meadow	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/2790/FUL 37 Theatre Street	We recommend REFUSAL. The Council's 2009 Community Infrastructure Study advised that there should be 0.2 sq metres of community centre facilities per resident, and the loss of this community facility would reduce the overall capacity in Woodbridge to below this ideal. There is no evidence to indicate that the site has been "realistically" marketed for a continuous period of six months, and no study which demonstrates an over-capacity of community centre space in Woodbridge.
DC/20/2775/TCA 2 St Annes School House, Crown Place	We recommend APPROVAL

jointed track. No means of avoidance or mitigation for such impact is investigated/proposed. The Council consider night-time trains could be avoided by incorporating a length of dual track in the Campsea Ashe area, effectively doubling line capacity during the day. Further extension of continuous rail from Bealings to Saxmundham would reduce noise impact and maintenance of many life expired timber sleepers.

WTC also wish to register concerns on other aspects that will impact residents, and the regional setting

- a) EDF's coastal process assessment, HCDF design, FRA findings, the suitability and practicality of an 'adaptable' coastal defence approach at Sizewell C on site safety and regional coastal erosion
- b) ii. the impact of the traffic movements to/from the Seven Hills lorry park on the A12 and the A12/A14 interchange

WTC will seek to assist Examiners if they request further particulars on these matters.

**Members are recommended to agree this statement as part of the registration process**

**279. TO COMMENT ON THE NON-MATERIAL CHANGES TO THE EAST ANGLIA HUB OFF-SHORE WIND TURBINES PROJECT – ATTACHED**

The Committee had no comments to make on the non-material changes to the East Anglia Hub off-shore wind turbines project.

**280. TO AGREE THE COMMENTS TO BE ASKED AT THE SIZEWELL C PRE-EXAMINATION Q & A EVENT**

The Committee asked Councillor Sanders to ask how the following concerns could be avoided, mitigated or compensated: -

- a) rat runs to Sizewell via Woods Lane/Woodbridge to Rendlesham, Tunstall, Snape possibly linked with avoiding use of park & rides.
- b) possible use of Rendlesham business park for off site support offices, stores etc. This could impact as HGV usage of Woods Lane/Woodbridge may be considerably increased,
- c) lack of consideration of the impact of HGV on traffic between Seven Hills (A14) and Woods Lane leading to rat runs into/out of Woodbridge
- d) impact on tourism and use of Woodbridge as a shopping centre
- e) noise of up to 6 Sizewell C linked overnight trains through the town

The Committee also asked Councillor Sanders to explore further support by Planning Aid, and how the joint concerns of (say) Martlesham, Melton and Woodbridge regarding road traffic, and Saxmundham and Woodbridge regarding increased rail traffic and noise, could be replicated in each of the pre-registration statements.

**281. CLOSURE**

The meeting was closed at 6.40pm.

Councillor Miller  
Chair

## ITEM 6

### TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

#### Links to East Suffolk Council planning portal:

##### **DC/20/3140/TCA - Garden House 3A Pytches Road**

T1 - Norway Maple

Pollard to 3m

- Significant die back, lots of dead and cavities. Previously reduced, very poor root, but forms a screen from the road

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QF7L9EQXLMX00&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/3242/FUL - 6 Ransom Road**

Single storey side and rear extension to dwelling

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QFK7CNQX06O00&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/3250/FUL - 60 Old Barrack Road**

Proposed alterations and extensions

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QFLXX4QXLT200&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/3304/FUL - 37 Grundisburgh Road**

Proposed Domestic Vehicle access

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QFPVLLQXLVC00&prevPage=inTray>

## ITEM 7

### TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLANNING SYSTEM

This consultation seeks any views on each part of a package of proposals for reform of the planning system in England to streamline and modernise the planning process, improve outcomes on design and sustainability, reform developer contributions and ensure more land is available for development where it is needed.

A summary of the consultation questions and the potential impact on Woodbridge is shown below:-

Question No.	Details of Proposal	Potential for Impact on Woodbridge	Question
1.			What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?
2(a)			Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]
2(b)			If no, why not? [Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]
3			Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]
4			What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]
5	<b>Proposal 1:</b> The role of land use plans should be simplified. The Government proposes that Local Plans should identify three types of land –	As a Council we have already expressed concern at the loss of protection previously granted to large swaths of the town by former local plan policy 11.9, and none of the categories	Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	<p>Growth areas suitable for substantial development, Renewal areas suitable for development, and areas that are Protected. All areas of land would be put into one of these three categories</p>	<p>of land in the proposed definition of “Protected” would apply to these areas. Growth areas have already been identified in the Local Plan (Martlesham) but what would be the growth areas in ten years time and are we likely to see challenges to East Suffolk’s definition of a “growth area” from housebuilders/developers ?</p>	
6	<p><b>Proposal 2: Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans.</b></p>	<p>Local Plans would become streamlined – more of a schedule of areas defined as one of the three categories. The detailed guidance on what could be built, the design, layout, accompanying services etc would be contained in “Design Guides” to be produced concurrently with the Local Plan (within 18 months). These can be for a site or for a greater area (e.g. the whole of East Suffolk). There are a number of concerns:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Capacity of East Suffolk to produce a large number of Design Guides concurrently which could lead to an area-wide approach;</li> <li>b) The history of “Sponsorship” of these Design Guides by interested parties;</li> </ul>	<p>Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		<p>c) The inability of Design Guides to be either innovative or restrictive</p> <p>d) The influence of national housebuilders on design</p>	
7	<p><b>Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, replacing the existing tests of soundness.</b></p>	<p>The proposal starts off by saying “<i>This would consider whether the plan contributes to achieving sustainable development in accordance with policy issued by the Secretary of State. The achievement of sustainable development is an existing and well-understood basis for the planning system, and we propose that it should be retained.</i>” And then goes on to say that it should be simplified to reduce any delays to the Local Plan being adopted.</p> <p>The impact of new or re development on the environment is both an important and a longlasting consideration and the process cannot be rushed. There is existing evidence of the impact of air pollution on health, as well as poor design on peoples’ well-being.</p>	<p>7(a). Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p> <p>7(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?</p>
8	<p><b>Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply</b></p>	<p>Affordability is not in itself an indicator of the need for additional homes – the Suffolk Coast is not alone in having a shortage of properties as a consequence of second-homers and holiday lets creating a shortage of</p>	<p>8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	<p><b>being a barrier to enough homes being built.</b></p>	<p>properties and a false market price. Tripling the number of properties in Southwold will have minimal impact on house prices there. Indeed in other parts of the County house prices are affected not by shortage of land but by higher prices at “more desirable” locations, leading to high levels of commuting by those who chose to live at X (and pay over the odds for doing so) because they can’t afford to live at their preferred location. This is where the removal of the Duty to Co-operate (between authorities) should be resisted, and indeed strengthened so that the need to build a greater number of properties at (existing) large conurbations (or centres of employment) is assisted by the process. The wording around this proposal talks of building 1million homes by the end of this Parliament – the number of dwellings with planning approval which developers are refusing to construct, preferring to land-bank approvals and maintain artificially high prices.</p>	<p>8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>
	<p><b>Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while</b></p>	<p>This is an existing, if under-used, piece of planning legislation available on sites where a particular need can be demonstrated (e.g. a development of bungalows where there is a demand but a shortage locally).</p>	<p>9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 9(b). Do</p>

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	<b>automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building</b>		you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology	This is reliant upon a national digitised series of planning overlays being available, accurate, integrated and accessible by the time the proposed changes come into force. It will involve bringing together, from a number of sources, mapping information which may be subject to challenge. As anyone who has tried to “prove” the route of a footpath using the 1974 definitive map will testify, the original data will be subject to dispute, and digitising analogue plans will add to those disputes.	Question 10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.	This is intended, via apps usable on smartphones, to increase the number of residents engaging in the planning process. It doesn't indicate how the increased public participation can be accommodated within the proposed 18-month local plan preparation time.	11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 8: Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to	With local authorities being threatened with refunding applicants whose applications are not considered within	12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No /

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	<p>meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.</p>	<p>the prescribed timescales, and proposed further sanctions against the Planning Inspectorate, there is a feeling that nothing, and nobody, should stand in the way of development. Can the public really have their voice heard within a 30-month statutory process for a local plan ?</p>	<p>Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>
	<p>Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools</p>	<p>Whilst proposing that Neighbourhood Plans should continue, and indeed even suggesting that they could be done at a “street” level, it is unclear as to how they would integrate with a new local plan, especially within a growth area. Would a growth area have lots of islands in it in which development was not to occur because of a Neighbourhood Plan ?</p>	<p>13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 13(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?</p>
	<p>Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning</p>	<p><i>“To address this, we propose to make it clear in the revised National Planning Policy Framework that the masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development (discussed under Pillar Two) should seek to include a variety of development types by different builders which allow more phases to come forward together. We will explore further options to support faster build out as we develop our proposals for the new planning system.”</i> It is hard to imagine that builders would want to “swamp” a slow housing</p>	<p>14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		market by building several phases together. If speed of delivery post-planning is the issue perhaps some form of taxation on land with extant but unbuilt planning approval might speed the process up – a bit like the punitive Council Tax on empty properties.	
	Planning for beautiful and sustainable places		15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/ or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify] 16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]
	Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predictable, we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development.	There will be a National Design Guide, National Model Design Code and the revised Manual for Streets. Local authorities are expected to produce their own Design Guides and Codes “with EFFECTIVE input from the local community”. It is unclear how a cash-strapped District Council covering over 12 towns of varying sizes and over 50 villages can effectively produce a Design Code for even part of its District, let alone each segment.	17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		Where there is no local Design Guide, the national ones will apply.	
	Proposal 12: To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making.	<p><i>“We will explore the options for establishing a new expert body which can help authorities make effective use of design guidance and codes, as well as performing a wider monitoring and challenge role for the sector in building better places. Different models exist for how this could be taken forward - such as a new arms-length body reporting to Government, a new centre of expertise within Homes England, or reinforcing the existing network of architecture and design centres.”</i></p> <p><i>“We will also bring forward proposals later this year for improving the resourcing of planning departments more broadly;”</i></p> <p>The proposals to better resource planning departments are welcomed, but it is difficult to understand the need for a new body to help authorities “make effective use” of design guidance, unless it is to impose central standards.</p>	18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England’s strategic objectives can give greater	And here is the nub of the argument. Should local Councils be let loose to agree their own design codes or should we have a national code. Are places to be better (define ?) or beautiful – why not both ?	19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	<p>emphasis to delivering beautiful places.</p>	<p>Design codes in Suffolk Coastal will need to allow for rainwater harvesting – perhaps not an issue in Manchester. Suffolk vernacular designs and colours would jar in Chester. Where does local community involvement come when “national leadership” is to be further embedded ?</p>	
	<p>Proposal 14: We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences</p>	<p><i>“We propose to do this in three ways. In the first instance, through updating the National Planning Policy Framework, we will make clear that schemes which comply with local design guides and codes have a positive advantage and greater certainty about their prospects of swift approval. Second, where plans identify areas for significant development (Growth areas), we will legislate to require that a masterplan and site-specific code are agreed as a condition of the permission in principle which is granted through the plan. This should be in place prior to detailed proposals coming forward, to direct and expedite those detailed matters. These masterplans and codes could be prepared by the local planning authority alongside or subsequent to preparing its plan, at a level of detail commensurate with the size of site and key principles to be established. For example, a set of simple ‘co-ordinating</i></p>	<p>20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		<p><i>codes' of the sort endorsed by the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission could set some initial key parameters for the site layout. Where sites are expected to come forward in the near future, more developed masterplans or codes, prepared by the local planning authority or site promoter, will provide greater certainty in areas suitable for development (Renewal areas), by allowing the pre-approval of popular and replicable designs through permitted development. The benefits are much more than fast delivery of proven popular designs – it will foster innovation and support industrialisation of housebuilding, enabling modern methods of construction to be developed and deployed at scale.”</i></p> <p>Note the reference to masterplans or codes possibly being prepared by the site promoter – we have seen how their token consultation brings about no changes to their plans.</p> <p>Note also the pr-approval of “popular and replicable” designs – so more of the same rather than the individuality which brings attractiveness to a location. Would Lavenham be such a tourist draw if every timbered house leant the same way – or had the same roof height ?</p>	
--	--	---	--

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	Proposal 15: We intend to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits.		
	Proposal 16: We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England.		
	Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century.		
	Proposal 18: To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.	This is to be welcomed, but should not be merely facilitated but imposed upon house builders, large and small.	
	Pillar Three – Planning for infrastructure and connected places	<p><i>“We want to bring forward reforms to make sure that developer contributions are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• responsive to local needs, to ensure a fairer contribution from developers for local communities so that the right</i></li> </ul>	21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		<p><i>infrastructure and affordable housing is delivered;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• transparent, so it is clear to existing and new residents what new infrastructure will accompany development;</i></li> <li><i>• consistent and simplified, to remove unnecessary delay and support competition in the housebuilding industry;</i></li> <li><i>• buoyant, so that when prices go up the benefits are shared fairly between developers and the local community, and when prices go down there is no need to re-negotiate agreements.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The Government could also seek to use developer contributions to capture a greater proportion of the land value uplift that occurs through the grant of planning permission, and use this to enhance infrastructure delivery. There are a range of estimates for the amount of land value uplift currently captured, from 25 to 50 per cent.<sup>19</sup> The value captured will depend on a range of factors including the development value, the existing use value of the land, and the relevant tax structure – for instance, whether capital gains tax applies to the land sale. Increasing value capture could be an important source of infrastructure funding but would need to be balanced against risks to development viability.”</i></p>	<p><i>and/or employment space / Green space / Don't know / Other – please specify]</i></p>
--	--	---	--

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		<p>On the face of it this could address some of the criticisms of the existing system – that additional houses do not (immediately) bring about the additional services needed to support them. However it would still fail to address the need for many of those services to be in place before construction starts, and collection via capital gains tax would result in claims of unfair redistribution across authorities.</p>	
	<p>Proposal 19: The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished.</p>	<p><i>We propose that the existing parallel regimes for securing developer contributions are replaced with a new, consolidated ‘Infrastructure Levy’.</i> Not all authorities have adopted the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy. It should be remembered that, pre-2008, this was intended to provide infrastructure improvements – post 2008 this was watered down to “pump prime”. For those authorities which have adopted the CIL, there is no requirement that it must (apart from the Parish proportion) be spent in the locality affected by development, or even report on its spending by Parish. Where is the CIL accumulated in Woodbridge being spent ? As a town we have accumulated c£59k – meaning ESC have accumulated just under £400k. Is there evidence of</p>	<p>22(a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 22(b). Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally] 22(c). Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 22(d). Should we allow local authorities</p>

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

		£400k of investment in Woodbridge over the last three years ?	to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 20: The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights	With the proposal elsewhere to increase permitted development rights this makes sense.	23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 21: The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision	If there is to be total reliance on the CIL (and the use of S106 discontinued) then not only must it deliver the equivalent affordable housing as S106, it must be seen to do so, perhaps by some form of earmarking.	24(a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 24(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 24(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 24(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
	Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to local authorities over		25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	<p>how they spend the Infrastructure Levy</p>		<p>Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] 25(a). If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>
	<p>Proposal 23: As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements: The cost of operating the new planning system should be principally funded by the beneficiaries of planning gain – landowners and developers – rather than the national or local taxpayer. Currently, the cost of development management activities by local planning authorities is to a large extent covered by planning fees, although the current fee structure means the cost of processing some applications can be significantly greater than their individual fee. However, the cost of preparing Local Plans and enforcement activities is now largely funded</p>		

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

	from the local planning authority's own resources.		
	Proposal 24: We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions	Long overdue but will Councils be brave enough to take action ?	
			26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

Members are recommended to formulate any comments to be drafted by the Locum Deputy Town Clerk for presentation to the next meeting of the Committee

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

## ITEM 8

### TO AGREE THE STATEMENT TO BE INCLUDED AS PART OF THE REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR THE SIZEWELL C INSPECTION

Councillor Sanders has prepared the following 500 word limit statement:-

Woodbridge Town Council (WTC) presents the following representation.

The DCO application does not consider the impact of contractor/subcontractor, consultants or EDF off site facilities on road usage, local employers and accommodation in the greater Suffolk area. There will be potential for such facilities to be developed at Rendlesham Business Park at the end of the A1152 where office and lay down areas are plentiful and temporary accommodation is feasible. It is on a direct non A12 route to Sizewell C.

The study of road-based transportation does not address the impact on Woodbridge and its environs or propose any avoidance or mitigation as it fails to

- a) consider the use that site staff, visitors and delivery drivers can make of non A12 routes to Sizewell or any off-site facilities. Traffic enabled GPS often directs this route
- b) the route likely to be directed is via the A1152 and B1069. This has pinch points at the junction with the B1438 and at Melton railway level crossing. There are no options to improve traffic flow. Significant additional traffic flow will cause queues to extend over the level crossing.
- c) the impact of additional traffic on extending periods of current queuing on the A12 south of the B1079/A12 roundabout to the B1438/A12 roundabout
- d) the use of B1438 through Woodbridge to the A1152 or onto the A12 southern park and ride and lorry park holding facility via Ufford and Wickham Market, known rat runs.
- e) The impact of diversion due to accidents between the A1152/A12 junction and the southern park and ride and lorry park holding facility.

Use of Rendlesham Business Park will attract employees from Woodbridge to Rendlesham increasing traffic issues. Further it will attract new employees to live in Woodbridge exacerbating current limits on low cost and tourist accommodation. This will impact on local employers, employees, tourist related employment, a key employment sector.

The DCO study of rail transportation assumes night-time delivery trains as train paths are currently restricted to one track from Woodbridge to Saxmundham. The railway passes through urban residential areas at Woodbridge, Melton, Campsea Ashe and Saxmundham with pedestrian crossing requiring use of klazons and noisy passage over

jointed track. No means of avoidance or mitigation for such impact is investigated/proposed. The Council consider night-time trains could be avoided by incorporating a length of dual track in the Campsea Ashe area, effectively doubling line capacity during the day. Further extension of continuous rail from Bealings to Saxmundham would reduce noise impact and maintenance of many life expired timber sleepers.

WTC also wish to register concerns on other aspects that will impact residents, and the regional setting

- a) EDF's coastal process assessment, HCDF design, FRA findings, the suitability and practicality of an 'adaptable' coastal defence approach at Sizewell C on site safety and regional coastal erosion
- b) ii. the impact of the traffic movements to/from the Seven Hills lorry park on the A12 and the A12/A14 interchange

WTC will seek to assist Examiners if they request further particulars on these matters.

**Members are recommended to agree this statement as part of the registration process**