

Representations on the Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List and the Council's Response



Representations on the Draft Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List and the Council's Response

Public consultation on the draft Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List was carried out between 18 August 2025 and 15 September 2025 (a period of four weeks).

Representations on the draft Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List were received from:

- Private individual
- Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
- Suffolk Constabulary
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Suffolk County Council

The representations are reproduced below and the Council's response provided to those points directly relating to the Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List. The commentary also indicates where the draft Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List has been revised to respond to comments as appropriate. Respondents are thanked for their input.

Ipswich Borough Council Local Validation List

NB: Modification are expressed in the conventional form of ~~striketthrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text.

External Consultation Responses

| Respondent | Consultation Response | IBC Response / Modification |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Private Individual 1 | <p><u>General</u> - Can I ask if these documents have been drawn up with a view to being relevant to any changes resulting from the English Devolution White Paper and changes in the structure of local government? I already see some minor differences with e.g. East Suffolk Council and wonder how all the different validation lists will be harmonised?</p> | <p>The Council acknowledges that local government reorganisation raises legitimate questions regarding the future of planning documents. However, pending final decisions on the geography of any new unitary authority, and in light of the statutory requirement to review Local Validation Lists every two years, it is anticipated that a further review will be undertaken prior to the vesting day of the new authority. That review would provide the most appropriate opportunity to consider alignment with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>No change.</p> |
| Private Individual 1 | <p><u>Local Validation List – Ownership Certificates</u> <i>“It is an offence to complete a false or misleading certificate, either knowingly or recklessly, with a maximum fine of up to £5,000. The responsibility for completing the appropriate Certificate rests entirely with the applicant.”</i></p> <p>Can I ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> who is responsible for checking the correct certificates are submitted? who is responsible for following up potential offences? | <p>The responsibility for completing Ownership Certificates lies solely with the applicant. The Council’s role is limited to checking that a valid certificate is submitted before an application can be validated. The Council is not responsible for investigating land ownership. Prosecution of offences under the <i>Town and Country Planning Act 1990</i> is a matter for the courts.</p> <p>An invalid or false certificate does not automatically prevent determination of a planning application; however, if it is established that the certificate is incorrect, the application may be</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>c. what Ipswich Council's responsibilities are in this respect?</p> <p>d. what impact such an offence might have on the planning process?</p> <p>Could all this be made clear in the list as, anecdotally, there seems to be a view that there are few checks and no consequences to eg certifying yourself to be an owner before you actually are.</p> | <p>rendered invalid and any decision could be subject to legal challenge.</p> <p>Following review, the Council considers that the existing text addresses the matter comprehensively; therefore, no further substantive changes are proposed. No change.</p> |
| Private Individual 1 | <p><u>Local Validation List – Street Scene Drawing</u> <i>When is it required?</i> <i>For all major applications.</i> <i>For works that will be visible from the road, especially new buildings or large side extensions that will be near to the boundary/neighbouring building.”</i></p> <p>a. Could I ask that it is made clear, for the avoidance of doubt, that “works” specifically includes individual householder applications?</p> <p>b. For the same reasons, could I ask that a major change of roof pitch, and/or a major change to the front elevation of a house, especially semi-detached, could be included after “especially” as these could all have a major impact on the street scene</p> | <p>The wording of the Local Validation List has been amended to provide greater clarity and to reflect the potential impact of a broader range of development types.</p> <p>Revised wording: <i>For works that will be visible from the road, including individual householder applications — in particular, new buildings, large side extensions close to the boundary or neighbouring buildings, major changes to roof pitch, or significant alterations to the front elevation of a dwelling (especially in the case of semi-detached or terraced properties), as these may have a substantial impact on the street scene.</i></p> |
| Suffolk Chamber of Commerce | <p><u>Economic Impact Assessment</u> - Another source of further information is the <u>Suffolk Economic Strategy</u></p> | <p>The suggested reference has been included within the ‘Sources’ column of the Local Validation Requirements table:</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| | | <p><i>Suffolk Economic Strategy and Growth Plan, Dec 2024 –</i> https://suffolkeconomy.co.uk/economic-strategy/</p> |
| Natural England | <p><u>Air Quality Assessment</u> - Natural England advise that you may wish to consider the inclusion of air quality and dust impact assessments on the validation list for applications that may have potential effects on ecological receptors. In particular, dust as well as nutrient inputs through ammonia and nitrogen deposition can affect sensitive species. We suggest that the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) is referenced. APIS provides specific air pollution advice based on habitats, ecosystems and species, and provides critical loads for acidity and nitrogen for designated features within designated nature conservation sites. Please note too that Natural England applies an initial 10km screening distance for European designated sites which are vulnerable to air quality changes.</p> <p>Simple screening tools are available via the internet, the relevant regulator or consultants. The results of screening should inform the need for any further, more detailed assessment which may be required to fully assess the impacts of a proposal.</p> | <p>The entry for Air Quality Exposure Assessment / Air Quality and Dust Assessment / Scheme Mitigation Statement has been updated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly refer to developments with potential effects on ecological receptors; • Include specific mention of dust, ammonia, and nitrogen deposition as potential pollutants requiring consideration; • Reference the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) as a key tool for identifying critical loads and site sensitivities; • Note Natural England’s 10 km screening distance for European designated sites; and • Encourage the use of screening tools to determine whether further detailed assessment is required. <p>These changes ensure that the Local Validation List aligns with Natural England’s advice and supports a proportionate, evidence-based approach to identifying and mitigating potential air quality impacts on ecological receptors.</p> |
| Natural England | <p><u>Ecological Impact Assessment</u> – Natural England welcomes the link to the SBIS Biodiversity Validation Checklist where it states</p> | <p>The Local Validation List has been updated to include the following resources within the</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| | <p>that “biodiversity or geodiversity assessment is required [when proposals] include or are close to sites designated ... for their biodiversity or geodiversity importance”. Development may have an ecological impact pathway to a designated site some distance away. In order to assist both your authority and applicants in judging whether a proposal is likely to affect a designated site, we recommend using Natural England’s Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zones tool. This gives user instant access to advice from Natural England as to whether we wish to be consulted on a specific proposal. Further guidance is available here.</p> <p>It may also be helpful to reference the following advice. For guidance on avoiding harm to protected areas and wildlife, Natural England has standing advice on construction near protected areas and wildlife and how to prepare a planning proposal to avoid harm or disturbance to protected species.</p> | <p>‘Sources’ column of the Ecological Impact Assessment section:</p> <p>Natural England’s Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zones tool - SSSI Impact Risk Zones (England) Natural England Open Data Geoportal</p> <p>Guidance on the interpretation and use of the Impact Risk Zones for Sites of Special Scientific Interest - https://magic.defra.gov.uk/Metadata_for_magic/SSSI%20IRZ%20User%20Guidance%20MAGIC.pdf</p> <p>References to Natural England’s standing advice on construction near protected areas and wildlife and guidance on avoiding harm to protected species have also been added to ensure applicants are directed to the most up-to-date national resources.</p> |
| Natural England | <p>Landscaping Strategy, Landscaping Scheme and Management Plan - The Suffolk Coast and Heaths National Landscape (referred to in legislation as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is located close to, and partially within, Ipswich. Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within Areas of Outstanding Natural</p> | <p>Additional text has been incorporated within the Landscaping Strategy, Landscaping Scheme and Management Plan section to reflect the proximity and significance of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).</p> <p>In recognition of the evolving nature of national planning guidance and legislative references, paragraph numbers are no longer included within</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| | <p>Beauty/National Landscapes and states that the scale and extent of development within all these areas should be limited. Paragraph 190 requires exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated to justify major development within a designated landscape and sets out criteria which should be applied in considering relevant development proposals. Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 places a duty on relevant authorities (including local planning authorities) to seek to further the statutory purposes of a National Park, the Broads or an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in England in exercising their functions. This duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.</p> | <p>the Local Validation List to ensure that the document remains current and avoids becoming outdated prematurely. For clarity and ease of reference, an additional source has been listed within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table, including the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 - https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2023/55/enacted</p> |
| Natural England | <p><u>Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment including an Appropriate Assessment</u> - You may wish to include reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework which contains evidence-based advice and tools on how to design, deliver and manage green and blue infrastructure.</p> | <p>The suggested reference has been included within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table - Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework - https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/GreenInfrastructure/Home.aspx</p> |
| Natural England | <p>Transport and Highways Reports - Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations is outlined here: NEA001, and this document refers to the evidence needed to inform impacts from air quality to designated sites.</p> | <p>The suggested reference has been included within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table - Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations (NEA001) -</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| | | https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4720542048845824 |
| Natural England | <u>Tree Survey (Arboricultural Assessment)</u> - Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodlands Map which can help identify ancient woodland. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice for planning authorities in relation to ancient woodland, and ancient and veteran trees, which may be a helpful reference for developments near ancient woodland and veteran trees. | The suggested references have been included within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table: Natural England Ancient Woodlands Map - https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/map?category=552039 Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions |
| Environment Agency | <u>Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment requirements</u> The Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) section of the draft local validation list has captured the majority of situations when an FRA is required. However, in line with government guidance on flood risk assessment for planning applications, we would recommend that this section of the draft local validation list should be updated to include all of the following situations where an FRA is required for validation of an application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within Flood Zone 3b, • within Flood Zone 1 and the flood map for planning shows it is at increased risk of flooding from rivers or sea during its lifetime, or | The Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) section has been updated to include all the additional circumstances identified by the Environment Agency where an FRA is required for the validation of a planning application. The Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning has been added as a new source within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table. |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within Flood Zone 1 where the LPA's strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA) shows it will be at increased risk of flooding during its lifetime. <p><u>Flood map for planning</u> As part of updating this part of the local validation list, please note that on the 27 August 2025 the flood map for planning was updated to include Flood Zones with climate change data, which can aid Ipswich Borough Council and developers in determining whether planning applications will be at increased risk of flooding from rivers or sea during its lifetime.</p> | |
| Environment Agency | <p><u>Sequential Test and Exception Test section</u> We recommend that part of the Sequential Test and Exception Test section is updated to better reflect the latest update to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The updated NPPF provides some additional detail on when applications may not need to apply the Sequential Test and Exception Test. Specifically, we recommend that the paragraph on Page 57 that starts "A Sequential Test does not need to be carried out if..." should be expanded upon to include the following in order to align with the updated NPPF: "Or if the application: (1) is for the types of minor development and changes of use as set out in paragraph 176 and footnote 62 of the NPPF; or, (2) provides an FRA that shows that, within the red line site boundary, no built</p> | The Sequential Test and Exception Test section has been revised to incorporate the Agency's suggested text, ensuring consistency with paragraphs 175–176 and footnote 62 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| | development, land raising or access and escape routes will be sited in an area at risk of flooding from any source either now or after climate change is considered (as set out in paragraph 175 of the NPPF).” | |
| Environment Agency | <p><u>Groundwater and Contaminated Land - Piling</u></p> <p>On page 34, piling is referenced. We would recommend that a Foundation Works Risk Assessment (FWRA) be required where piling is undertaken in sites affected by contamination, with a link to the following document: Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention. Please also note that a FWRA should be undertaken prior to the foundation design being fully decided, as the risk assessment should determine the most appropriate foundation solution.</p> | <p>Text has been added to reflect the requirement for a Foundations Works Risk Assessment (FWRA): Where piling is to be undertaken on contaminated land, a Foundations Works Risk Assessment (FWRA) should be completed. The FWRA must be undertaken prior to finalising any foundation designs.</p> <p>The suggested references have also been incorporated within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table: Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods - <u>Environment Agency Guidance (PDF)</u></p> |
| Environment Agency | In the Land Contamination Assessment section, we feel the statement “For development on land that has been identified on the public register as being contaminated or land that is adjacent to a source of contamination, a Phase 1 Assessment will be required as a minimum.” is too vague. We frequently see applicants answer “no” to the question “Land where contamination is suspected for all or part of the site” despite there being a past contaminative use. | <p>The Land Contamination Assessment section has been revised and expanded to include reference to potential sources of contamination by past use, directing applicants to the DoE Industry Profiles as an interim resource for identifying potential contaminative uses.</p> <p>The Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance has been added to the <i>Sources</i> column and linked to ensure applicants follow the appropriate framework when preparing a Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>To combat this, we recommend adding a list of ‘potential sources of contamination by past use’ which can be referenced within the validation list. If required, we have an appropriate list that we can share which can be added as a separate accompanying document. Otherwise, the DoE Industry Profiles may suffice in the interim. However, please note that these profiles are now 30 years old, and understanding of emerging contaminants such as per/polyfluoroalkyl substances has moved on since publication.</p> <p>Furthermore, we recommend that the Land Contamination Risk Management guidance should be linked and mentioned in the Further Information column, as the Phase 1 Desk Study must follow Tier 1 of Stage 1.</p> <p>The National Quality Mark Scheme (NQMS) is referenced; we suggest this is also linked: NQMS.</p> <p><u>Fuel Filling Stations</u> New and existing fuel filling stations pose a risk to groundwater quality and should be assessed accordingly when there is a proposal through the planning regime. Therefore, we recommend adding the following requirement for Fuel Filling Stations: “Every proposal involving underground fuel tanks should undertake an Above vs Below Ground Options Appraisal. Proposals should consider position statements D1 to D3 from The Environment Agency’s approach to groundwater</p> | <p>A direct link to the National Quality Mark Scheme (NQMS) has been included in the <i>Sources</i> column to promote the use of accredited professionals and consistent standards in land contamination reporting.</p> <p>Text has also been added to the section relating to Fuel Filling Stations, requiring all proposals involving underground fuel storage tanks to undertake an Above vs Below Ground Options Appraisal and to have regard to Environment Agency Position Statements D1–D3 and the published guidance <i>Prevent groundwater pollution from underground fuel storage tanks (GOV.UK)</i>.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>protection. Please also reference: Prevent groundwater pollution from underground fuel storage tanks - Assessing and preparing for risks for an underground storage tank - Guidance - GOV.UK".</p> | |
| <p>Environment Agency</p> | <p><u>Foul drainage</u> - Where a proposal clearly requires foul drainage, applicants sometimes tick "Unknown" under "Foul Sewage" and provide no details of the foul sewage disposal method. We need to review all cases wherein non-mains drainage is proposed either, in a mains supplied area and/or or for a major development. Therefore, all applications should include details of foul sewage disposal method.</p> <p>We note that currently on the draft validation list, Foul Drainage System information is only required "Where a bio-disc plant is proposed". We therefore recommend changing this to: "where non-mains sewerage is proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in a mains supplied area, or • for a major development" <p>You may also wish to add a requirement for Foul Drainage Assessment forms in such cases, in line with FDA1 guidance. Without a FDA1 form, we are likely to object to a non-mains system in a mains sewerage area if an applicant has not proved that connection to mains sewer is infeasible.</p> <p><u>General binding rules</u> - On page 41, we suggest that the general binding rules (General binding</p> | <p>The Foul Drainage section has been revised to ensure all proposals provide sufficient information on the method of foul sewage disposal. Text has been added to clarify that where non-mains sewerage is proposed, applicants must demonstrate that a connection to the mains sewer is not feasible.</p> <p>The validation requirement has been expanded to specify that Foul Drainage System Information must be submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where non-mains sewerage is proposed in a mains-supplied area, or • for a major development. <p>A requirement has also been introduced for the submission of a Foul Drainage Assessment (FDA1) form alongside any Foul Drainage System Information. This ensures compliance with Environment Agency expectations and provides sufficient evidence to assess the suitability of proposed non-mains systems.</p> <p>References to relevant guidance have been added within the <i>Sources</i> column of the Local Validation Requirements table, including:</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>rules: small sewage discharge to the ground - GOV.UK) are referenced.</u></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>FDA1 Guidance – Foul Drainage Assessment Form (FDA1) – GOV.UK</u> • <u>Environment Agency – General Binding Rules: Small Sewage Discharge to the Ground – GOV.UK Guidance</u> <p>These additions ensure applicants are directed to the appropriate Environment Agency guidance and provide clarity on when foul drainage information and assessment forms are required.</p> |
| Suffolk Constabulary | <p><u>Statement of Crime Prevention</u> – It would be helpful if further checks were included within the process to ensure Statements of Crime Prevention are included with applications.</p> | <p>Text has been added to the Design and Access Statement section to clarify how crime prevention considerations should be addressed and to reiterate the link between the two sections. The following wording has been included: <i>Additionally, the Statement of Crime Prevention may be incorporated into the Design and Access Statement where appropriate. Please cross-reference with the Statement of Crime Prevention section for full details.</i></p> <p>Internal feedback will also be provided to planning officers to ensure the appropriate checks are carried out and that Statements of Crime Prevention are requested and reviewed in accordance with the validation requirements.</p> |
| Suffolk County Council (LLFA) | <p>The LLFA have recommended new text, which is shown underlined and has been incorporated into the Local Validation List.</p> | <p>Any new information provided by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has been incorporated into the Local Validation List. The incorporation of this material strengthens the validation requirements by providing clearer</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (including Sequential test) -</p> <p>A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development (including minor development and changes of use) in Flood Zones 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; sites in Flood Zone 1 and the flood map for planning shows it is at risk of flooding from surface water; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in the LPA's strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.</p> <p>A planning application may be refused by Ipswich Borough Council if it does not include a Flood Risk Assessment when it is required, or the contents are not satisfactory.</p> <p>Establish which flood risk zone your site falls within or if the development is at risk of surface water flooding using the Environment Agency flood map for planning.</p> <p>Refer to check the long term flood risk for an area in England to identify if your site is at risk of flooding from groundwater (where data is available) or reservoirs</p> | <p>direction for applicants and ensuring consistency with national standards and local guidance.</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Refer to the site-specific flood risk assessment checklist: Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK</p> <p>All relevant current Climate Change Allowances (Peak River Flow, Peak Rainfall Intensity and Sea level) for use in Flood Risk Assessments can be obtained from Climate change allowances for peak rainfall.</p> | |
| <p>Suffolk County Council (LLFA)</p> | <p>The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has provided recommended new wording, which is shown underlined and has been incorporated into the Local Validation List.</p> <p>Sustainable Drainage Strategy</p> <p>You need to include a sustainable drainage strategy if your application is for development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • which could affect drainage on or around the site • in an area at risk of flooding such as Flood Zones 2 or 3, or at risk of surface water flooding <p>Your Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with the National standards for sustainable drainage systems and Suffolk County Council LLFA SuDS Guide (2023) SF3967 - SCC Suffolk Flood Risk Appendix A. You should include all the information set out in: section 6 of the site-specific flood risk assessment checklist</p> | <p>Any new information provided by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has been incorporated into the Local Validation List.</p> <p>This includes clarification on the level of detail expected in Drainage Strategies, as well as updated links to the most recent versions of technical resources.</p> <p>The incorporation of this material strengthens the validation requirements by providing clearer direction for applicants and ensuring consistency with national standards and local guidance.</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Other useful links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suffolk Flood Risk Management Partnership - https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/asset-library/Final-Published-Suffolk-LFRM-Strategy-February-2023.pdf - Flood smart Living handbook - https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/asset-library/Flood-Smart-Living-November-2024.pdf - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) a Local Design Guide Appendix A to the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy - (2023) SF3967 - SCC Suffolk Flood Risk Appendix A - The SuDS Manual 2007 - https://www.ciria.org/ItemDetail?iProductCode=C753F&Category=FREEPUBS | |
| Suffolk County Council | <u>Archaeology</u> – SCC support the requirements and have no further comments to make. | Noted. |
| Suffolk County Council | <u>Fire and Rescue</u> - Support for Fire Statement. Usually require condition on specific details of the location of fire hydrants and a strategy to ensure their provision. Confirmation that a hydrant condition won't be removed from the decision process because of this statement, as details of hydrants location would be assessed later in the development process and between the water undertaker and SFRS on behalf of the applicant to ensure a satisfactory provision for hydrants can be achieved. | Noted |
| Suffolk County Council | <u>Health Impact Assessment</u> Public Health welcome the inclusion of Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) within the Validation | The additional text proposed by Suffolk County Council (Public Health) has not been incorporated into the Local Validation List. While the Council |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>List. HIAs are a valuable tool to ensure developments contribute positively to health, mitigate risks, and align with the Local Plan’s health and climate ambitions.</p> <p>Recommendations: SCC suggests there would be benefit in providing further clarity on the process for HIA implementation. E.g. should the applicant consult with IBC at screening/scoping stages and what criteria should be met to determine whether HIAs are desktop, rapid or comprehensive?</p> <p>For developments that are smaller than the 100 dwellings trigger, it is recommended to use an alternative Healthy Placemaking Checklist. This could be based on an existing model such as the Building for a Healthy Life framework or be a bespoke Ipswich model. Public Health would gladly support in the production of such a resource. Example text to support this:</p> <p><i>‘For residential developments below the 100 dwelling threshold, applicants must complete the Ipswich Healthy Placemaking Checklist. This will ensure that key health considerations are addressed in proportionate developments’.</i></p> <p>HIAs should specifically consider risks associated with climate change, including flood risk, overheating/extreme heat, and other weather-related health impacts, consistent with IBC’s Climate Emergency declaration (2019). Mitigation</p> | <p>supports the use of Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) as an important tool for promoting health and wellbeing in planning, the level of procedural and design detail proposed goes beyond what can be reasonably required through local validation requirements under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance – Health and Wellbeing (Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 53-007-20190722) already establishes the key principles for undertaking an HIA, including that it should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise positive health impacts and minimise negative impacts; • Align with local health and wellbeing priorities; • Be proportionate to the significance of the proposal; and • Involve early engagement with public health partners. <p>These national principles provide sufficient flexibility for proportional assessment and for aligning HIAs with the scope of development proposals.</p> <p>The additional wording suggested by SCC, including prescriptive requirements on climate-related risks, screening and scoping procedures, and the proposed Healthy Placemaking Checklist, would introduce new local policy requirements that are not yet established through the adopted Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>measures should be embedded into design at the earliest stage and evidenced within the HIA submission (and Healthy Placemaking Checklist if applicable). SCC recommends inserting the following text to page 42:</p> <p><i>‘Where a Health Impact Assessment is required, it must clearly address climate related risks, including flood risk, overheating/extreme heat, and other weather related health impacts. The HIA submission must evidence how mitigation measures (e.g. SuDS, shading, green infrastructure, passive cooling) are embedded into the design from the outset. Applicants must demonstrate that these measures have been modelled for effectiveness and are deliverable as part of the proposed development’</i></p> | <p>Such detail would therefore be more appropriately considered as part of a future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) or guidance note, rather than within the statutory Local Validation List.</p> <p>Accordingly, the existing reference to Health Impact Assessments within the Validation List has been retained in its current form, consistent with the NPPF and PPG, while recognising the value of continued collaboration with Public Health on developing future supporting guidance.</p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>Overheating and Heat Resilient Design</p> <p>Overheating is a direct health risk, especially for children and older adults. Because Building Regulations Part O (Overheating) now applies to new homes, validation should require clear evidence at submission.</p> <p>Recommendations: Include the following wording to Page 16 under the suggested new title:</p> | <p>While this topic is important and aligns with climate adaptation goals, the wording proposed by SCC goes beyond what a validation list can require. Building Regulations Part O is enforced through Building Control, not planning. Validation cannot require applicants to prove compliance with Building Regulations, that’s outside the remit of the planning system. The text requires specific technical modelling evidence (“dynamic modelling for representative dwelling types...”) this would amount to a new validation requirement not set by national or adopted local policy.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><i>‘Overheating & Heat Resilient Design Statement For all major residential applications, an Overheating & Heat Resilient Design Statement must be provided. This should demonstrate compliance with Building Regulations Part O, including dynamic modelling for representative dwelling types and worst case orientations. The Statement must evidence passive measures such as external shading, solar control glazing (with g-values specified), cross ventilation routes, thermal mass, and site wide greening. Where noise or air quality constraints exist, applicants must demonstrate thermal comfort can be achieved without reliance on openable windows, including through acoustically attenuated ventilation where necessary.’</i></p> <p>Of the Noise and Vibration section of page 51, it is recommended the text requires assessments to show how acoustic design interacts with overheating risk, so residents don’t have to choose between fresh air and quiet. The following wording is suggested: <i>‘Noise and vibration assessments must not only demonstrate that acceptable internal and external noise levels can be achieved, but also show how the acoustic design interacts with overheating risk. Where external noise constraints may lead to reliance on closed windows, applicants must evidence how thermal comfort will be maintained through passive design measures (e.g. external shading, solar control glazing, cross-ventilation, thermal</i></p> | <p>The proposed additional wording regarding the interaction of noise design and overheating risk has not been included in the Local Validation List. While the Council recognises the importance of designing to avoid conflicts between acoustic comfort and ventilation or thermal comfort, the detailed evidence requirements suggested relate primarily to Building Regulations (Parts O and F) and go beyond the scope of planning validation. Existing validation requirements already require applicants to submit Noise and Vibration Assessments where relevant, and applicants are encouraged to consider overheating and ventilation as part of good design practice.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | <i>mass) and, where necessary, acoustically attenuated ventilation. This is to ensure residents are not forced to choose between acceptable indoor temperatures and quiet living conditions.'</i> | |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>Air Quality The draft document requires Air Quality Exposure Assessments/AQAs and Construction Management Plans. Making exposure by design explicit and firming construction controls will improve on site pollution implications and resident exposure. Public Health welcome the Air Quality provisions of the LVL and have no recommendations or substantive recommendations for change at this stage.</p> | Noted |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>Transport and Active Travel</p> <p>Everyday activity and mode shift depend on safe, direct walking/cycling links and usable, inclusive cycle parking.</p> <p>Recommendations: Public Health recommend inserting the following text to page 74 using the title</p> <p><i>'Active Travel Statement', 'All major applications must provide an Active Travel Statement. This should set out: - Safe and direct pedestrian and cycle access to key local destinations (e.g.</i></p> | The proposed "Active Travel Statement" requirement has not been included in the Local Validation List. While the Council supports the principle of promoting active travel and recognises the public health benefits of walking and cycling, the level of prescription suggested would create a new local validation requirement not currently supported by adopted planning policy or the DMPO. These matters are already addressed through Transport and Highways Reports entry, which are the appropriate mechanisms for demonstrating how development proposals support active travel and modal shift. |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p><i>schools, health services, shops) - Provision of secure, inclusive cycle parking - Measures to support modal shift, including public transport integration and site wide connectivity'</i></p> | |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>Whole Life Carbon & Circular Economy</p> <p>The LVL requires Sustainability Statements but does not specify whole life carbon or circular economy principles.</p> <p>Recommendation: Public Health recommend the wording under the 'Sustainability Statement' section of page 68 is extended to include the following:</p> <p><i>'The Statement should include a strategy for the re-use of materials, design for disassembly, and reduction of embodied carbon'</i></p> | <p>The additional wording proposed by Public Health has not been included in the Local Validation List. While the Council supports the integration of whole life carbon assessment and circular economy principles in development proposals, these elements are not currently specific validation requirements under adopted planning policy. The existing Sustainability Statement requirement already provides scope for applicants to address these issues where relevant.</p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>Community Consultation Exercise Statement</p> <p>Early and inclusive community engagement is essential for reducing health inequalities. It ensures that planning processes reflect the needs of all residents, not just those who routinely participate. By actively engaging with rarely heard from groups, such as low income households, ethnic minorities, disabled individuals, and young</p> | <p>Recommended text included: <i>This must include detailing the methods used to specifically engage with disadvantaged and at-risk groups.</i></p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>people, planning authorities can better identify and mitigate potential health impacts.</p> <p>Recommendation: Public Health recommend additional wording to page 33 using the following:</p> <p><i>‘Applicants are expected to provide a written statement demonstrating how the views of the local community have informed the development proposal. This must include detailing the methods used to specifically engage with disadvantaged and at-risk groups.’</i></p> | |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>Cumulate Impacts</p> <p>The combined effects of multiple developments (e.g. traffic, air quality, pressure on social infrastructure) can compound over time, exacerbating health inequalities. These pressures often go unnoticed in isolated assessments, yet they play a critical role in shaping long term health outcomes. Without a clear requirement to evaluate these cumulative effects, planning decisions risk overlooking the broader context of community wellbeing.</p> <p>Recommendation: Applicants should demonstrate how cumulative impacts have been assessed in relation to other committed developments in the area. Where relevant, supporting assessments (e.g. HIAs, AQAs) should specifically address</p> | <p>The proposed additional wording on cumulative impacts has not been included in the Local Validation List, as it would introduce new mandatory assessment requirements not currently set out in national or local planning policy. The consideration of cumulative impacts is already addressed within relevant legislation and guidance, including the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, Planning Practice Guidance, and local.</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>cumulative effects. SCC recommends the following wording is inserted to a new section titled 'Cumulative Impacts':</p> <p><i>'Applicants must ensure that supporting assessments such as Health Impact Assessments (HIAs), Air Quality Assessments (AQAs), and Transport Assessments (TAs) explicitly consider cumulative impacts in relation to other committed or planned developments in the area.'</i></p> | |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u></p> <p>SCC would recommend the inclusion of a section, highlighting 'Minerals Assessments': Under policy MP10 from the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan any development coming forward in a "minerals consultation areas" as defined by the safeguarding and policies map in the local plan. Will require the local authority to consult with Suffolk County council as the Mineral Planning Authority and will have to demonstrate 'that the sand and gravel present is not of economic value, or not practically or environmentally feasible to extract, or that the mineral will be worked before the development takes place or used within the development' or Suffolk county council will object to the application. A Minerals assessment will be required to demonstrate this and could be required for the validation of applications within minerals consultation areas and meet the threshold of MP10.</p> | <p>Policy MP10 of the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2020) establishes a clear requirement for applicants to assess the impact of development proposals within Minerals Consultation Areas. Accordingly, a new section has been added to the Local Validation List setting out when a Minerals Assessment is required and the information it should contain, consistent with national validation guidance and local plan policy</p> <p>Recommended text included:</p> <p><i>When is this required?</i> <i>Under policy MP10 from the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan any development coming forward in a "minerals consultation areas" as defined by the safeguarding and policies map in the SCC minerals local plan.</i></p> <p><i>What is required?</i> <i>Will require the local authority to consult with Suffolk County council as the Mineral Planning</i></p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Where proposed development sits within the 'safeguarding buffer' for any Minerals or Waste sites as identified on the 'Safeguarding and Proposals map' from the SMWLP), SCC would recommend the inclusion of Noise and Air Quality (including dust) Assessments to assess local impacts and cumulative effects, in line with NPPF paragraph 180, 225,</p> | <p><i>Authority and will have to demonstrate 'that the sand and gravel present is not of economic value, or not practically or environmentally feasible to extract, or that the mineral will be worked before the development takes place or used within the development' or Suffolk county council will object to the application. A Minerals assessment will be required to demonstrate this and could be required for the validation of applications within minerals consultation areas and meet the threshold of MP10.</i></p> <p><i>Where proposed development sits within the 'safeguarding buffer' for any Minerals or Waste sites as identified on the 'Safeguarding and Proposals map' from the SMWLP)applicant should include Noise and Air Quality (including dust) Assessments to assess potential local impacts and cumulative effects, in line with NPPF paragraph 180, 225.</i></p> <p>These references have been included within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table:</p> <p><i>Suffolk County Council – Minerals and Waste Plan https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/suffolk-minerals-and-waste-plan</i></p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Natural Environment</u></p> <p>Local List – Biodiversity Gain Plan</p> | <p>The Biodiversity Gain Plan requirement has been moved to the national requirements table.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>The submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan is included within the Local Requirements – Supporting Information section of the Draft Local Validation Checklist.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of Biodiversity Net Gain in the Validation Checklist. However, because the relevant information required to be submitted with an application to meet Biodiversity Net Gain is set out in national legislation, it is recommended that this is considered a ‘national’ requirement instead of ‘local’.</p> <p>In addition, it is suggested that the term ‘Biodiversity Net Gain Statement’ may be better suited to the Validation Checklist instead of ‘Biodiversity Gain Plan’. The Biodiversity Gain Plan is a document required to be submitted post-permission/pre-commencement, as opposed to at the application stage, and therefore may cause some confusion for applicants if requested for validation.</p> <p>It is also noted that while the inclusion of an HMMP is not required under the legislation until the pre commencement stage, SCC would recommend requesting the HMMP upon validation for applications where it is plausible for them to be available upon submission (for example; smaller BNG development proposals with on-site mitigation)</p> | <p>References to ‘Biodiversity Gain Plan’ have been replaced with ‘<i>Biodiversity Net Gain Statement</i>’.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Natural Environment</u></p> <p>Environmental Statement</p> <p>The submission of an Environmental Statement is included within the Local Requirements – Supporting Information.</p> <p>Support the inclusion an Environmental Statement in the Validation Checklist. However, it would be more appropriate to include the Environmental Statement in the ‘national’ requirements, or as its own section, since the submission of an Environmental Statement is a specific requirement set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> | The Environmental Statement requirement has been moved to the national requirements table. |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Natural Environment</u></p> <p>Additional Suggestions</p> <p>For major developments, Suffolk County Council have also included the submission of a Draft Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan as a ‘local’ validation requirement. This has been included to ensure that developers consider the long-term management of their planting proposals and allow the feasibility of securing the proposed Biodiversity Net Gain to be assessed at an early stage.</p> | <p>A new section for HMMP has been included within the local requirements section:</p> <p><i>When is it required?</i></p> <p><i>For all major developments.</i></p> <p><i>What is required?</i></p> <p><i>The submission of a Draft Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. This has been included to ensure that developers consider the long-term management of their planting proposals and allow the feasibility of securing the proposed</i></p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p><i>Biodiversity Net Gain to be assessed at an early stage.</i></p> <p>These references have been included within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table: <i>DEFRA & Natural England – Creating a habitat management and monitoring plan for BNG</i> https://www.gov.uk/guidance/creating-a-habitat-management-and-monitoring-plan-for-biodiversity-net-gain</p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Public Rights of Way</u> - In regard to Public Rights of Way Statement, it would be beneficial to include an explanation of when one is required and crossover with a Transport Assessment.</p> | <p>Additional text has been added to the Public Rights of Way Statement requirements: <i>(this should be submitted where development impacts upon PROWs and should detail proposed mitigation or enhancements.)</i></p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Transport</u> - Application Form</p> <p>It would be useful if the application forms could include details of existing and proposed parking for each use. This should include cycle, powered two-wheeled vehicles, electric vehicle and vehicle parking, as well as disabled parking (where applicable). Currently, only vehicle parking is referred to.</p> | <p>The existing application form requirement already includes provision for specifying the total number of existing and proposed parking spaces by vehicle type. This wording encompasses car, cycle, motorcycle, electric vehicle, and disabled parking spaces where applicable. The text is therefore considered sufficient, although a minor clarification could be added to make explicit reference to cycle and other parking modes for completeness.</p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Transport</u> - Location Plan</p> <p>Visibility splays are referenced; however, details are limited. It should be clear that visibility splays are to be clearly labelled including dimensions but</p> | <p>Additional text has been added to the Location Plan requirements:</p> <p><i>Where visibility splays are provided, they must be clearly labelled including dimensions and shown</i></p> |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | also that they should be shown to their full extent and to the nearside edge of the carriageway. | <i>to their full extent and to the nearside edge of the carriageway.</i> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Transport - Design and Access Statement</u> It should be clear that details of access include all access (including sustainable and active forms of access), and not just vehicular access. It is noted that the policy refers to inclusive mobility; however, no clear reference to sustainable / active modes of travel is referenced.</p> | <p>Additional text has been added to the design and access statement requirement:</p> <p>Design and Access Statements should also explain the design response to creating accessible and adaptable places, including provision for disabled access, <u>as well as sustainable and active forms of movement</u> and how relevant requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan policies have been taken into account, see also Disability Access Statement. Detail any consultation undertaken in relation to the proposal, and how the outcomes have informed the proposed development. Applicants should also explain how any specific issues that could affect access to the proposed development have been considered and addressed.</p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Transport - Block Plans</u> The need to include details of all trees is clear – this should make it clear that this includes trees within the maintainable highway which are likely to be impacted by development (including any trees within visibility splays which may require removal to avoid obstructing visibility).</p> | Noted. |
| Suffolk County Council | <p><u>Transport - Sustainability Statement</u> This approach is supported by SCC. It is particularly useful that reference is made to</p> | Noted. |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | achieving mode shift in line with Travel Plan requirements. | |
| Suffolk County Council | <p>Transport - Transport and Highways Reports</p> <p>SCC welcomes the inclusion of considering all modes of travel within this section. It is outlined that committed development should be considered where there is reasonable certainty it will proceed within the next 3 years. It is not understood where the 3 years requirement derives from – it would be more suitable to require development to be committed where there is reasonable certainty that it will proceed within the assessment period. Reference should be made to the need to undertake a detailed audit of the local highway network to determine what improvements are required to ensure that sustainable and active travel infrastructure is safe and suitable for use to encourage its use to meet wider planning policy requirements</p> | <p>Additional text has been added to the transport and highways report requirement, specifically within the scope section:</p> <p><u>A detailed audit of the local highway network to determine what improvements are required to ensure that sustainable and active travel infrastructure is safe and suitable for use to encourage its use to meet wider planning policy requirements</u></p> |
| Suffolk County Council | <p>General Comment</p> <p>It is suggested to add a section specific to Active Travel and Sustainable Transport which emphasised the importance of designing the site to promote and prioritise active and sustainable travel modes.</p> <p>While it may not be considered an essential component of validating a planning application, SCC in its capacity of Local Highway Authority is keen to direct developers to the Active Travel England: planning application toolkit early in the planning process to ensure that sufficient</p> | <p>Additional text has been added to the transport and highways report requirement:</p> <p><u>Where possible, developers should engage with the Active Travel England: planning application toolkit to ensure that sustainable travel is promoted within a development.</u></p> <p>This reference have been included within the Sources column of the Local Validation Requirements table:</p> <p><u>Active Travel England – Planning application assessment toolkit</u></p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>consideration is being given to promoting sustainable travel. As stated by Active Travel England, the planning application assessment toolkit helps to gather evidence and assess the active travel merits – walking, wheeling and cycling – of a development proposal. It should be used by local authority planning and transport officers in conjunction with the applicant.</p> | <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-england-planning-application-assessment-toolkit</p> |
| <p>Suffolk County Council</p> | <p><u>General</u> - National Validation Requirements table requires repeating headers for each page, these should be revised and amended accordingly.</p> <p>Add section at the start before the table to say that IBC offers a pre-application service to outline the specific requirements of such an assessment. Set out what the minimum is required for this service or link to a webpage that does?</p> <p>Pleased to see reference to Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk. The link identified is no longer valid and should be replaced with https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-wasteand-environment/planning-and-development-advice/section-106-planning-obligations/developersguide-to-infrastructure-contributions-in-suffolk</p> <p>Generally, the hyperlinks listed in sources column need checking as many do not work or take you to page cannot be found.</p> | <p>The Local Validation List will not be published in the same format as the consultation draft. The final adopted document will follow the formatting and layout used in the adopted Ipswich Local Validation List, which ensures consistency and accessibility across published planning guidance documents.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to include a direct hyperlink to the pre-application advice service within the Local Validation List. The purpose of the document is to set out the information requirements for the validation of planning applications, whereas details regarding pre-application advice are published separately on the Council’s website. Applicants are encouraged to access this service directly via the Planning webpages for tailored guidance prior to submission.</p> <p>The hyperlink to the Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk has been</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | <p>The SPD refers to an older version of the Suffolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy which was updated in 2023 and should be provided in the table as a source of further information.</p> | <p>updated throughout the document, using the new web address provided by Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>All hyperlinks in the Sources column have been checked and verified as working at the time of publication. It is acknowledged that web links can change over time as documents are moved or updated, and while the Local Validation List is not a live document, every effort has been made to ensure accuracy at the time of adoption.</p> <p>References to the Suffolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy have been updated to reflect the 2023 version, and references to the Suffolk Travel Plan Guidance have also been reviewed and updated accordingly.</p> |
| Essex Place Services | <p>The required details set out below are from Article 7 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and are appropriate to be referenced for details required for BNG to be submitted at application stage. However, to be clear about the requirements of BNG to developers, it may be useful to state that Ipswich BC would accept the following information in most instances where mandatory BNG applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A <u>Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool</u> of the pre-development baseline on the date of application (or an earlier date), including a condition assessment where the | <p>Additional text has been added to the Biodiversity Net Gain Statement requirement:</p> <p><u>The required details set out below are from Article 7 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and are the details required for BNG to be submitted at application stage.</u></p> <p><u>Ipswich Borough Council will accept the following information in most instances where mandatory BNG applies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool of the pre-development baseline on the date of application (or an earlier date), including</u> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool is used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat map of the pre-development baseline <p>Further information may then be requested where Irreplaceable habitat is present or when habitat degradation has occurred.</p> <p>In addition, I also recommend that you set validation criteria for the submission of details to meet the requirements of the Biodiversity Gain Plan. Please see the following general guidance:</p> <p><u>Biodiversity Gain Plan</u></p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Planning Practice Guide states the following information should be included as part of ‘Biodiversity Gain Plan’:</p> <p><i>The following content of a Biodiversity Gain Plan is required for development which is not to proceed in phases. Where planning permission is granted that has the effect of permitting development in phases, there are different requirements for the Biodiversity Gain Plan. Under paragraph 14(2) of Schedule 7A, a Biodiversity Gain Plan must include the following matters:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;</i> | <p><u>a condition assessment where the Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool is used.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Habitat map of the pre-development baseline</u> <p><u>Further information may then be requested where Irreplaceable habitat is present or when habitat degradation has occurred.</u></p> <p><u>Validation criteria for submission must meet the requirements of the Biodiversity Gain Plan. The Planning Practice Guidance states the following information should be included within a ‘Biodiversity Gain Plan’:</u>Where development would be subject to the general biodiversity gain condition, the application must be accompanied by minimum information set out in Article 7 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015:</p> <p><u>The following content of a Biodiversity Gain Plan is required for development which is not to proceed in phases. Where planning permission is granted that has the effect of permitting development in phases, there are different requirements for the Biodiversity Gain Plan. Under paragraph 14(2) of Schedule 7A, a Biodiversity Gain Plan must include the following matters:</u></p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;</i> • <i>the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;</i> • <i>any registered off-site biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity; and</i> • <i>any biodiversity credits purchased for the development.</i> <p><i>In addition, under Articles 37C(2) and 37C(4) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the following specified matters are required, where development is not to proceed in phases:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>name and address of the person completing the Plan, and (if different) the person submitting the Plan;</i> • <i>a description of the development and planning permission reference number (to which the plan relates);</i> • <i>the <u>relevant date</u>, for the purposes of calculating the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats and if proposing an earlier date, the reasons for using this earlier date;</i> • <i><u>the completed biodiversity metric calculation tool(s)</u>, stating the publication date of the tool(s), and showing the calculation of the pre-development onsite value on the <u>relevant date</u>, and post-development biodiversity value;</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;</u> • <u>the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;</u> • <u>the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;</u> • <u>any registered off-site biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity; and</u> • <u>any biodiversity credits purchased for the development.</u> <p><u>In addition, under Articles 37C(2) and 37C(4) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the following specified matters are required, where development is not to proceed in phases:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>name and address of the person completing the Plan, and (if different) the person submitting the Plan;</u> • <u>a description of the development and planning permission reference number (to which the plan relates);</u> • <u>the relevant date, for the purposes of calculating the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats and if proposing an earlier date, the reasons for using this earlier date;</u> • <u>the completed biodiversity metric calculation tool(s), stating the publication</u> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a description of arrangements for maintenance and monitoring of habitat enhancement to which paragraph 9(3) of Schedule 7A to the 1990 Act applies (habitat enhancement which must be maintained for at least 30 years after the development is completed);</i> • <i>(except for onsite irreplaceable habitats) a description of how the biodiversity gain hierarchy will be followed and where to the extent any actions (in order of priority) in that hierarchy are not followed and the reason for that;</i> • <i>pre-development and post-development plans showing the location of onsite habitat (including any irreplaceable habitat) on the <u>relevant date</u>, and drawn to an identified scale and showing the direction of North;</i> • <i>a description of any <u>irreplaceable habitat</u> on the land to which the plan relates which exist on the <u>relevant date</u>, and any part of the development for which planning permission is granted where the onsite habitat of that part is irreplaceable habitat arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat; and</i> • <i>if <u>habitat degradation</u> has taken place:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>a statement to this effect,</i> ○ <i>the date immediately before the degradation activity,</i> | <p><u>date of the tool(s), and showing the calculation of the pre-development onsite value on the relevant date, and post-development biodiversity value;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>a description of arrangements for maintenance and monitoring of habitat enhancement to which paragraph 9(3) of Schedule 7A to the 1990 Act applies (habitat enhancement which must be maintained for at least 30 years after the development is completed);</u> • <u>(except for onsite irreplaceable habitats) a description of how the biodiversity gain hierarchy will be followed and where to the extent any actions (in order of priority) in that hierarchy are not followed and the reason for that;</u> • <u>pre-development and post-development plans showing the location of onsite habitat (including any irreplaceable habitat) on the relevant date, and drawn to an identified scale and showing the direction of North;</u> • <u>a description of any irreplaceable habitat on the land to which the plan relates which exist on the relevant date, and any part of the development for which planning permission is granted where the onsite habitat of that part is irreplaceable habitat arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat; and</u> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>the completed biodiversity tool showing the calculation of the biodiversity value of the onsite habitat on that date, and</i> ○ <i>any available supporting evidence for the value.</i> <p><i>There is a standard <u>Biodiversity Gain Plan template</u> available to complete which brings together many of these matters into one document.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph: 035 Reference ID: 74-035-20240214</i></p> <p><u>Significant on-site enhancements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Any significant on-site enhancements need to be managed and monitored for 30 years from the completion of development via a Habitat Management Monitoring Plan (HMMP). ● The presence of significant on-site enhancements will need to be agreed with the Councils as part of the Biodiversity Gain Plan. ● Management and monitoring requirements for significant on-site enhancements need to be secured by planning obligation (or possibly a separate HMMP condition). This must be finalised before the discharge of the BGP. <p><u>Registered off-site biodiversity gains</u></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>if habitat degradation has taken place:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ <u>a statement to this effect,</u> □ <u>the date immediately before the degradation activity,</u> □ <u>the completed biodiversity tool showing the calculation of the biodiversity value of the onsite habitat on that date, and</u> □ <u>any available supporting evidence for the value.</u> <p><u>There is a standard Biodiversity Gain Plan template available to complete which brings together many of these matters into one document.</u></p> <p>a statement as to whether the applicant believes that planning permission, if granted, would be subject to the biodiversity gain condition; the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat on the date of application (or an earlier date) including the completed metric calculation tool used showing the calculations, the publication date and version of the biodiversity metric used to calculate that value; where the applicant wishes to use an earlier date, the proposed earlier date and the reasons for proposing that date; a statement confirming whether the biodiversity value of the onsite habitat is lower on the date of application (or an earlier date) because of the carrying on of activities ('degradation') in which case the value is to be taken as immediately</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Advice on off-site net gains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-site net gains relate to any biodiversity units recorded in the off-site unit tabs of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool (i.e. not in the red line boundary). • The Small Sites Metric – Calculation Tool cannot be used for biodiversity gain condition where off-site units are required, as there is no off-site option site option within the metric. • Off-site units could relate to securing biodiversity units in blue line boundary land within the applicant’s control or with an off-site habitat bank delivery body registered on the biodiversity gain site register. • Off-site units in blue boundary land will require a legal agreement with the Council to be secured. • Off-site units with a registered off-site habitat bank delivery body will already have a legal agreement in place with the relevant LPA or responsible body. • All off-site net gains must be registered on the biodiversity gain site register and allocated to the development: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/register-a-biodiversity-gain-site. This requires the following information to be submitted on registration: • the title deeds or lease agreement to prove ownership | <p>before the carrying on of the activities, and if degradation has taken place supporting evidence of this;</p> <p>a description of any irreplaceable habitat (as set out in column 1 of the Schedule to the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations [2024]) on the land to which the application relates, that exists on the date of application, (or an earlier date); and</p> <p>a plan, drawn to an identified scale which must show the direction of North, showing onsite habitat existing on the date of application (or and earlier date), including any irreplaceable habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Registered off-site biodiversity gains</u>The Environment Act sets out that the Biodiversity Gain Plan should cover: • <u>Off-site net gains relate to any biodiversity units recorded in the off-site unit tabs of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool (i.e. not in the red line boundary).</u> • <u>The Small Sites Metric – Calculation Tool cannot be used for biodiversity gain condition where off-site units are required, as there is no off-site option site option within the metric.</u> • <u>Off-site units could relate to securing biodiversity units in blue line boundary land within the applicant’s control or with an off-site habitat bank delivery body registered on the biodiversity gain site register.</u> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>written authorisation</u> from the landowner or leaseholder if you're applying on their behalf • a document or image showing the land boundary – this must not include any personal information, like a landowner's name • a <u>legal agreement</u> that secures the land for at least 30 years – this must be a planning obligation (Section 106 agreement) or conservation covenant • completed <u>statutory biodiversity metric tool</u> calculations that include information about all the land secured by the legal agreement • a <u>habitat management and monitoring plan</u> (this may be within your legal agreement) • a <u>local land charge search certificate</u> <p>What is required as part of the biodiversity gain plan where off-site units are proposed:</p> <p><u>Option 1 - Off-site units proposed in blue line boundary land</u></p> <p>A legal agreement (i.e. s.106 agreement) will be required to be secured as part of the application or the biodiversity gain plan, to secure the management and monitoring of the biodiversity units for 30 years from completion of development. Once agreed, the off-site units should be registered and allocated to the development prior to the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Off-site units in blue boundary land will require a legal agreement with the Council to be secured.</u> • <u>Off-site units with a registered off-site habitat bank delivery body will already have a legal agreement in place with the relevant LPA or responsible body.</u> • <u>All off-site net gains must be registered on the biodiversity gain site register and allocated to the development:</u> https://www.gov.uk/guidance/register-a-biodiversity-gain-site. This requires the following information to be submitted on registration: • <u>the title deeds or lease agreement to prove ownership</u> • <u>written authorisation from the landowner or leaseholder if you're applying on their behalf</u> • <u>a document or image showing the land boundary – this must not include any personal information, like a landowner's name</u> • <u>a legal agreement that secures the land for at least 30 years – this must be a planning obligation (Section 106 agreement) or conservation covenant</u> • <u>completed statutory biodiversity metric tool calculations that include information about all the land secured by the legal agreement</u> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><i>Note: As this is a significant commitment for both LPA and applicant, Place Services have flagging when applications include off-site units in blue line boundary at application stage. Suggesting that alternative options should be explored as part of the biodiversity gain plan.</i></p> <p><u>Option 2 – Off-site Habitat Bank where an agreement is already in place</u> The applicant will just need to demonstrate that the site has been allocated to the registered off-site habitat bank on the biodiversity gain site register. See the ‘allocation section’ for the example Habitat Bank: <u>BNG: Biodiversity gain site records</u>.</p> <p>The LPA / ecology consultee should still confirm that they support the approach in principle, prior to the discharge of the biodiversity gain plan. A signed agreement is not necessarily required if the biodiversity units have been allocated on the register.</p> <p><u>Option 3 - Off-site Habitat Bank where an agreement is not in place</u> In the circumstances where the applicant would like certainty that the off-site approach will be agreed by the LPA before securing off-site habitat units, it is recommended that an agreement in principle is provided by applicant and the off-site provider that the off-site option can be delivered.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>a habitat management and monitoring plan (this may be within your legal agreement)</u> • <u>a local land charge search certificate</u> <p><u>What is required as part of the biodiversity gain plan where off-site units are proposed:</u></p> <p>- <u>Option 1 - Off-site units proposed in blue line boundary land</u> <u>A legal agreement (i.e. s.106 agreement) will be required to be secured as part of the application or the biodiversity gain plan, to secure the management and monitoring of the biodiversity units for 30 years from completion of development. Once agreed, the off-site units should be registered and allocated to the development prior to the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition.</u></p> <p>- <u>Option 2 – Off-site Habitat Bank where an agreement is already in place</u> <u>The applicant will just need to demonstrate that the site has been allocated to the registered off-site habitat bank on the biodiversity gain site register. See the ‘allocation section’ for the example Habitat Bank: BNG: Biodiversity gain site records.</u></p> <p>- <u>The LPA / ecology consultee should still confirm that they support the approach in principle, prior to the discharge of the biodiversity gain plan. A</u></p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>This could be submitted by email or covering letter, alongside the completed Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool and other required BNG information.</p> <p>The proposals can then be reviewed by the LPA / ecology consultee to confirm that they support the approach in principle. Once confirmation has been received, the applicant will just need to demonstrate that the site has been allocated to the registered off-site habitat bank prior to the discharge of the biodiversity gain plan. A signed agreement is not necessarily required if the biodiversity units have been allocated on the register.</p> <p><u>Statutory Biodiversity Credits</u> Statutory Biodiversity Credits are a last resort option to be secured via the Government and are completely separate to off-site biodiversity gains. See further information: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/statutory-biodiversity-credits</p> <p>How to prove statutory credits are needed: The developer will need to include the following in their biodiversity gain plan when using statutory credits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that they considered on-site BNG and the reasons why this is not possible. | <p><u>signed agreement is not necessarily required if the biodiversity units have been allocated on the register.</u></p> <p>- <u>Option 3 - Off-site Habitat Bank where an agreement is not in place</u> <u>In the circumstances where the applicant would like certainty that the off-site approach will be agreed by the LPA before securing off-site habitat units, it is recommended that an agreement in principle is provided by applicant and the off-site provider that the off-site option can be delivered. This could be submitted by email or covering letter, alongside the completed Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Calculation Tool and other required BNG information.</u></p> <p>- <u>The proposals can then be reviewed by the LPA / ecology consultee to confirm that they support the approach in principle. Once confirmation has been received, the applicant will just need to demonstrate that the site has been allocated to the registered off-site habitat bank prior to the discharge of the biodiversity gain plan. A signed agreement is not necessarily required if the biodiversity units have been allocated on the register.</u></p> <p><u>Statutory Biodiversity Credits</u> <u>Statutory Biodiversity Credits are a last resort option to be secured via the Government and are separate to off-site biodiversity gains. See further</u></p> |
|--|--|---|

- Evidence that the developer **approached 3 local or national suppliers**, habitat banks or trading websites and that insufficient off-site options are available in England. For example, correspondence emails or a PDF download showing a marketplace search.

Evidence for small numbers of statutory credits:

If a developer needs less than 0.25 biodiversity units (area or linear), they can buy statutory credits without approaching 3 local or national suppliers.

How to work out the number of credits required:

There is a 'unit shortfall tab' with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Tiers 'A1' to 'A5' refer to area habitats, tier 'H' refers to hedgerow, and 'W' to watercourse habitats). This does not include the off-site spatial multiplier and should only be used for working out the number of statutory credits required. See below:

| Unit Shortfall by Tier/Module | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Tier | Unit Shortfall |
| A1 | 0.00 |
| A2 | 0.00 |
| A3 | 0.00 |
| A4 | 0.00 |
| A5 | 0.00 |
| H | 0.00 |
| W | 0.00 |

information:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/statutory-biodiversity-credits>

How to prove statutory credits are needed:

The developer will need to include the following in their biodiversity gain plan when using statutory credits:

- Evidence that they considered on-site BNG and the reasons why this is not possible.
- Evidence that the developer **approached 3 local or national suppliers**, habitat banks or trading websites and that insufficient off-site options are available in England. For example, correspondence emails or a PDF download showing a marketplace search.

Evidence for small numbers of statutory credits:

If a developer needs less than 0.25 biodiversity units (area or linear), they can buy statutory credits without approaching 3 local or national suppliers.

How to work out the number of credits required:

There is a 'unit shortfall tab' with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Tiers 'A1' to 'A5' refer to area habitats, tier 'H' refers to hedgerow, and 'W' to watercourse habitats). This does not include the off-site spatial multiplier and should only be used

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Therefore, where developers have gone down the statutory credit route, the LPA / ecology consultee must double check the 'unit shortfall tab' against the statutory credit proof of purchase as part of the biodiversity gain condition.</p> <p>If there are less credits being proposed, then this will not be acceptable and further information will be required before the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition. If more credits are being proposed, then Natural England have stated that there will be no refunds as part of the process.</p> <p>How to developers should approach buying statutory biodiversity credits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Check the cost of statutory biodiversity credits</u> to work out the total cost. 2. You should contact the LPA to discuss buying statutory biodiversity credits as part of your overall BNG strategy. 3. Your LPA should confirm that you can use statutory credits before you buy them. 4. <u>Apply to purchase credits</u>. It can take up to 8 weeks to approve your application. 5. If your application is approved, you will receive an invoice for the total price of credits. 6. Pay for the credits. 7. Submit your proof of purchase with the biodiversity gain plan. | <p><u>for working out the number of statutory credits required</u></p> <p>- <u>If there are less credits being proposed, then this will not be acceptable, and further information will be required before the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition. If more credits are being proposed, then Natural England have stated that there will be no refunds as part of the process.</u></p> <p>- <u>How to developers should approach buying statutory biodiversity credits:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Check the cost of statutory biodiversity credits to work out the total cost.</u> 2. <u>You should contact the LPA to discuss buying statutory biodiversity credits as part of your overall BNG strategy.</u> 3. <u>Your LPA should confirm that you can use statutory credits before you buy them.</u> 4. <u>Apply to purchase credits. It can take up to 8 weeks to approve your application.</u> 5. <u>If your application is approved, you will receive an invoice for the total price of credits.</u> 6. <u>Pay for the credits.</u> 7. <u>Submit your proof of purchase with the biodiversity gain plan.</u> |
|--|--|--|

