

Suffolk County Council Hearing Statement**Matter 8 – Development Management Policies****Issue: Whether the development management policies are justified, positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy?****Transport and Access**

227. Is Policy DM21 effective, justified and consistent with national policy in respect of transport and access in new developments?

SCC highlighted that DM 21 was not sound as it was not effective in communicating when a Travel Plan is necessary. The modifications proposed to the explanatory text in accompanying this policy in the SoCG between SCC and IBC (I17) address this issue and would make the policy sound.

Car and Cycle Parking

228. Does Policy DM22 defer important policy matters relating to vehicle parking, including cycle parking, in new developments, to other policy documents, including the Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019). Having regard to Regulations 5 and 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 should these matters be included in the Plan?

Planning applications should have regard to the Suffolk Parking Guidance, unless stated otherwise in the plan. The Suffolk Guidance for Parking is evidence based and can be updated to reflect new evidence and best practice. If the full guidance was placed within planning policy, there is a risk that parking requirements would become inflexible while other strategies (such as the ISPA transport strategy) aim to be flexible to take advantage of opportunities to improve sustainable modes of transport.

229. Is the town centre car parking strategy in Policy SP17 justified and effective? Has consideration been given to its impact on climate change and air quality?

Provided that the changes highlighted in the SoCG between SCC and IBC (I17). These changes will improve the policies impacts on climate change and air quality, by better supporting the ISPA Transport Mitigation Strategy.

230. Does Policy SP17 provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal for car parking on the allocated sites?

The modification of policy SP17 and supporting text suggested in the statement of common ground between SCC as Highway Authority and IBC (A29) improves clarity by including the additional site of IP051, the old cattle

market, making it clear that there should be no net increase of long-stay provision in the plan period and that new car parks will be linked to the expiry of temporary permissions for car parks. These changes make the policy more comprehensive, better aligned with the strategy for sustainable transport and provide clear markers as to when granting planning permission for parking is acceptable.

Heritage Asset

234. Is the Plan effective and consistent with national policy in respect of the impact of the policies and proposals on heritage assets?

DM14 relates to archaeology, and is consistent with national policy, setting out an approach that in particular (although not exclusively) relates to the implementation of paragraphs 189-90 and 199 of the NPPF (2019).

Design and Character

244. Are the requirements of Policy DM12 for 25% of new dwellings to be built to Building Regulations Standard M4(2) justified?

As a social care authority the county council is strongly in support of the provision of the dwellings built to the M4(2) standard. Housing built to this standard enables people to adapt their home as their mobility needs change. Being able to adapt their own home enables people to live in their established homes and communities for longer, without having to move to housing with care, or care institutions.