

Matter 7 – IP-One Area Action Plan**Issue: Whether the AAP for the IP-One Area is sound, in terms of whether the policies and proposals are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**Authors

Cameron Clow – Senior Planning and Growth Officer
Luke Barber – Principle Development Management Engineer
Chris Fish - Senior Development Management Engineer
Abby Antrobus – Senior Archaeology Officer

Strategy for IP-One Area

199. Would the improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes identified in Policy SP15 provide safe and accessible routes which would promote walking and cycling? Are the improvements deliverable? Have the implications of the provision of these improvements been considered on the viability of the associated schemes?

The county council considers that the improvements would improve walking and cycling and strongly support these measures.

202. Are the transport proposals in the IP-One Area set out in Policy SP16 effective and justified?

The measures described in in SP16 would provide improved walking and cycling in a sustainable location, improving accessibility throughout the area.

203. Does Policy SP16 provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal where the provision of a new Wet Dock Crossing is proposed and/or improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes are supported by this policy?

Yes, the policy provides clear indication of what is expected to be delivered though this site.

204. Should the potential route for a Wet Dock Crossing be shown on the IP-One Area Inset and should reference be made in Policy SP16 to the potential route for a Wet Dock Crossing being shown on the Policies Map?

This would help in directing a developer in what is expected in their proposals.

205. Is the town centre car parking policy set out in Policy SP17 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

If changed in line with the proposed modifications in the SoCG (I17) between SCC as Highway Authority and IBC the policy will be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. SCC highlighted issues with Policy SP17 (representation 26640) and the parking strategy in general and have worked with IBC to address these issues in the SoCG mentioned previously.

IP-One Opportunity Areas

IP028b – Jewsons, Greyfriars Road

216. Has the impact of the proposed allocation on archaeology been fully considered? Is the proposed change to the archaeology wording on the Site Sheet agreed with Suffolk County Council in the SoCG [A28] necessary to make the Plan sound in this respect?

The proposed change to archaeology wording is necessary to correct the information about the archaeological potential of the site, which is higher than indicated in the original wording. It would also provide clarity for developers and ensure that the plan soundly sets out expectations for the site in relation to the implementation of DM14 and policies in the NPPF.

IP226 – Helena Road/Patteson Road

217. Has full consideration been given to the impact of the development of this site on the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of neighbouring residents and car parking?

Parking would be expected to be delivered on site as per the minimum parking requirements in the Suffolk County Council Guidance for Parking 2019, unless other standards in Policy DM22 apply.