



Woodbridge Town Council

Shire Hall Market Hill Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4LP

Town Clerk: Mr G E Diaper

Tel: 01394 383599

Email: townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk



To Members of the Planning Committee

Cllr Adelson

Cllr Bale

Cllr Blois

Cllr Gillard

Cllr Holdcroft

Cllr Miller

Cllr Rawlings

Cllr Sanders

Cllr Sutton

Cllr Walsh

You are hereby summoned to attend a **meeting** of the **Planning Committee** to be held at the **John Gibbins Gallery, The Longshed, Tide Mill Way** on **Tuesday 24th May 2022** at **7pm**

Greg Diaper

Town Clerk

19th May 2022

Public Attendance

Members of the public and press are welcome to join this 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 fifteen minutes duration but may be extended at the discretion of the Mayor.

Agenda

1. To appoint a Chair of Committee for the 2022/2023 Civic Year.
2. To appoint a Vice-Chair of Committee for the 2022/2023 Civic Year.
3. Apologies.
To receive apologies for absence.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. Confirmation of Planning Committee Minutes.

To confirm the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 10th May 2022.

7. 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.

8. To note this Committee's Terms of Reference.

9. To note intentions to undertake works to trees in the conservation area.

10. To comment on applications to trees with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

11. To comment on applications for planning permission.

12. To note East Suffolk Council decisions on Planning Applications where those decision are contrary to this Council's recommendations and not previously reported.

13. To note the response from the Sizewell C Working Party to the Secretary of State (To follow).

14. To note communication from East Suffolk Council regarding the Adoption of Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

15. Closure.

Woodbridge Town Council

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at the **John Gibbins Gallery** on **Tuesday 10th May 2022** at 5pm

Councillors:

Present: D Adelson, S Bale, G Holdcroft, S Miller, C Page, R Sanders, M Sutton, and C Walsh.

Apologies: Lady C Blois

Absent
without apologies: C Mapey

In Attendance: Town Clerk and three members of the public

991. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Blois

992. To receive Declarations of Interest

No members made any Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Local Non-Pecuniary Interests in relation to items on the agenda.

993. To consider requests for Dispensations

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

994. To agree and approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 26th April 2022

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held 26th April 2022 were approved.

995. Public Question Time

The owners of 23 Hasketon Road addressed the Committee regarding application DC/22/1255/FUL.

The resident of the neighbouring property to that considered in application DC/22/1303 /FUL addressed the committee regarding their objection to the proposed development.

996. To note intentions to undertake works to trees in the Conservation Area

Councillors noted the intentions to undertake works to trees in the Conservation Area:

- DC/22/1721/TCA - 84 Victoria Road

997. To comment on applications to trees with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)

Councillors noted the applications to trees with a TPO:

Application No and Address	Committee Comments
DC/22/1467/TPO - 26 Ipswich Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4BU	We recommend APPROVAL however ask that the East Suffolk Council tree officer examine the dead wood in the Oak tree for the presence of stag beetles before approving this work.

998. To comment on applications for planning permission

The Council agreed their comments as set out below:-

Application No and Address	Committee Comments
DC/22/1255/FUL - 23 Hasketon Road	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/22/1303/FUL - 5 Gladstone Road	We recommend REFUSAL as this application contravenes Policy SCLP11.2: Residential Amenity c) Access to daylight and sunlight; e)The resulting physical relationship with other properties;
DC/21/4002/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	The Committee agreed to make No Comment on this application
DC/22/1475/FUL - 1 Quay Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1BX	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/22/1564/FUL - The Old Convent St Johns Terrace Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1HP	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/22/1589/FUL - 1 Woolnough Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1HJ	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/22/0836/FUL - 7 Andersons Way	We recommend APPROVAL

999. To note East Suffolk Council's decisions on planning applications where those decisions are contrary to this council's recommendations and not previously reported

The Committee noted East Suffolk Council's decisions on planning applications where those decisions are contrary to this Council's recommendations and not previously reported.

1000. Sizewell C – Response to Applicant's and Others Further Submissions

It was agreed that Councillor Sanders be appointed the Committee's representative to attend a Zoom meeting on May 13th.

It was noted that an extraordinary meeting of the Planning Committee may be required in order to agree the Committee's response regarding the additional information requested by the Secretary of State.

1001. To consider a nomination for the Quality of Place Awards 2022

The Committee agreed not to submit a nomination for the 2022 Quality of Place awards.

1002. To receive a verbal report following a meeting with Rose Builders.

The Chair, Deputy Chair and Town Mayor have a verbal update of their recent meeting with Rose Builders.

1003. Closure

The meeting was closed at 6.13pm.

Councillor Sanders
Chair

Item 8

To note this Committee's Terms of Reference

Full Council approved the Terms of Reference for its Committees at the Annual General Meeting held on May 17th. **Members are asked to note the Terms of Reference for the Planning Committee.**

7. Planning Committee

The Committee shall:

- a. incur expenditure on planning advice and legal fees or other planning-related costs which is within the agreed budget for the current year.***
- b. receive from the Clerk a summary of every Planning Application submitted, the name of the Applicant, the address of the project described in the Application and any information relating to the Listed Building or Conservation Area status of the proposals,
- c. assess each Application with reference to:
 - i. existing legislation including the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) together with General Development and Classes Orders, Local and County Structure Plans,
 - ii. declared Conservation Areas.
 - iii. harmonisation with the surrounding area,
 - iv. the views of neighbours and other members of the public where these relate to material planning considerations.
 - v. any known history of the buildings or land in question.
- d. assess each Application without reference to:
 - i. (in a personal application) the status, reputation, or personal detail relating to the Applicant,
 - ii. aspects automatically determined by regulations and legal requirements,
 - iii. any information concerning the likely implementation of the subject matter of the Application.
- e. pass motions recommending 'approval', 'no objection', or 'refusal', qualified by any additional comments of the Committee's choosing, allowing however that the Committee shall refer major proposals to the Council for decision,
- f. empower the Clerk to make a response to a planning application following a discussion with the majority of members of the Committee in the event that the consultation time does not allow for a meeting to take place if the application is judged by the Clerk after discussion with the Chairman of the

Committee to be,

- i. trivial or of minor importance,
- ii. determinable solely by regulations or by legal requirements,
- g. defer any Applications not considered in detail by the Committee to a subsequent meeting.
- h. respond to invitations to comment on the details of any planning projects received, even if located outside Woodbridge, and refer them to the Council if of major importance.
- i. monitor all strategic highway and road safety matters within or in the neighbourhood of Woodbridge and press for such correction or improvement action as is deemed desirable.

***Members are reminded that no budget was allocated to the Planning Committee for the current financial year. Any requirement to spend will need to be recommended to Full Council for approval (unless under £1000 within an approved budget, Fin. Reg 4.1).

Item 9

To note intentions to undertake works to trees in the conservation area (TCA)

Neither the District Council nor the Town Council can object to these works unless the tree(s) is/are covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

DC/22/1908/TCA - The Abbey School Church	Expiry Date: Wed 08 Jun 2022
Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1DS	Determination Deadline: Sun 19 Jun 2022
1no. Lime (T001 on plan) - Pollard regrowth on field side stem, 1no. Lime (T002 on plan) - Remove 2 dead stems, 1no. Elm (T003 on plan) - Fell, 1no. Elm (T004 on plan) - Fell 2 larger dead stems, 1no. Oak (T005 on plan) - Remove 1 dead limb section, 1no. Group of mixed species (G001 on plan) - Lateral reduction on field side to fence line and reduce in height to 2.4 metres above ground.	

DC/22/1907/TCA - Woodbridge School Burkitt	Expiry Date: Fri 10 Jun 2022
Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4JH	Determination Deadline: Sun 19 Jun 2022
2no. Elm (T001 on plan) - Fell, 1no. Holm oak (T003 on plan) - Fell, 1no. Ash (T004 on plan) - Fell two dead stems, 1no. Ash (T005 on plan) - Fell, 1no. Pine (T014 on plan) - Fell, 1no. Sycamore (T017 on plan) - Fell, 15no. Lime (G001 on plan) Limes 15 - Repollard, 1no. Group of mixed species (G004 on plan) - Prune to clear buildings by 2 metres, 4no. Elm (G005 on plan) - Fell 4 small dead trees Fell to stump	

Item 10

To comment on applications to trees with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)

DC/22/1860/TPO - Sandywood Broomheath Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4DL	Expiry Date: Thu 09 Jun 2022
	Determination Deadline: Wed 29 Jun 2022
TPO 100/1971: 2no. Pine and 2no. Oak (T1, T2, T3 and T4 on plan) - Fell, 1no. Oak (T5 on plan) - Crown reduction by 30%	

Item 11

To comment on applications for planning permission

DC/22/1385/FUL - 21 Mill View Close Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4HR	Expiry Date: Tue 31 May 2022
	Determination Deadline: Mon 27 Jun 2022
Removal of 10ft hedge and erection of 6ft fence to side of property, and Removal of 10ft hedge and erection of 6ft fence on top of retaining garden wall to rear of property.	

DC/22/1716/FUL - 2 Ipswich Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4BU	Expiry Date: Mon 06 Jun 2022
	Determination Deadline: Tue 28 Jun 2022
Extensions and alterations to existing dwelling. Inclusive to adaptations to external and driveway.	

DC/22/1738/FUL - 33 Hilly Fields Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4DX	Expiry Date: Mon 06 Jun 2022
	Determination Deadline: Wed 29 Jun 2022
Reconstruction of existing utility room (fronting highway) including new pitched roof over	

DC/22/1717/FUL - Fenn Cottage Fen Walk Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4BH	Expiry Date: Mon 06 Jun 2022
	Determination Deadline: Tue 21 Jun 2022
Replacement of existing single garage with new outbuilding containing garage/workshop with multi-purpose/annexe space above.	

DC/22/1564/FUL - The Old Convent St Johns Terrace Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1HP	Expiry Date: Thu 09 Jun 2022
	Determination Deadline: Mon 13 Jun 2022
Part single-storey, part two/three storey rear/side extension, alterations to house, demolition of existing extension and outbuildings, removal of 2no. trees and construction of a new swimming pool.	

DC/22/1209/LBC - 2 Carmelite Place, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP12 1DR	Expiry Date: Mon 20 Jun 2022
	Determination Deadline: Tue 05 Jul 2022
Installation of 2 No. replacement windows at ground floor on rear (west facing) elevation	

Item 12

To note East Suffolk Council decisions on Planning Applications where those decision are contrary to this Council's recommendations and not previously reported

This schedule only lists those applications not previously reported to Committee.

Date	Application	WTC Decision	ESC Decision	ESC Officer (Delegated) or Committee Decision
05.10.21	DC/21/4002/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
05.10.21	DC/21/4003/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
05.10.21	DC/21/4004/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
05.10.21	DC/21/4005/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
19.10.21	DC/21/4557/FUL - Little Kyson Broomheath	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
30.11.21	DC/21/4557/FUL - Little Kyson Broomheath	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
18.01.22	DC/21/5698/FUL - 60 Old Barrack Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4ER	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
01.02.22	DC/22/0045/FUL - 16A Market Hill	Approval	Awaiting decision	
01.02.22	DC/22/0046/LBC - 16A Market Hill	Approval	Awaiting decision	
01.03.22	DC/21/4004/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	No comment	Awaiting decision	
01.03.22	DC/21/4005/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	No comment	Awaiting decision	
15.03.22	DC/22/0569/FUL - 8 Russell Close Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4LE	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
29.03.22	DC/22/0836/FUL - 7 Andersons Way Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4EB	Approval	Awaiting decision	
29.03.22	DC/22/0833/FUL - 11 Barton Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1JQ	Approval	Awaiting decision	
12.04.22	DC/22/1106/VOC - Part Rear Garden Of 29 Warren Hill	Approval	Awaiting decision	
12.04.22	DC/21/5748/FUL - Shop At 10-12 Market Hill Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4LU	Refusal	Awaiting decision	
12.04.22	DC/21/4005/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	No comment	Awaiting decision	
12.04.22	DC/21/4004/ARM - Land To The South And East Of Adastral Park	No comment	Awaiting decision	
26.04.22	DC/22/1303/FUL - 5 Gladstone Road	No comment	Awaiting decision	
26.04.22	C/22/1286/FUL - 31 Warren Hill Road	Approval	Awaiting decision	

Item 13

To note the response from the Sizewell C Working Party to the Secretary of State.

At its last meeting The Committee nominated Cllr. Sanders to attend a Zoom meeting on May 13th. Further to this meeting a response was required to be sent to the Secretary of State/ Planning Inspectorate by midnight on Monday 23rd May, and the Sizewell C Working Party (Adelson, Bale, Sanders) produced the overleaf response:

As per the minutes of the last meeting the intention had been to call an Emergency Meeting to agree the Committee's response, however due to Officer holiday it was not possible to hold an EGM on Monday 23rd.

In order to ensure that Woodbridge Town Council provided a response in line with the deadline the Working Party agreed a detailed response based on their cumulative knowledge of the Sizewell C project, and duly submitted it to the Sizewell C Planning Inspectorate. **Members are therefore asked to note the response from the Sizewell C Working Party to the Secretary of State.**

Sizewell C – Direct Consent Order ('DCO')

Interested Party –Woodbridge Town Council ('WTC')

Response to the request by the Secretary of State ('SoS') for comments on submissions by Parties to SoS questions of 18 March and 31 March 2022

Introduction

1. WTC's comments address the responses by the Applicant Sizewell C Co ('SzC Co') in its report (PINS reference EN010012 – 010817), to the questions posed by the SoS and are in chronological order of SoS requests and under the headings used in the SoS Questions.

Submissions in response to SoS Questions of 18 March

The DCO Applicant, SZC Co, submission

2. Water Supply, Desalination Plant and Drainage

i) Question 3.1/3.2 abbreviated – The Secretary of State notes that at the end of the Examination, the Applicant was unable to demonstrate that they had secured a permanent water supply for the proposed Development. The Applicant should therefore provide information that sets out the progress that has been made in terms of securing a permanent water supply solution

- a) The Applicant has been engaged in the preparation of documentation for consultations, and latterly the DCO, for at least ten years and the crucial matter of water supply, both temporary for construction purposes and permanent for operation of the proposed facility, has been raised throughout by various Interested Parties. SzC Co has failed during this extensive period to make advance arrangements via the local water supplier Northumberland Water Limited ('NWL') to secure an adequate water supply, even for construction, by its proposed start date of 2023. This is demonstrated by the fact that it was only in the latter part of the DCO Examination that the Applicant submitted details of a temporary water supply for construction via a desalination plant.
- b) **The Applicant's response to the SoS questions can be succinctly summarised as no progress as there is no secure water supply solution that has been fully developed, assessed for environmental compliance and impact and approved by the water supplier Northumberland Water Limited('NWL') and Regulators.**
- c) NWL's current Water Resources Management Plan ('WRMP') August 2019 for East Suffolk Water states "Our view is that there is still significant

uncertainty regarding the Sizewell C construction start date and as such it would be wrong to include it in our final plan now.” NWL did state that based on a maximum demand requirement of 2ML/d (2 million litres/day) it assessed its ability to supply and *“The scenario testing shows that there would be a supply deficit and so a new supply would be required”*. NWL further stated the Applicant (referred to therein as EDF) would have to fund the new water supply.

- d) Further, the Applicant is dependent on Northumberland Water Limited(‘NWL’) on securing a supply via Sections 55 and 56 of the Water Industry Act 1991 (‘WIA’) which is only a reasonable endeavours obligation and not a statutory obligation to supply.
- e) NWL’s five yearly Water Resources Management Plan update is due for submission in 2024 and is in its early stages of preparation. We understand no definitive proposals exist as to whether NWL will provide a permanent water supply for Sizewell C. Further the required demand now well exceeds that which the Applicant advised to NWL for its 2019 WRMP.
- f) The Applicant has indicated that it wishes to commence the construction of Sizewell C in 2023. This means construction will start and substantial costs will be incurred with no certainty that there will be a permanent water supply via NWL.
- g) WTC considers it is unreasonable for the Applicant to state in §2.1.15 of its response *“This background should provide more than sufficient comfort both for SZC Co., but also for the Secretary of State, that NWL will be in accordance with the statutory scheme plan to deliver the required infrastructure (so far as is possible) to provide a long-term supply to SZC”*. Further, it is unreasonable to further state in §2.1.19 that *“SZC Co. can reasonably expect that NWL will deliver the required infrastructure as the relevant demand is now included within the current draft WRMP”*. That the demand is included does not, in WTC’s view, confer certainty of supply.
- h) The Applicant concedes that point as in §2.1.20 it states *“If it were to become apparent that there was any risk of NWL being unable to provide the supply, there are a range of actions open to SZC Co (see further below).”*
- i) **In summary, WTC contend there is no certainty that such a supply will be available and thus no comfort is provided that monies spent by government to advance this project, if DCO approval is given, will gain a recovery or that an operational plant will be feasible.**

ii) [Question 3.3](#) The Applicant should confirm if it would be possible for the proposed temporary desalination plant to permanently meet the full water supply demand for the lifetime of the proposed Development should no alternative water supply solution be identified.

- a) **The simple answer is no, as eventually conceded by the Applicant in its fifth paragraph §2.2.5**
- b) The Applicant introduces here the necessity of a permanent desalination plant if NWL is not able to provide the water supply crucial to the operation of Sizewell C.
- c) The Applicant's preliminary considerations are outlined in §2.2.6 and it is readily apparent that it is considering that the desalination plant will be located on, or adjacent to, the nuclear platform for Sizewell C as it refers to new outfalls/intakes and/or altered DCO presented outfalls and intakes. The Applicant also refers in §2.2.5 to "*likely...standby desalination capability within the plant to maintain security of supply during maintenance periods*". The plant here refers to the desalination facility.
- d) The Applicant and Interested Parties are aware of the tight constraints of the area of land that Sizewell C facilities sit upon, and WTC considers it likely that there will be difficulty in locating such additional plant in such a constrained site without significant alteration to other facilities, assuming that is even feasible. The Applicant has neither demonstrated that it is feasible nor shown the layout of any reconfiguration of the main site from that presented to and proposed for permitting by the DCO process. WTC note the Applicant is proposing in §2.2.9 to locate these permanent desalination facilities either underground north-west of the SSSI crossing, i.e. off the area within the DCO for permanent development or on a part of Sizewell A which would increase traffic along the current road to Sizewell A and B. This former will require substantive earthworks and other engineering works e.g. contiguous bored pile walls as WTC believe it will be below the groundwater table, the latter's impact has not been assessed in the DCO.
- e) WTC also contend that the location of such critical supply plant immediately adjacent to the rest of the Sizewell C main site development or other active nuclear facilities, such as Sizewell B, poses unacceptable risks of adverse interaction with it, or by it, in case of fire or other incidents. Such a facility should be sufficiently remote from the site to minimise such risks and any standby back up facility should be remote from the main facility for the same reason. For surety of supply WTC would also contend that a standby facility should be as independent as possible and a surface reservoir fed by natural springs would provide such surety. The Applicant has in WTC's view failed to consider all viable and sensible options.
- f) In §2.2.8 the Applicant concedes it has not completed a detailed environment assessment of such a scheme despite it having all relevant base data to do so. WTC believe it is likely this is due to SzC Co proposals for a permanent salination plant being so underdeveloped that detailed assessment at this time is impossible. SzC Co attempts to conclude, without any assessment or even limited justification statements, that a permanent desalination plant will "*be unlikely to generate any materially new or materially different significant environmental effects*"

and that “*the marine environmental impact of connecting the desalination plant discharge into the cooling water discharge is likely to be insignificant*”, the latter on the sole basis of saline discharge rather than total discharge composition of such a facility. This is unreasonable, as, if considered acceptable to allow the DCO to be approved, it would question the need for any detailed assessment of essential subsidiary plant to nationally important projects.

- g) Whilst the Applicant states in §2.2.11 that it has spoken to ONR about “a *bespoke permanent desalination plant*”, salient details to confirm acceptability have clearly not been able to be provided to give surety that such solution will be acceptable to ONR prior to DCO approval and construction commencement.
- h) **In summary WTC does not agree with the Applicant’s §2.2.11 that “the Secretary of State can be satisfied that there is no in principle difficulty regarding a permanent desalination supply”**

iii) [Question 3.4](#): The information provided should be sufficiently detailed to enable the Secretary of State to understand and reach a reasoned conclusion on the cumulative environmental effects, including for Habitats Regulations purposes, of the different permanent water supply solutions.

- a) **The simple answer is the Applicant has not provided sufficient detail to enable the SoS to understand and reach a reasoned conclusion, as eventually conceded by the Applicant in its third paragraph §2.3.3**
- b) The Applicant in §2.3.6 tries to circumvent the SoS requirement by providing what it considers is case law to support the SoS reaching a conclusion without such detail. It is readily apparent to WTC, and hopefully the SoS, that the case is not comparable and thus case law precedent does not apply. Additionally the Applicant is only using this to support a permanent solution as provided by NWL not its own permanent desalination plant as effectively stated in §2.3.10.
- c) The case relates to two linked but separate projects, the main assessment being done on the first project, but the case law refers to “***The ES for the first project should contain appropriate data on likely significant cumulative impacts arising from the first and second projects to the level which an applicant could reasonably be required to provide, having regard to current knowledge and methods of assessment***” (WTC highlight). That is clearly not the case for the permanent water supply for Sizewell C as the DCO application does not contain appropriate data on likely significant cumulative impacts arising from any, as yet, determined NWL development. Further if one takes an Applicant developed permanent desalination plant as the second project, that similarly is undefined at this time.

3. Traffic and Transport

i) *Question 4.1 The Applicant should advise as to whether or not they consider that a control mechanism(s) could secure the delivery of the Sizewell Link Road and Two Village Bypass in advance of the commencement of Phase 1 works on the Main Development Site*

- a) The Applicant implies in §3.1.12 and 3.1.13 that the SoS request for the SLR and TVB to be delivered before Phase 1 of the Main Development Site will incur a delay of 2 years or greater and thereby additional costs.
- b) Phase 1 works comprise Site Establishment and Preparation for Earthworks and is shown in REP10-025 as commencing in January 2023. The SLR and TVB are shown as commencing at the same time with a 2-year construction programme. **WTC believe, via its councillor who is highly experienced in highway construction in East Suffolk, that the latter period can be considerably shortened to 12 - 15 months.** Such acceleration was achieved by minor design changes at very short notice on a major part of the A14 (then A45) Ipswich Bypass in the 1980's when it became apparent to the then Department of Transport Eastern region office that the Orwell Bridge construction would otherwise be completed before road links were present. Thus WTC contend delay can be reduced to one year or even less as the SLR and TVB are significantly smaller scheme to the A14 particularly as the Applicant is already delayed on the Main Development Site with its geotechnical trials for crucial elements of Phase 1/2 yet to commence.
- c) The Applicant under subsection c) of its response entitled Practical Difficulties refers in §3.1.29 to the SLR being delivered in parallel with the Main Development site to *“optimise sustainability, delivery and efficiency”* and in §3.1.30 to *“not exporting any natural/inert excavated material off-site as waste and an aim to make use of all suitable site won material as fill within the Main Development Site thereby also minimising the need for imported fill aggregate”*.
- d) The Applicant further states in §3.1.33 that this is because *“site won material from the SLR and the TVB on the Main Development Site, circa 140,000m³ of surplus material will be diverted from off-site disposal to on-site reuse”*.
- e) **WTC contend this argument is spurious and perverse. It is entirely feasible for the site won material to be temporarily stockpiled for re-use off the Main Development Site.** As the Applicant is already intending for it to be temporarily stockpiled for re-use on the Main Development Site, see extract from §3.1.33 above, there is no clear sustainability argument which precludes the SLR and TVB being built prior to Phase 1 works on the Main Development site or any requirement for additional HGV movements. In both instances double handling is required.

Question 7.1: In relation to noise and visual disturbance effects during the construction of the proposed Development upon the breeding marsh harrier feature of the Minsmere-Walberswick Special Protection Area ("SPA") and Ramsar site, the Applicant is requested to provide information to demonstrate how the wetland habitat element of the proposed marsh harrier compensatory habitat area could be in place and functioning prior to the onset of disturbance to marsh harrier from construction activities.

The applicant has responded to this question with a number of statements about timing, which WTC recommends the SoS should check with species conservation experts such as the RSPB.

6.1.2 "*Other habitat works, such as planting and seeding, are excluded from this seasonal constraint because they will not cause disturbance.*" This seems a questionable statement; it should be checked with the RSPB as local expert on the conservation of the priority species.

6.1.3 "*...the Excavation works will not disturb breeding birds, including bittern or marsh harrier, provided they cease by the end of February.*" Again this should be checked with the RSPB. The applicant says it has been advised that booming starts in February. "Booming" is calling by the male bitterns to establish territories and advertise their presence to females. It therefore seems that it could easily be disrupted by excavation works adjacent to their nesting area, and advice should be taken from species conservation experts as to whether excavation should cease by early February.

6.1.4/6.1.5 "*SZC Co. wish to revise the Excavation period (and definition) in the Code of Construction Practice from October-February over up to two consecutive winters, to mid August to February (inclusive) over a single winter.*" The applicant proposes to change from 2 periods of 5 months each, to one period of 6½ months (which might possibly have to be shortened to finish by early February, see above); and then baldly states that it is "*confident this is achievable*". The much shorter time allowed, calls into question the applicant's intentions as to the extent and quality of the work now planned. Is there any allowance for unfavourable weather, unexpected discoveries such as wartime defences, and so on? Again, the RSPB has relevant experience of this type of work in this location, and WTC requests the SoS to seek confirmation from the RSPB that the new plan has a high chance of success.

These considerations also apply to the applicants response to **Question 8.16 - With regards to disturbance upon the bittern, gadwall and shoveler features of the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and Ramsar site caused by excavation works associated with the creation of the marsh harrier compensatory habitat 6 [that are due to commence in the first winter of construction], the Applicant is invited to submit an updated Code of Construction Practice which includes an amendment to the excavation period to specifically exclude the month of February.**

Question 7.2: In relation to noise and visual disturbance effects during the construction of the proposed Development upon the breeding and non-breeding gadwall and shoveler features of the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and Ramsar site, the Applicant is requested to provide additional information to demonstrate exclusion of adverse effects on site integrity alone and in combination or alternatively measures to avoid, mitigate, or compensate for any adverse effects identified.

The applicant's response does not provide the requested information; instead it seeks to give excuses as to why the information is not needed. WTC believes the applicant is hoping that by sounding confident, it can convince the SoS that there is nothing to worry about. WTC recommends that the SoS should press the applicant for the required information about excluding adverse effects (i.e. preventing them) or mitigating/compensating them.

6.2.1- 6.2.6 refer back to the applicant's position at examination; the very statements which the SoS has rightly requested more information about.

6.2.1 *"Important to this conclusion is the fact that for both the breeding and non-breeding populations of these two species, the potential for disturbance effects is limited to birds which occur on the functionally linked land (FLL) on the Minsmere South Levels and Sizewell Marshes. It is considered that the displacement of a proportion of the birds from these areas of FLL would not affect the status of the populations of the qualifying features within the designated site and, hence, the associated conservation objectives of the site."* It is claimed as "fact" that disturbance is limited to the FLL area; and then stated, without support, that displacement of birds from FLL doesn't affect the status of the populations on the main site. There is no reason to believe this statement about displacement is true; it is highly likely that displacement will take place onto the main SPA/Ramsar site itself - and generally, when a site receives displaced birds there is less to go round among the birds already present and the incoming displaced individuals, in terms of feeding opportunities, roosting or nesting sites or other resources. (If this were not the case, the birds would form larger flocks in the most favourable place, so as to benefit from the safety-in-numbers principle).

6.2.2 *"effects which would not be acceptable within the boundary of the protected site may or may not be acceptable on the FLL"* – In referring to this guidance, the applicant doesn't make any specific point about how it relates to the disturbance that would be caused by the construction of SZC.

6.2.3-6.2.6 make similar claims to 6.2.1, without reference to the impact of displacement to the main site.

Regarding the new baseline data referenced in 6.2.7-6.2.16, WTC recommends that the species numbers should be checked with Natural England and the RSPB.

Question 8.2 - The Applicant is invited to provide an update as to whether landowner consent has been obtained for great crested newt mitigation at the Northern Park and Ride, and in the event landowner consent is not obtained, to comment on alternative sites for translocation.

WTC notes that the applicant has applied for a District Licence that avoids having to provide on-site mitigation, however the applicant's answer fails to comment on alternative sites for compensation or translocation.

Item 14

To note communication from East Suffolk Council regarding the Adoption of Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

Officers received the following communication from East Suffolk Council on May 19th regarding the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document:

Dear Sir/Madam

Adoption of Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

East Suffolk Council has adopted a new Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on 3rd May 2022. The Affordable Housing SPD provides guidance to support the implementation of planning policies relating to affordable housing.

The Affordable Housing SPD replaces the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (May 2012) that covers the former Waveney area and the Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 Affordable Housing (July 2004) for the former Suffolk Coastal area.

The SPD was subject to two rounds of consultation during its production. The Consultation Statement contains summaries of the responses received and how these have informed the preparation and finalisation of the SPD.

The Affordable Housing SPD, Consultation Statement, Adoption Statement and other supporting documents are available to view on the East Suffolk Council website at www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy-and-local-plans/supplementary-planning-documents/

Physical copies of documents are also available to view at the Council's Customer Service Centres (see www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/contact-us/customer-services/ for details) and in libraries across the district. Should you have any difficulties in accessing copies of the document you can contact us on 01394 444557 or email planningpolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk and we will aim to assist you.

The Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion relating to the SPD can also be requested by email or in hard copy by emailing or phoning the Planning Policy and Delivery Team on the contact details above.

You have received this email because your details are held on the East Suffolk Council Local Plan mailing list. If you would prefer to be removed from the mailing list, please contact us by emailing or phoning the Planning Policy and Delivery Team on planningpolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk or 01394 444557.

Yours faithfully,

Amcwillan



**Andrea McMillan | Principal Planner
(Policy and Delivery)**

East Suffolk Council

01394 444 557

www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk

www.eastsuffolkmeansbusiness.co.uk

Our ambition is to deliver the best possible quality of life for everyone who lives in, works in and visits East Suffolk.

We are East Suffolk

Members are asked to note this update.