
WRITTEN STATEMENT

IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL CORE STRATEGY AND POLICIES DPD REVIEW

EXAMINATION HEARING SESSIONS JUNE 2016

MATTER 9 – TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY (INCLUDING IN THE IP-ONE AREA)

PREPARED ON BEHALF OF
CREST NICHOLSON

June 2016

WRITTEN STATEMENT TO
IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL
CORE STRATEGY AND POLICIES DPD REVIEW
EXAMINATION HEARING SESSIONS JUNE 2016
MATTER 9 –TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY
(INCLUDING IN THE IP-AREA)

Prepared on behalf of
Crest Nicholson

June 2016

Project Ref:	24013/A5/Hearing Statements
Status:	Final
Issue/Rev:	01
Date:	23 June 2016
Prepared by:	LN
Checked by:	HA
Authorised by:	HA

Barton Willmore LLP
The Observatory
Southfleet Road
Swanscombe
Kent
DA10 0DF

Tel: 01322 374660
Email: huw.edwards@bartonwillmore.co.uk

Ref: 24013/A5/LN/kf
Date: 23 June 2016

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore LLP.

All Barton Willmore stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

1.0	INTRODUCTION	01
2.0	RESPONSE TO MATTER 9 – TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY (INCLUDING IN THE IP-ONE AREA)	03

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Written Statement has been prepared on behalf of Crest Nicholson in respect of Matter 9 of the Inspector's Stage 2 Matters and Questions for the Core Strategy and Policies DPD Review (CSP DPD Review).
- 1.2 Crest Nicholson has control of the northern parcel of Ipswich Garden Suburb (IGS) known as 'Henley Gate', which is allocated under Policy CS10 of CSP DPD for mixed-use development. An IGS Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared by Ipswich Borough Council (IBC), and interim 'adoption' took place in September 2014. Full adoption of the SPD will not take place until the revised CSP DPD has been adopted. This Statement is prepared with due regard to the allocation of the Ipswich Garden Suburb (IGS) under Policy CS10 of the CSP DPD Review.
- 1.3 Crest Nicholson has control of the northern parcel of IGS, known as 'Henley Gate', and an Outline planning application was submitted on 22 June 2016 for the following:

Mixed use development comprising up to 1,100 residential dwellings (C3); a local centre inc. up to 250sqm (net) of convenience floor space (A1), up to 300sqm of comparison floorspace (A1), up to 250sqm in use classes A1-A5; and up to 500sqm community centre (D1); provision of land for a primary school (D1); provision of sports facilities, Country Park (inc. visitor centre- D1); and open space (inc. amenity space/children's play areas and allotments), sustainable urban drainage systems; and associated landscaping, infrastructure and engineering/earthworks; and the creation of 2No. new vehicular accesses from Henley Road, 1No. vehicular access from Westerfield Road (to serve Country Park only), pedestrian/cycle bridge over railway (access only), vehicular bridge over railway (access only).

- 1.4 A Site Boundary Plan (**Ref. AA203-2001 Rev D**) is enclosed at **Appendix A**.
- 1.5 The remaining phases of IGS are referred to as 'Fonnereau' and 'Red House' within the IGS SPD (2014). 'Fonnereau' is controlled by CBRE, however Mersea Homes has a Promotional Agreement in place. Mersea Homes also own 'Red House' (with the exception of land owned by Ipswich School).
- 1.6 CBRE/Mersea Homes submitted a planning application for 'Fonnereau' in July 2014 (Ref. 14/00638/OUTFUL). That site totals 43ha and is located directly south of the railway line. The application seeks Outline planning permission for 815 dwellings, a district centre, a primary school, vehicular accesses, amenity space and infrastructure. The application is currently under consideration by IBC.

- 1.7 Red House is the only parcel not currently subject to a planning application.
- 1.8 Matter 9 relates the soundness of the policies within the CSP DPD Review and Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-One Action Area Plan) Development Plan Document (SAP DPD) relevant to transport and accessibility.
- 1.9 This Hearing Statement has been prepared with due regard to the tests of 'soundness', as set out in Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), namely:
- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
 - **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
 - **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
 - **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

2.0 RESPONSE TO MATTER 9 – TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY (INCLUDING IN THE IP-ONE AREA)

- 2.1 **Policy CS5: Improving Accessibility** – This Policy requires development to be located and designed to minimise the need to travel and to enable access safely and conveniently on foot, by bicycle and by public transport (bus and rail). This Policy confirms that IBC will support implementation of the Travel Ipswich scheme and work with the Highway Authority to manage travel demand in Ipswich. This Policy is therefore supported.
- 2.2 **Policy CS20: Key Transport Proposals** – This Policy states that the Council supports the Travel Ipswich Scheme which aims to reduce dependency on the private car by 15% within the lifetime of the Plan. This is supported.
- 2.3 **Policy DM17: Transport and Access in New Developments** – This Policy sets out measures to promote sustainable growth in Ipswich and reduce the impact of traffic congestion.
- 2.4 Part c. seeks to incorporate electric charging points where this would be consistent with the scale and location of the development. It is not considered that the provision of electric charging points are necessary for a development to come forward in a sustainable way. In addition, IBC has not considered the viability implications of such as requirement. Part c. is not considered to be 'justified' and is therefore 'unsound'.
- 2.5 Part f. seeks new developments to have safe and convenient access to public transport within 400m. This is not considered necessary for all development sites. Notably, this Policy does not take into account sites that are within reasonable walking distance of local services and would not therefore necessarily need to be within 400m of public transport. The Policy should therefore be reworded to reflect individual site circumstances to ensure it is 'justified' and 'effective'.
- Policy DM18: Car and Cycle Parking** – This Policy proposes to move away from maximum parking standards and seeks to ensure developments comply with the adopted standards of car and cycle parking adopted by the County Council. This is supported.