

# **IPSWICH LOCAL PLAN**

## **EXAMINATION OF:**

***the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan  
Document Review***

***and***

***the Site Allocations and Policies (incorporating IP-  
One Area Action Plan) Development Plan Document***

*Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI – Inspector  
Annette Feeney – Programme Officer*

**The Examination will take place in two stages. Stage 1 will consider the legal and strategic issues addressed in the two Matters listed below, primarily concerning the Duty to Co-operate and policies CS6, CS7, CS11 and CS13.**

**If, following the Stage 1 hearing sessions, I conclude that in relation to these issues the DPDs (ie “the plan”) are likely to be capable of being found legally compliant and sound (having regard to the potential for me to recommend modifications) Stage 2 will then commence. Stage 2 will consider all other matters relating to the plan.**

## **STAGE 1 - MATTERS AND QUESTIONS**

### **Matter 1 - Legal Requirements, Duty to Co-operate and Cross-Boundary Issues**

- 1.1 Are the likely environmental, social and economic effects of the plan adequately and accurately assessed in the Habitats Regulations Assessments and the Sustainability Appraisals (SAs)? Do the SAs test the plan against all reasonable alternatives?
- 1.2 Is the plan compliant with:
  - (a) the Local Development Scheme?
  - (b) the Statement of Community Involvement?
  - (c) the 2004 Act and the 2012 Regulations?

- 1.3 Has the Council engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with all relevant organisations on strategic matters of relevance to the plan's preparation, as required by the Duty to Co-operate?
- 1.4 Does the plan provide effective outcomes in terms of cross-boundary issues? In particular, is the approach of policies CS2 and CS7 that 3,378 dwellings will be provided for by working with neighbouring local authorities later in the plan period (in line with policy CS6) soundly based and in accordance with national policy? Is there sufficient certainty that these housing needs will be provided for? If you consider that the plan is not sound in this respect could it be modified to make it so?

## **Matter 2 – Objectively Assessed Needs for Housing and Employment Land**

- 2.1 Is the identified objectively-assessed need (OAN) for housing of 13,550 new dwellings (an average of 677 per year), as set out in policy CS7, soundly based and supported by robust and credible evidence? In particular:
  - (a) Does the OAN take appropriate account of the 2012-based CLG Household Projections?
  - (b) Does the OAN appropriately consider the likelihood of past trends in migration and household formation continuing in the future?
  - (c) Does the OAN take appropriate account of 'market signals'?
  - (d) Is the OAN appropriately aligned with forecasts for jobs growth?
  - (e) Does the OAN take appropriate account of the need to ensure that the identified requirement for affordable housing is delivered?
- 2.2 Is the plan clear as to the identified need for additional pitches for gypsies and travellers (policy CS11) and is the identified need soundly based and supported by robust and credible evidence?
- 2.3 The soundness of proposals for the Ipswich Garden Suburb and the land allocations for housing set out in policy SP2 (and the case for 'omission sites') will be considered at Stage 2 of the Examination. However, on the basis of the plan as submitted, is it realistic that they would provide for:
  - (a) A supply of specific deliverable sites to meet the housing requirement for five years from the point of adoption?
  - (b) A supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10 from the point of adoption?If you contend that the plan would not provide for either (a) or (b) above (or both) could it be appropriately modified to address this?

2.4 The soundness of individual employment sites set out in policies CS13 and SP5 will be considered at Stage 2 of the Examination. However, on the basis of the plan as submitted, is policy CS13's aim of encouraging the provision of approximately 12,500 jobs soundly based and supported by robust and credible evidence?