

Appendix A: Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the 'List'

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

The table below lists the consultation responses to the consultation on the draft Local Validation List (Friday 8 December 2023 to Friday 2 February 2024), along with the officer response/consideration of those comments, and a summary of the changes made to the Local Validation List.

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
<p>Badger Building (E.Anglia)Ltd (Edward Gilder)</p>	<p>Good afternoon - I have been through the draft update of the validation list. The requirements are well set out and the proposed links will be helpful.</p> <p>However, whilst having the information submitted with the application is useful for officers when considering applications, in too many instances the availability of information is ignored when decision notices are drafted and conditions imposed requiring the submission of additional information, when with a bit of discovery, the information conditioned for resubmission could be found in the documents accompanying the application.</p> <p>This is hugely frustrating and a waste of time and effort. Can it pleased be impressed on officers that before imposing conditions they check submitted information carefully to ensure that what they are requesting really hasn't been previously submitted.</p>	<p>These comments are not specifically about the content or requirements set by the Local Validation List.</p>
<p>Bromeswell Parish Council (Verity Brown)</p>	<p>Having spent a very long time going through both the old 2020 document and the proposed new one I can find nothing in the changes to specifically comment on.</p> <p>I had hoped to have been able to pull up the documents side-by-side and compared like for like but the new one is just so different, that easier route was just not possible. Whilst I appreciate the documents have to be long, it is really difficult for those of us who volunteer to be on Parish Councils, with no expertise to draw on, to adequately respond to this kind of document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Local Validation List has to be long, due to the nature of the subject matter and the need for it to list and explain all of the documents and drawings that can potentially be required for applications.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
<p>Dennington Parish Council (Robert Wardley)</p>	<p>Following our conversation this morning in connection with the draft Local Validation List document I wish to make the following comment.</p> <p>I know you have spent a considerable amount of time producing the document and it must be rewarding to find its nearing completion, however, please can you consider making the following changes.</p> <p>In various parts of the document there are references to non acceptable documents and plans, where this is so, please could you add adjacent to these references an example what will be acceptable in the pre applications this could be in the form of additional plans and wording.</p>	<p>The recommendation to include acceptable as well as non-acceptable examples of plans is a good idea.</p> <p>There was already an example of an acceptable drawing for the Joinery and Window Details section.</p> <p>An additional example will be added with the Site Location Plan.</p>
<p>East Suffolk Council (Planning Policy)</p>	<p><u>Floorspace (Caroline)</u> Could it be noted that we often have difficulty monitoring changes in non-residential floorspace as the floorspace is not entered into the application form. From the applicants point of view there is no ‘change’ in floorspace i.e. there is 100sqm before development and 100sqm after development. But for our purposes there could be a loss of 100sqm from retail floorspace to office floorspace. Again plans/planning statements/officer reports do not state the floorspace.</p> <p><u>Health Impact Assessments (Jazz)</u> The Health Impact Assessment validation requirements are recommended to be updated in the following respects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The validation requirement thresholds brought into alignment with the latest version of Planning in Health (‘the Health Protocol’), which is the agreed engagement protocol between the Norfolk and Waveney ICB, the Local Planning Authorities in the Norfolk and Waveney area (including the former Waveney area but not former Suffolk Coastal area), Public Health Norfolk, and Public Health Suffolk. Bringing the validation requirements into alignment with the engagement thresholds mean that all discussions between East Suffolk case officers and the above listed health partners will 	<p><u>Floorspace</u> A requirement for all applications to have floor plans annotated with numerical floorspace area figures or for a separate document listing those figures would not be a reasonable requirement, because in most cases the specific floorspace numerical figures are not material to the determination or outcome of applications for changes of use or extensions or non-residential schemes. Therefore, the inclusion of this would not meet the test for it to be a reasonable requirement within a Local Validation List.</p> <p>However, text has been added to the section on Floor Plans suggesting the inclusion of numerical floorspace figures can be useful.</p> <p><u>Health Impact Assessments</u></p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>be supported by a Health Impact Assessment (as the application would require it to be valid). This will help to improve communication between ourselves and health partners by acting as a shared resource that can be pointed to (which will be further supported by the forthcoming East Suffolk Healthy Environments Supplementary Planning Document once adopted) and directly addressed in verbal and written communication. Bringing the thresholds into alignment would have the effect of lowering the thresholds for validation, and therefore requiring Health Impact Assessments for more major developments in East Suffolk, supporting and aligning with the organisations increased focus on health, wellbeing and inclusivity for the district’s resident communities.</p> <p>The revised matched thresholds are therefore recommended to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A housing development of 50 dwellings or more [the Validation List currently has the threshold of 100 dwellings] • A development of less than 50 dwellings but which is still deemed to potentially impact on health services significantly [this is stronger and more open than the Validation List’s current “Schemes involving the loss of, or creation, or expansion of health care facilities”] • A development that includes care homes, housing for the elderly, or student accommodation [this scopes in housing for older people without an element of care and student accommodation – we could actually stick to our criteria here as this scope may be too broad] • A development that involves the significant loss of public open space [the Validation List does not currently include this] • Any other type of development that could have significant health implications [The addition of the latter criterion is particularly valuable, as this provides the case officer with the discretion to require a Health Impact Assessment outside of these thresholds if they have reasonable grounds to think this would be useful and appropriate to require as a validation requirement in the determination of the application]. 	<p>The need for a Health Impact Assessment for applications which include care home/ care facility or student accommodation was also included in the comments from the NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care Board. As stated in response to their comments these have been added into the Local Validation List.</p> <p>The other changes recommended here in relation to Health Impact Assessments are reasonable and would meet the requirements of what is reasonable within a Local Validation List.</p> <p>Therefore, all of the changes recommended here in relation to Health Impact Assessments have been made to the Local Validation List.</p> <p><u>Custom and Self Build Delivery Statement</u> The inclusion of a Custom and Self Build Delivery Statement is reasonable and sensible, given the requirements of Planning Policy and the emerging Supplementary Planning Document which is to be adopted later this year.</p> <p>It has therefore been added to the Local Validation List with a caveat that the requirement for submission to only come into effect once the Supplementary Planning Document is adopted.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, regardless of the fact that the engagement protocol is not agreed for supporting development in the whole of the East Suffolk district area, these matched validation requirements would be expected to apply to the whole of the East Suffolk district area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 2.219 could be more positive in its wording by adding in something along the lines • of “and identify opportunities for addressing health challenges of development sites through the planning and design approach used for the development, particularly in relation to housing, streets, open space, infrastructure and shared facilities”. • Para 2.222 – “East Suffolk Council as Local Planning Authority is currently developing a Healthy Environments Supplementary Planning Document. As that moves towards adoption that should be greater considerations and once adopted that document must be considered as part of any Health Impact Assessment”. This could be amended to be clearer – the Healthy Environments SPD’s guidance should be used to inform the HIA process. Also it’s probably worth bringing to the reader’s attention that the document includes specific guidance on the proposed structure/use of HIA tools. This includes the recommendation that – for now – the HUDU Rapid HIA tool is used unless something more bespoke is needed (‘desktop’ or ‘full’ HIA, which would be expected to be more in-depth – to be agreed on a case by case basis). This is intended to be later superseded by a Suffolk-wide template HIA tool – once adopted the use of this tool will be required to be used in order for applications to be validated, rather than the HUDU HIA template tool. • Further information can be found via the following – add the HUDU tool link here, link to the Healthy Environments SPD, East Suffolk Open Spaces Assessment, East Suffolk Play Area Strategy, East Suffolk Cycling & Walking Strategy, East Suffolk 	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Air Quality reports (annual), a link to Public Health Suffolk’s annual Public Health reports, and a link to OHID’s public health profiles dashboard.</p> <p><u>Custom and Self Build (Anthony)</u> We are currently preparing the Custom and Self-build Housing SPD, a draft of which can be viewed here: https://eastssuffolk.inconsult.uk/CSB0823DRAFT/consultationHome. At paragraph 2.6 of the draft SPD, we set out the need for applications that seek to secure the principle of custom and self-build housing to submit a Custom and Self-build Delivery Statement (e.g. outline and full planning applications involving custom and self-build housing). A template of the Custom and Self-build Delivery Statement is provided at Appendix 2 of the draft SPD, and below. Between now and adoption of the SPD there may be some changes to the delivery statement. However, we can work with you to ensure the correct version of the delivery statement is included within the Local Validation List. We plan to adopt the SPD at Cabinet on the 7 May 2024.</p> <p>Custom and Self-build Delivery Statement Template: Please write answers to the following questions in the corresponding textboxes. The text in italics within each textbox below are examples of potential answers.</p> <p>1. How do you intend to deliver the home/s as custom and self-build housing?</p> <div data-bbox="414 986 1429 1098" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><i>e.g. I’m going to build the home myself and live in it.</i> <i>Or</i> <i>I’m going to service the plots and sell them with outline planning permission.</i></p> </div> <p>1. What type of custom and self-build housing is proposed? (please tick as many that apply)</p> <div data-bbox="414 1241 1417 1348" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>a) Self-build (DIY) – Serviced plot/s provided to initial occupants, who design and construct the home/s primarily by themselves, with the aid of technical experts (e.g. architect, electrician, plumber) where necessary/appropriate.</p> </div>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>b) Self-build (commission) – Serviced plot/s provided to initial occupant/s, who design the home either by themselves or with an architect, and commission the construction of their home. Initial occupants may undertake some minor construction work themselves, but it is mostly constructed by others.</p> <p>c) Custom-build (individual) – A developer provides a selection of customisable house types and design and layout options from which the initial occupants choose their home. Initial occupants will usually not undertake any of the construction work themselves.</p> <p>d) Custom-build (group) – Housing whereby groups of households come together as intentional communities to design and deliver, or commission professionals to design and deliver, housing which they will live in.</p> <p>e) Custom-build (co-housing) – Housing whereby groups of households come together as intentional communities to collectively design and deliver, or commission professionals to design and deliver, housing which they will live in. This usually involves an element of communal living, such as for example a communal building within the housing development and/or communal amenity space shared by all residents.</p> <p>f) Custom-build (self-finish/shell) – Housing built as a watertight shell by a developer, the internal layout of which is then designed and finished by the initial occupant. This type of housing will not provide initial occupants with an input into the built form and external appearance of the home.</p> <p>g) Other</p> <p>1. How many custom and self-build houses are proposed? <input data-bbox="416 1166 1171 1206" type="text" value="e.g. One / two / three / etc"/></p> <p>How does the custom and self-build house/s qualify as custom and self-build housing,</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>as defined in section 1 of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended)?</p> <p>Section 1 of the 2015 Act states: “1(A1) In this Act “self-build and custom housebuilding” means the building or completion by—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individuals, • (b) associations of individuals, or • (c) persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, of houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals. <p>(A2) But it does not include the building of a house on a plot acquired from a person who builds the house wholly or mainly to plans or specifications decided or offered by that person.”</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance (2021, paragraph 016) states that initial occupants must have a primary input into the final design and layout of the home. Please set out in the following text box how the proposed custom and self-build housing will meet the legal definition.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><i>e.g. I am proposing to commission the servicing of 3 plots of land (in accordance with sections 1 and 5 of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015). After achieving outline planning permission each plot of land will be sold to an initial occupant, who will secure reserved matters permission for the design of the houses.</i></p> </div> <p>1. Where affordable housing is required/proposed, the Council expects affordable housing to be delivered as non-custom and self-build housing. Affordable Housing is defined in the NPPF Glossary (2023). If affordable custom and self-build</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made				
	<p>housing is proposed how will the custom and self-build housing legal definition specified in question 3 be met?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="412 341 786 376"> <tr> <td data-bbox="412 341 600 376">...</td> <td data-bbox="600 341 786 376"></td> </tr> </table> <p>1. Does the description of development for your planning application (as set out in your planning application form) refer to custom and self-build housing, and do you specify the number of custom and self-build homes in the ‘residential units’ section of your planning application form?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="412 632 1429 703"> <tr> <td data-bbox="412 632 1016 703">If no, please explain why. <i>e.g. Yes/No (with explanation)</i></td> <td data-bbox="1016 632 1429 703"></td> </tr> </table> <p>1. Would you be willing to accept a condition and/or section 106 agreement clause confirming the development is for/includes custom and self-build housing? If no, please explain why. <i>e.g. Yes/No (with explanation)</i> We are currently preparing the Custom and Self-build Housing SPD, a draft of which can be viewed here: https://eastsuffolk.inconsult.uk/CSB0823DRAFT/consultationHome. At paragraph 2.6 of the draft SPD, we set out the need for applications that seek to secure the principle of custom and self-build housing to submit a Custom and Self-build Delivery Statement (e.g. outline and full planning applications involving custom and self-build housing). A template of the Custom and Self-build Delivery Statement is provided at Appendix 2 of the draft SPD, and below. Between now and adoption of the SPD there may be some changes to the delivery statement. However, we can work with you to ensure the correct version of the delivery statement is included within the Local Validation List. We plan to adopt the SPD at Cabinet on the 7 May 2024. Custom and Self-build Delivery Statement Template:</p>	...		If no, please explain why. <i>e.g. Yes/No (with explanation)</i>		
...						
If no, please explain why. <i>e.g. Yes/No (with explanation)</i>						

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Please write answers to the following questions in the corresponding textboxes. The text in italics within each textbox below are examples of potential answers.</p> <p>1. How do you intend to deliver the home/s as custom and self-build housing? e.g. I’m going to build the home myself and live in it. Or I’m going to service the plots and sell them with outline planning permission.</p> <p>1. What type of custom and self-build housing is proposed? (please tick as many that apply)</p> <p>a) Self-build (DIY) – Serviced plot/s provided to initial occupants, who design and construct the home/s primarily by themselves, with the aid of technical experts (e.g. architect, electrician, plumber) where necessary/appropriate.</p> <p>b) Self-build (commission) – Serviced plot/s provided to initial occupant/s, who design the home either by themselves or with an architect, and commission the construction of their home. Initial occupants may undertake some minor construction work themselves, but it is mostly constructed by others.</p> <p>c) Custom-build (individual) – A developer provides a selection of customisable house types and design and layout options from which the initial occupants choose their home. Initial occupants will usually not undertake any of the construction work themselves.</p> <p>d) Custom-build (group) – Housing whereby groups of households come together as intentional communities to design and deliver, or commission professionals to design and deliver, housing which they will live in.</p> <p>e) Custom-build (co-housing) – Housing whereby groups of households come together as intentional communities to collectively design and deliver, or commission professionals to design and deliver, housing which they will live in. This usually involves an element of communal living, such as for example a communal building within the housing development and/or communal amenity space shared by all residents.</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>f) Custom-build (self-finish/shell) – Housing built as a watertight shell by a developer, the internal layout of which is then designed and finished by the initial occupant. This type of housing will not provide initial occupants with an input into the built form and external appearance of the home.</p> <p>g) Other</p> <p>1. How many custom and self-build houses are proposed? e.g. One / two / three / etc</p> <p>1. How does the custom and self-build house/s qualify as custom and self-build housing, as defined in section 1 of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended)? Section 1 of the 2015 Act states: “1(A1) In this Act “self-build and custom housebuilding” means the building or completion by—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individuals, • <p>(b) associations of individuals, or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>(c) persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, of houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals.</p> <p>(A2) But it does not include the building of a house on a plot acquired from a person who builds the house wholly or mainly to plans or specifications decided or offered by that person.”</p> <p>The Planning Practice Guidance (2021, paragraph 016) states that initial occupants must have a primary input into the final design and layout of the home. Please set out in the following text box how the proposed custom and self-build housing will meet the legal definition.</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>e.g. I am proposing to commission the servicing of 3 plots of land (in accordance with sections 1 and 5 of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015). After achieving outline planning permission each plot of land will be sold to an initial occupant, who will secure reserved matters permission for the design of the houses.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Where affordable housing is required/proposed, the Council expects affordable housing to be delivered as non-custom and self-build housing. Affordable Housing is defined in the NPPF Glossary (2023). If affordable custom and self-build housing is proposed how will the custom and self-build housing legal definition specified in question 3 be met?</p> <p>...</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Does the description of development for your planning application (as set out in your planning application form) refer to custom and self-build housing, and do you specify the number of custom and self-build homes in the ‘residential units’ section of your planning application form?</p> <p>If no, please explain why.</p> <p>e.g. Yes/No (with explanation)</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Would you be willing to accept a condition and/or section 106 agreement clause confirming the development is for/includes custom and self-build housing? If no, please explain why.</p> <p>e.g. Yes/No (with explanation)</p>	
<p>East Suffolk Council (Nicholas Newton)</p>	<p>In respect of Section 2.5 Arboricultural Assessment and Tree Survey-</p> <p>The numbering sequence is confusing.</p> <p>Otherwise we suggest that the following is relevant to Sections 2.30 and 2.31</p>	<p>All recommended changes to the text are reasonable and have been made.</p> <p>The paragraph numbering was added prior to the consultation purely to enable those commenting to be able to reference particular</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>The following information is expected for all development applications where there are any trees or hedges on the property or on adjoining properties which are within influencing distance of the proposed development.</p> <p>Development proposals involving minor works (such as replacement windows/re-cladding) or development which does not involve any excavation of the ground or pruning of trees (such as alterations/extensions to a roof) will not normally be included.</p> <p>Existing and Proposed Site Plan The existing and proposed site plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The position of all trees within the site with a stem diameter of 75mm or more (measured at 1.5 metres above ground level), and any such trees adjacent to the application site within a distance of up to 12 times their estimated stem diameter; • The crown spreads and Root Protection Areas (RPAs) for any individual trees, and/or the overall extent of canopy and average RPAs for woodlands or substantial tree groups; <p>All trees that are to be removed and/or retained clearly marked.</p> <p>BS 5837:2012 Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment The need and level of information will be dependent on the type and scale of development as well as the quality and value of any affected trees/hedges. A BS 5837:2012 tree survey, undertaken by a suitably qualified arboriculturalist, shall be submitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees on or immediately adjacent to (within 15m of) the application site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order; • Trees on or immediately adjacent to (within 15m of) the application site are within a Conservation Area; 	<p>paragraphs in their comments. The final interactive online version will be broken down into webpages so will likely not have paragraph numbering. However, if a printable pdf version is also to be provided the paragraph numbering issue will be resolved for that document.</p> <p>The recommendations relating to the Arboricultural Assessment and Tree Survey section are appropriate and will be useful in terms of making expectations clear. The suggested changes have been made to the Local Validation List.</p> <p>Similarly, the recommendations relating to trees and the Block/Site Plan, and the recommendation in terms of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and Landscaping details are all appropriate and will be useful in terms of making expectations clear. The suggested changes have been made to the Local Validation List.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Or any trees/hedges on or immediately adjacent to (within 15m of) the application site have any other special merit or importance to the local landscape and the application includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of trees or hedges; • Development within the RPAs and/or crown spreads of retained trees; • Development that may have an impact on trees/hedges within the development site or on adjacent land and/or when trees/hedges may adversely affect a proposed development. <p>Note: If it is considered that the risk to the trees/hedges on or adjacent to the site is low, or if the affected trees/hedges are not of sufficient quality or value to merit a full BS 5837:2012 report, then it shall be for the applicant/agent to demonstrate this, or provide details of a simple tree protection scheme accordingly. It may also be prudent to limit the extent of surveying and tree protection required, for example when dealing with isolated areas of large sites.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE</p> <p>In respect of section 2.41 and 2.42-</p> <p>LVIA</p> <p>-Numbering is slightly confusing – LVIA heading is 2.41 but then text starts at 2.278 -Additional text suggestions below in red: <i>2.278. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is required to validate an application for:</i> <i>o schemes which are likely to have a significant landscape or visual impacts, whether that is due to its scale, location or another factor.</i> <i>o All applications where an Environmental Impact Assessment is required</i></p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>2.279. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment may form part of an environmental statement where a proposal would fall within the guidelines of an environmental impact assessment (EIA) development.</p> <p>2.280. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a description of the site and the landscape context,</i> • <i>evaluation of the landscape sensitivity and the capacity to accommodate incorporate the development,</i> • <i>identification and assessment of landscape effects on landscape character and quality,</i> • <i>identification and assessment of visual effects,</i> • <i>visualisations of proposed development in line with Landscape Institute technical guidance,</i> • <i>measures that would avoid or minimise adverse effects,</i> • <i>where significant adverse effects are unavoidable, consideration of alternatives and why they have been rejected,</i> • <i>methodology of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) with reference to best practice guidance.</i> <p>2.281. <i>It is also recommended that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is submitted for any sites which are covered by an allocation policy that specifically highlights a requirement for scheme of landscape assessment. These allocation policies are located within district level Local Plan documents and Neighbourhood Plans.</i></p> <p>2.282. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be proportionate to the scale of development and in some cases a Landscape and Visual Appraisal will be satisfactory. This should be agreed with the Council before submission.</p> <p>Landscaping details -Numbering is slightly confusing – LVIA heading is 2.42 but then text starts at 2.283</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>-Additional text suggestions below in red:</p> <p>2.283. An Indicative Landscape Masterplan or Landscape Strategy should be submitted for all major applications, minor applications in a sensitive landscape, and Paragraph 80 houses.</p> <p>2.284 Whilst not a specific requirement to validate a planning application It is recommended that landscaping details are supplied up front for all applications for development where soft and/or hard landscaping is to be undertaken, this includes planning applications for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new build dwelling(s), commercial units, agricultural buildings, medical services and community uses, - significant extensions to existing commercial units, agricultural units, medical services and community uses, and and - The conversion of existing buildings to dwelling(s), commercial uses, medical services and community uses. <p>2.2845. The submission of landscaping details with the application is strongly encouraged in order to reduce the potential need for conditions on the consent (if granted) which would then need to be discharged via a discharge of condition application, which can add additional time delays and costs to the construction process.</p> <p>2.2856. Details should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • schedule of proposed planting of trees, hedges and shrubs, • any existing trees and vegetation to be retained, • surface materials for hard landscaping, • boundary treatments, • any excavation or changes in ground level, • planting specification, 	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tree pit details where tree planting is proposed in hard landscaping, • the timescale for implementation, and • proposals for long-term maintenance and landscape management. <p>2.286. In some circumstances, particularly with outline planning applications, applicants may wish to provide a lesser amount of landscaping detail, however in such a case it will need to be acknowledged that full landscaping details will be expected as part of reserved matters applications or as a pre- commencement condition.</p>	
<p>East Suffolk Council (Nicola Biddall)</p>	<p>page 92 2.333 & 334 I think the requirement to show public rights of way on plans should also appear on the requirements for the 2:10 Block Plan/Site 2.7 p 21 as any effect on public rights of way is a material consideration.</p> <p>There is a local information requirement 2.333 & 2.334 which states that, 'Proposals which seek to create or amend public rights of way should include a statement on the creation process proposed and detailed plans of the locations, width and surface proposed.'</p> <p>The process of diverting, creating or extinguishing a right of way is a separate legal process from planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 257 or 258 and all those details of location, width and surface will be provided when a Public Path Order is applied for and will be looked at by the Highway Authority for Suffolk, Suffolk County Council Rights of Way, and the relevant officer at East Suffolk Public Path Orders or relevant colleague in Babergh Mid Suffolk processing the order under the provision of the rights of way services agreement. Therefore it is unnecessary in terms of the grant of planning permission for these details to be requested.</p> <p>Following the amendment of Section 257 by the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013, a public path order order may be made in anticipation of planning permission.</p>	<p>The recommended additional to the Block Plan/Site Plan are reasonable. This change has been made to the Local Validation List.</p> <p>The comments on the Rights of Way section of the Local Validation list, are reasonable.</p> <p>Changes have been made to the wording of the Local Validation List to reflect the majority of these comments.</p> <p>However, reference is retained (in an amended form) to the submission of details of works, because these may require planning permission in their own right so it is advisable for applicants to include them within the application, to avoid the need for a further application at a later date.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>However, an order made in advance of planning permission cannot be confirmed by either the authority or the Secretary of State until that permission has been granted. It would be useful to make this information available to developers at the pre app stage</p> <p>An informative on the planning permission letter giving details of who/where to apply to for a Public Path Order or Agreement would be useful but is outside the scope of this consultation.</p>	
<p>East Suffolk Council (Nicola Parrish)</p>	<p>In the Section on CIL - there's wording that is not quite correct! this is because new dwellings or conversion that create new dwellings do not have a threshold that applies.</p> <p><i>For all proposals seeking the creation of additional floorspace for, or a change of use, to a use that is CIL liable and above the floorspace limits set out below</i></p> <p>I would therefore suggest this text is amended as follows: <i>For all proposals seeking the creation of new or additional floorspace, or a change of use, to a use that is CIL liable as set out below:</i></p>	<p>Recommended changes to the text are reasonable and have been made.</p>
<p>East Suffolk Council (Nicola Parrish)</p>	<p>The Section on CIL -at the start it says 2.100. <i>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Additional Information form is required -</i> It is also a CIL Form 2 that is required! If anything it is more important as we must have full contact details for the landowners/applicants (as applicable) in order to issue (in a timely manner) the statutory CIL Liability Notices where development is liable for CIL. I therefore suggest 2.1000 is amended as follows: 2.100. <i>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Additional Information form and also CIL Form 2 are required</i> then the section where these two forms are mentioned in detail -- please add</p>	<p>Recommended changes to the text are reasonable and have been made.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>CIL form 2 must contain a contact address, contact phone number and the individuals email address. It is not appropriate to record agent contact details on behalf of clients within the Assumption of Liability details.</p>	
<p>East Suffolk Council (Nicola Parrish)</p>	<p>2.50. Phasing Plan/Schedule Please do not say that development can be phased in order to phase CIL payments!!! Development should only ever be phased because there is a clear planning reason why it needs to be phased. Phasing does have a consequence for CIL but phasing should not be put in to make sure they pay CIL for separate planning phases. EG - self-build housing should all be individual phased developments because it is built at different times! AS a consequence you need to remove references to CIL in this section please.</p>	<p>Recommended changes to the text are reasonable and changes along these lines have been made.</p>
<p>East Suffolk Council - District Cllr Framlingham (Vincent Langdon-Morris)</p>	<p>1.8 Needs to include flooding information</p> <p>1.9 Pre application needs to be public</p> <p>1.19 Planning Portal. Is digital portal fit for purpose? Need for human site visits, ecological assessments by a person. Digital submission is not sufficient.</p> <p>2.21 Amends Variation of conditions. Ban dual applications completely</p> <p>2,29 Flood Zones</p> <p>2,180 These specs are out of date. Raising levels, why? The Dutch are using flood areas / plains in an innovative and effective way.</p> <p>Flood Risk should be a material consideration.</p> <p>2.32 Foul Drainage Assessment</p>	<p>1.8 – this paragraph explains matters that can be potentially covered by Pre-Commencement conditions if details aren’t submitted upfront as part of the application. Flooding is a matter that has to be resolved during the application process.</p> <p>1.9 – This paragraph is simply highlighting that the pre-application process exists. The Local Validation List relates to formal Planning Applications not pre-application submission. There will be a separate consultation on the pre-application process.</p> <p>1.19 – this paragraph lists the types of applications on which ownership certificates are required under the national requirements. The Local List can not go beyond those in requiring</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>2.204 Capacity of local waste water treatment is not exceeded. This is already happening in Framlingham? As per Anglia Water, documented?</p> <p>2.35 Health Impacts - severe flooding and mixing of raw sewage effluent.</p> <p>2.37 Housing Statement</p> <p>2.246 Neighbourhood Plan - affordable housing requirement must be enforced, no exemptions at all.</p> <p>2.47 Odour Assessment - Flooding - mixing with raw sewage, overloading existing systems, interior and exterior smell.</p> <p>2.48 Open Space Assessment</p> <p>2.314 Enhance role and function of identified green space. Used to justify new development, when there are green spaces within 1-2 minutes walk of the proposed site?</p> <p>2.51 Planning Statements</p> <p>2.330 Community Facilities Justification statement ... ACVs</p> <p>2.60 SuDs</p> <p>2.376 Proposed Victoria Mill Rd and Newtide sites in Framlingham must have rigorous examination and implementation of SuDs and other, bunds?</p> <p>2.378 SuD did not protect nearby houses in Framlingham (personal observation) and are exacerbated flooding problems.</p>	<p>ownership certificates for amendment and variation of condition applications. Those application types are seeking changes to an existing consent so ownership declaration has already been made.</p> <p>The National Regulations enable the submission of dual applications, and the LPA can not change national legislation.</p> <p>2.29 – this paragraph relates to arboricultural assessments not flood risk. Flood Risk is a later section. This document can not set material considerations or set planning policy. It is setting out the documentation that can be required to enable the consideration of existing policy and material planning considerations.</p> <p>2.204 – the requirement for means of foul water drainage is covered under another section of the document.</p> <p>Health Impacts Assessments – these are a nationally recognised form of assessment relating to health care provision and impacts upon that. Prevention and mitigation for potential impacts of flooding and raw sewage effluent would be matters for the other documentation listed in this Local Validation List (i.e. the Flood Risk Assessment and Foul Drainage Assessment).</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Infrastructure - mismatch between existing infrastructure in towns and new housing development which then overwhelms infrastructure. This is pointed out consistently by communities / parish / town council</p>	<p>Enforcing neighbourhood Plan and affordable housing requirements – that is not a matter for the Local Validation List.</p> <p>Odour Assessment and requirements in relation to raw sewage, overloading systems etc. The means of foul water disposal would be a matter for a Foul Water Assessment. The requirement for an Odour Assessment is when a proposal has the potential to cause significant levels of odour, so would be required for a new water treatment works. It is also required for sensitive development close to existing sources of odour, so new homes near an existing water treatment plant would require one.</p> <p>2.314 – This paragraph relates to the submission of the landscaping (i.e. trees, shrubs, paving etc) details, not the provision of open space or proximity to open space. The comments submitted appear to be suggesting there should be a policy in terms of proximity to open space but it is not the role of this document to set planning policy.</p> <p>Community Facilities Statement – yes ACVs are community facilities, as set out in the policies which this document directs readers to.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
		<p>It is not the appropriate to comment on specific sites or proposed through this document. However, it should be noted that there have been extreme weather events over the past few months which in turn lead to exceptional flood events. There are SuDs requirements for new developments, and the submission of details of SuDs are required to be submitted as set out in the Local Validation List.</p>
<p>Evolution Town Planning (David Barker)</p>	<p>We have reviewed the draft Local Validation List.</p> <p>We act for both of the owners of the Bentwaters Airfield and the owners of part of the Debach Airfield. We attach plans edged red showing our clients ownerships.</p> <p>We object to the requirement for additional contamination information being required on and MOD land or military bases.</p> <p>We object because the Validation list needs to reflect that while Debach and Bentwaters are former airfields they have been in commercial use for many years. The character of former airfields varies across the District with some in an undeveloped state while others such as Debach and Bentwaters have been significantly developed and used for employment for many years. There needs to be flexibility when preparing planning applications to reflect the difference between developing an existing well established industrial/employment area and developing an undeveloped airfield.</p> <p>For example, military use of Debach ceased around 1948. Debach Airfield has been used by our client’s business Debach Enterprises which is a major East Suffolk haulage and warehousing company working with local businesses such as Notcutts.</p>	<p>The requirements for Land Contamination Assessments within the Local Validation List was drafted on the basis of advice from the ESC Environmental Protection Team, who regularly comment on such matters on planning applications.</p> <p>A consistent approach has to be adopted with all former airfield and MOD sites. No formal evidence has been submitted as to why an exception should be made for these particular former airfields.</p> <p>The development of these two sites has taken place over a number of years, during which the required assessment levels for contamination were lower than under current regulations.</p> <p>Also, due to the nature of some of the uses and when they were proposed, they would also not</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>They have been using the area shown edged red on the attached plan at Debach since 1976. The site is a modern warehouse facility. It has modern drainage infrastructure in place. The developments undertaken over the past 48 years mean that the risk of land contamination is low. There have been no issues of drainage, flood risk, or contamination on the site.</p> <p>Bentwaters is a large employment area, and has been in employment use for many years. It was decommissioned as a military base in 1995 and has been in commercial use from 2001. The site has provided commercial space for many companies and hundreds of employees for a long time. The site has a modern drainage system in place. We have undertaken a large number of planning applications at Bentwaters since 2012 and there have been no issues of drainage, flood risk, or contamination arising from these applications. Since the site wide Masterplan application was approved in December 2015 reference C/10/3239, there has been no need to submit information on contamination as these issues have been addressed.</p> <p>We hope that the above comments will be taken into account. If more information is needed, or if you would like to visit the airfields, please lets us know. We would be grateful if you could contact us when you have had a chance to consider these comments and let us know the Councils response.</p>	<p>necessarily triggered the need for land contamination investigation, and/or the assessments made at those times would not meet todays requirements.</p> <p>Therefore, there could be yet unidentified contamination on these former airfields, which would need to be assessed and considered in the determination of future applications.</p> <p>Therefore, no changes are to be made to the Local Validation List in this regard.</p>
J Elliot	<p>I am writing on behalf of Waldringfield Parish Council. WPC discussed this document at our January meeting and agreed the following comments.</p> <p>We found the new validation list to be very comprehensive & informative but were a little disappointed that our previous suggestion regarding an interactive cross referencing table has not been incorporated.</p> <p>It is very difficult for an applicant to find out which documents are required for specific types of application. The current list of documents, which are in alphabetical</p>	<p>A spreadsheet/grid approach was previously considered by officers, but discounted because it would have to be a very large and complex grid/table, which would be unlikely to fit on a single screen or sheet, because of the significant number of application and proposal types that can be submitted, and the significant number of other factors that can influence what is required such as on site features and designations. As a</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>order, is extremely difficult to navigate unless an applicant already knows which supporting document may be required for the particular type of application they wish to make. We suggested that each of these validation documents are allocated a number. A new, possibly interactive, document could then be created in the form of a table/grid with most/all the types of applications listed on the vertical axis and all of the local validation documents listed by their allocated number across the horizontal axis. The various validation documents required for each type of application could then be indicated by an * in the intersections of the appropriate vertical and horizontal axes. Ideally, the * would link to the actual validation document.</p> <p>The information on such a grid will be easy to read and applicants (and consultees) will be able to identify which documents are required for most types of application.</p> <p>Best regards</p> <p>J Elliot (Vice Chair, Waldringfield Parish Council)</p>	<p>result of its likely size and complexity, it would be unwieldy and very difficult for most people to use, especially on devices with smaller screens.</p> <p>Therefore, a more interactive website style approach with the guidance integrated with the list will be provided on the ESC website.</p>
<p>Melton Parish Council (Pip Alder)</p>	<p>Melton Parish Council discussed this consultation document. It was felt that asking volunteer Councillors, with no formal planning training, to review a 126 page document was unrealistic. They would really appreciate a crib sheet listing the significant changes being proposed by this consultation.</p> <p>Some observations:</p> <p>Air Quality Assessment In most circumstances this will only be required for ‘Major’, but those generating a considerable number of traffic movements to/from the site close to an AQMA and/or generating potential air pollution from the nature/type of activity on site will always require such an assessment.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the Local Validation List has to be long, due to the nature of the subject matter and the need for it to list and explain all of the documents and drawings that can potentially be required for applications.</p> <p>There were a lot of changes from the previous version of the Local Validation list (the count on tracked changes prior to the final amendments ready for consultation shows more than 3,200 revisions, from the 2020 version of the list). Therefore, it is not realistically possible to provide a crib sheet.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Question - What is the definition of 'Major' and 'considerable number of traffic movements'?</p> <p>Biodiversity - why are National Landscapes not referenced?</p> <p>Daylight / Sunlight Assessment When required to validate an application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is required for all applications where the development is likely to have an adverse impact on the current levels of daylight/sunlight enjoyed by adjacent properties or buildings, including associated gardens and amenity space. <p>Question - How is 'likely to have an adverse impact' determined?</p> <p>p25 and p112 references AONB. Needs to change to National Landscape</p>	<p>The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Order) 2015, defines ‘Major’, ‘Minor’ and ‘Other’ types of planning applications.</p> <p>‘Considerable number of traffic movements’ would be dependant upon the proximity of the site to sensitive receptors, the likely type of traffic movements and the nature/type of activity on site. Therefore, it can not be defined in terms of precise numbers, due to the variability in these influencing factors.</p> <p>National Landscapes are no referenced within the Biodiversity section because they are landscape not ecology/bio diversity designations.</p> <p>The likelihood of applications having an adverse impact upon light levels is usually dependant upon height, depth and proximity of the proposal to a boundary and/or receptor (e.g. a window serving a habitable room) and the orientation of the site, the neighbouring properties and the proposal. The BRE standards are commonly recognised as the means to make such an assessment.</p> <p>The draft Local Validation list referred to AONB, rather than the new term of ‘Suffolk and Essex</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
		Coast and Heaths National Landscape’ because the name change occurred after the document had been drafted. The reference to AONB have been replaced with ‘Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape’.
NHS Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care Board (-)	<p>Thank you for consulting the Norfolk and Waveney Integrated Care System, Strategic Estates team on the Local Validation List.</p> <p>Following a review of the documents, I can confirm that the strategic estates function are happy that the following documents are included in the required documentation to validate an application...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Consultation Statement • Community Facilities Justification Statement • Dwelling sizes and tenure plan/schedule • Health Impact Assessment • Phasing Plan • Planning Statement • Site Location Plan <p>These help the NHS understand and model the impact of a potential new development on healthcare services.</p> <p>For applications which involve a care home/care facility or student accommodation, it would be beneficial for the ICB to see a needs assessment from the applicant to understand the requirement/rationale behind these applications.</p>	The recommendation for applications which involve a care home/care facility or student accommodation to include an assessment are noted and this has been added to the Health Impact Assessments section of the Local Validation List.
National Highways	Thank you for your letter, dated 08 December 2023. You have requested our comments on the above-mentioned draft.	The inclusion on the Site Location Plan, of the location of the site in relation to the Strategic Road Network, particularly for schemes close to

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
(Shamsui Hoque)	<p>National Highways is a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority, and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). As such, we have responsibilities for managing the SRN in accordance with the requirements of its licence and in general conformity with the requirements of the Highways Act 1980, and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety.</p> <p>We have reviewed the supporting document titled, East Suffolk Local Validation Requirements – The “Local Validation List”, dated November 2023 Consultation Draft.</p> <p>I have the following comments to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed Development Site’s Location Any proposed development site requires a location. For National Highways we like to understand the nearest Strategic Road Network (SRN) and the SRN junction which will be used by the proposed development site. 2.Trip Distribution While proposed development has forecasted trip generation, then it requires stating how those future development trips will be distributed on the road network. National Highways will be interested to see the peak hours trip distribution and route assignment. Trip generation – how many arrivals/departures in each peak period? Sometimes the information is presented only as a percentage. We like to see the number of future trips for both LGVs and HGVs (where applicable). 3.Consultation Notification For the scoping opinion or any pre-consultation, depending on the development scale and nature, a Transport Assessment (TA) which will be submitted as part of EIA later. We would like to be engaged at an early opportunity, preferably in advance of any application, to comment on the scope and approach to be used in the TA. 	<p>or directly increasing traffic movements on to a junction is reasonable. Therefore, this change has been made to the Site Location Plan requirements in the List.</p> <p>Officers agree that the requirement for a Glint and Glare Assessment should also be added to the Local Validation List. In addition to the requirements recommended by the Highways Agency, it should also be required for locations located alongside or within the vicinity of the local highway network and heliports. These changes have been made to the list.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>4. Traffic Impacts National Highways standard practice is to require junction capacity modelling of developments that add +30 two-way trips in the peak hour to SRN junctions, and that they must provide mitigation where this results in an increase in congestion at overcapacity junctions.</p> <p>As a matter of principle, we would normally start looking for a developer’s Transport Assessment to consider the site’s impact at the SRN if it met one of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was seen as likely to generate more than 30 additional two-way trips in the peak hour at the nearest SRN junction; or • It was physically located so close to an SRN junction that traffic entering and leaving the site could affect the safe and free flowing operation of the SRN junction in question. <p>5. Policy Documents The assessment should be undertaken in accordance with DfT Circular 01/2022 “The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development” or any subsequent version. The document “The strategic road network: Planning for the future (A guide to working with Highways England on planning matters)” and the Planning Practice Guidance PPG (the National Planning Policy Framework NPPF dated December 2023 or any subsequent version) provides additional information.</p> <p>6. Road Safety Audit Requirements Where any mitigation proposed physically interacts with the SRN, National Highways recommends the DMRB design standards and expect that any mitigation scheme to be supported by (where applicable):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appropriate designs and supporting junction modelling. b. Requirements for Safety Risk Assessment (GG104) c. Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment and Review (WCHAR – GG142) d. Stage One Road Safety Audit (GG119) <p>Note: Where the proposed development is related to the Strategic Road Network (SRN), then all these Road Safety Audit are required to complete with National</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Highways recommended format, as guided by the Department of Transport’s standards.</p> <p>7. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) As part of the planning application, we suggest submitting a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The CTMP should include (but not limited to) agreement on travel routes during construction and operation to and from the proposed development site and the nearest Strategic Road Network (SRN) junction, which measures to minimise delivery of construction materials during peak periods.</p> <p>8. Glint and Glare Assessment Where there is a Solar Farm application, it requires a Glint and Glare Assessment report to cover the surrounding road users, especially, where the proposed development site is along the boundary of any Strategic Road Network. In addition, this Glint and Glare should be assessed considering a regular vehicle’s driver’s eye level, as well as for any Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) driver’s eye level too.</p> <p>Note: Glint and Glare Assessment is also applicable for any airport which is located near the proposed solar farm site.</p> <p>I have no other comments to make. Please contact me if you require any further information.</p> <p><u>Standing advice to the local planning authority</u> The Climate Change Committee’s 2022 Report to Parliament notes that for the UK to achieve net zero carbon status by 2050, action is needed to support a modal shift away from car travel. The NPPF supports this position, with paragraphs 73 and 105 prescribing that significant development should offer a genuine choice of transport modes, while paragraphs 104 and 110 advise that appropriate opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport should be taken up.</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Moreover, the build clever and build efficiently criteria as set out in clause 6.1.4 of PAS2080 promote the use of low carbon materials and products, innovative design solutions and construction methods to minimise resource consumption.</p> <p>These considerations should be weighed alongside any relevant Local Plan policies to ensure that planning decisions are in line with the necessary transition to net zero carbon.</p>	
<p>PURE architecture ltd (craigh page)</p>	<p>I am limiting my response to housing.</p> <p>The document is not easy to navigate due to its volume.</p> <p>It appears that projects smaller than '10 dwellings' are not regarded as being so important in their contribution to the local environment. One or two houses can have a worse effect upon a local population when it is at their door. Nine homes that are ill thought out and harmful, seem as though they might have a less onerous planning route than ten homes of an exceptional standard. The measure of what has to be submitted ought not be based upon numbers at all but be determined on a pre-application study that looks specifically at the quality of the design and its 'fit'.</p> <p>In housing specifically, it is hugely disappointing that the same old, (poor) designs are rolled-out with very little regard for materials, (other than brick or render colours). In every other industry engineering has been embraced.</p> <p>There is little regard for a 'family home' nor any aspirations to create inspirational, adaptable living spaces. The mass 'unit' builders are given complete authority to keep building their houses from standard templates with no regard at all for the people who have no choice but to live in them. It is worthless to have such rigorous controls on development when the fundamental basis of their approved and sanctioned designs are flawed.</p>	<p>As explained in the text on the consultation webpage and in the notifying email to consultees, the information was presented in a pdf format to enable consultation on its contents, but a more interactive website style approach with the List and guidance integrated will be provided on the ESC website, so that it easier for users to access the information requirements for their proposed applications.</p> <p>The Validation Process can and should not access the quality of a scheme or proposals. Such assessment is a matter for the determination process of the application with consideration of Planning Policy and material planning considerations.</p> <p>The Validation Process and hence the Local Validation List is purely seeking to ensure sufficient information is submitted with an application to enable the proposals to be assessed through the determination process.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>We should learn from countries that do have good housing for their populations not just keep building more of the same poor standard housing using materials that the house builders are actively encouraged to use.</p> <p>'2.62. Any new residential development (including conversions/sub-division to create additional units) within the Zone of Influence will be required to mitigate the effects of the development and show how this will be achieved prior to approval of planning permission.</p> <p>In smaller development this is most efficiently achieved through payment of the RAMS contribution only. For sites comprising of more than 50 dwellings and in more sensitive locations, a bespoke approach including payment of RAMS and demonstration of on[1]site/off-site mitigation measures may be required.'</p> <p>It was disappointing that the Authority itself refers to the creation of 'units' when homes would seem appropriate.</p> <p>These schemes should not 'mitigate the effects but be compelled to enhance and genuinely improve the environments they are to fit into. It seems that there are very many housing developments that don't have sufficient infrastructure or services to support them yet they gain approval with a simple payment of a CIL 'fee' or other strange contributions that do nothing to improve the quality of the local scheme for the people who live in and around them. The success of a scheme should be judged upon the quality; the proximity of its very local services, and whether the design will encourage neighbours to be aware and engage with each other. All of it missed in the evaluation of a scheme from a planning perspective. We once referred to it as community, not a word I have seen in the document when I passed my eye over it other than in its reference to CIL.</p> <p>'2.142. Based upon national guidance, a design and access statement should: • explain the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the</p>	<p>Therefore, these comments relating to design quality and aspirations for shaping housing development would be appropriate if this was a document setting Local Planning Policy, i.e. a Local Plan or Supplementary Planning Document. They are not matters that can be covered through the Local Validation List as it is not setting Local Planning Policy., for consideration in the determination of applications.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>development, • demonstrate the steps that have been taken to appraise the context of the development and how the design of the development takes that context into account in relation to the proposal.'</p> <p>The National Guidance could fall short. If the context in which a design sits is poor it takes a small amount of effort and cost to raise the bar. The cumulative effect of an opportunity to develop should be to ensure that each area affected by a development is lifted to a point that really makes a difference for the community that is there, and more, allows it to flourish. Houses should provide safety, opportunities to integrate with neighbours and the opportunity for privacy too. Daylight and sunlight should be used within homes more effectively throughout the day in order to reduce the reliance on artificial lighting and, crucially, to provide a perception of the outside environment.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there is little control over the building of these homes and it allows these tiny cells / tiny rooms to be created. It is unsurprising that mental health consequences are being experienced on an ever increasing and ever alarming scale. This seems not though to be a material consideration nor is it required by Government/National Policy. Are we really destined to just keep taking the same old route with the same, increasing negative outcomes?</p> <p>Although apparently comprehensive, the Policy has some serious omissions that nobody, either in local or national government seem to see as relevant to a development assessment.</p>	
Persimmon Homes (Kerry Smith)	<p>Paragraph 2.7 (p16) refers to Biodiversity Gain Plans and notes that this is required for all 'major' developments. According to government guidance, mandatory BNG and Gain Plans should only apply to new outline and full applications, reserved matters pursuant to prior permissions are not in scope and are exempt. This is due to reserved matters not technically being a planning permission upon which to attach the requirement.</p>	<p>There was a known need to revise the whole Biodiversity Net Gain section, as it was drafted in Spring 2023, prior to legislation and guidance being published.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>I also note that many of the paragraph numbers do not match with the headings, which could cause confusion.</p> <p>Many thanks.</p>	<p>This section of the Local Validation List has since been redrafted to refer to the national requirements, and has been reviewed by the ESC Ecology Team. It makes no additional local requirements.</p>
<p>Pigeon Investment Management Ltd (William Page)</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Pigeon has a number of land interests in East Suffolk and welcomes the opportunity to participate in this consultation. Our comments are provided in the interests of facilitating high quality mixed-use sustainable schemes within East Suffolk and maintaining our ongoing collaborative working relationship with the local authority. Whilst we agree with the majority of the proposed changes to the Local Validations List (“LVL”), we feel that a number of subtle changes are necessary to facilitate greater flexibility, particularly in differentiating between different types of planning application.</p> <p><u>2.16 Construction Management Plan/Method Statement</u></p> <p>Though it is not a formal requirement, section 2.16 states that a Construction Management Plan/Method Statement is ‘strongly encouraged in order to reduce the potential need for conditions on the consent’. We suggest that it is amended so Construction Management Plans/Method Statements are encouraged unless the application is for Outline planning permission. This is because the details necessary to produce such a document would not be known when preparing an Outline application. Furthermore, a Construction Management Plan/Method Statement can also be secured via a planning condition. Though in practice the Council may not be expecting these details to be provided earlier in the planning process, we would appreciate if this were officially acknowledged within the LVL.</p> <p><u>2.24 Dwelling Sizes/Tenure Plan</u></p>	<p>The comments relating to construction management plans are noted. The wording of this part of the List has been amended to make it clearer that the encouragement for their submission relates to applications for full planning permission and reserved matters application to reduce the need for pre-commencement conditions.</p> <p>Details of dwelling sizes (i.e. no of bedrooms) and mixes/tenures are required at the outline stage (even if those details are only indicative at that stage), so that an assessment can be made as to whether that the requirements of planning policy relating to housing mix can be met.</p> <p>The housing mix and tenure is also often required to be included within legal agreements/S106 agreements, which have to be completed at outline stage. Therefore these details need to be included as part of the outline application submission.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Similarly, section 2.24 states that ‘A Dwelling Sizes and Tenure Plan/Schedule is required on all schemes that include proposals for more than two residential units.’ We recommend that Dwelling Sizes and Tenure Plans/Schedules are required unless the application is for Outline planning permission. Details on dwelling sizes and tenures will not always be known at Outline stage so in some cases the requirement would be impossible to fulfil. Dwelling Sizes and Tenure Plans/Schedules can also be secured via a planning condition.</p> <p><u>2.50 Phasing Plan/Schedule</u> Section 2.50 requires a Phasing Plan/Schedule ‘where the development is to be phased, for whatever reason’. More specifically, ‘A Phasing Plan/Schedule must detail which order the development is going to take place. It is recommended this is provided in the form of an annotated layout plan(s) and a schedule listing the order in which each plot/unit will be commenced and completed.’ Whilst we support transparency in terms of making the Council aware that phasing would be the preferred approach as early as possible, the precise details of phasing, such as individual plot details, will often not be known at Outline stage. We recommend that the requirement to provide a ‘Phasing Plan/Schedule’ is relaxed for Outline applications, so developers are required to provide less detail when applying for Outline planning permission. As above, the Council can also secure a Phasing/Plan Schedule via planning condition to ensure details are shared at a later date.</p> <p><u>2.30 Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Test</u> Section 2.30 states that ‘in addition to a Flood Risk Assessment, a Flood Risk Sequential Test will be required for ‘vulnerable use’ developments.’ One of the criteria for developments having to meet this requirement is ‘if the application is for Major development’. We suggest that Major sites with an allocation should be excluded from the requirement because the Sequential Test would have been undertaken at Local Plan preparation stage. There is already such an exception listed for Non-Major development in paragraph 2.193: ‘Non-Major development unless: The site has been allocated for development and subject to the test at the plan</p>	<p>Similarly phasing often needs to be known to form part of the legal agreements/S106 agreements, which have to be completed at outline stage. The indented method of phasing can also influence the way conditions on the planning permission have to be worded, such as the trigger points for certain things to be completed by. Therefore, these details are required as part of outline applications.</p> <p>Therefore, no changes are to be made to the Local Validation List in terms of the requirement for housing sizes and tenure mix , and phasing to be submitted on outline applications.</p> <p>The comments relating to the wish to exclude allocated sites from the need for the sequential test for Major sites, are noted. This was the intention, but officers accept that the formatting of this section of the document altered the way in which this section was read. Therefore, this part has been reformatted to make things clearer.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>making stage (provided the proposed development is consistent with the use for which the site was allocated and provided there have been no significant changes to the known level of flood risk to the site, now or in the future which would have affected the outcome of the test).’ We recommend that there should be a similar exemption for Major Development.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation of your consideration of the above comments.</p> <p>As detailed above, if it would assist the Councils to meet to discuss any of the points that we have raised in this representation, then we would be happy to do so.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>William Page</p>	
<p>Save Our Country Spaces (B Robinson)</p>	<p>(Original email To Colin Hedgley, Dan Clery, to be taken to the committee on our behalf.) Meeting Details Strategic Planning Committee Date/Time: 8 Jan 2024 – 10:30</p> <p>Comment and ‘Customer Experience’ relating to Current Validation List and due process Our reported incidents relating to planning and development (outstanding from 2021-2023) which are impacting our 2 properties, plus adjacent landowners of SK170738, involve East Suffolk District Council and their Statutory and non statutory partners. Concerns raised in 2019 nd 2020 within our objections to proposals at IP69BZ likely to impact on, us have been realised sadly resulting to Enforcement action. The Parish Council objected in 2019 for similar reasons.</p> <p>Following recent serious shortfalls and major issues over the planning validation and development processes at IP69BZ, since 2019, (in particular non mains drainage non-compliance and pollution, fire safety /2005 Fire Safety Act/Building Control etc, we</p>	<p>This comments predominantly relate to a particular planning enforcement case and the associated planning application process on that site, and the respondents view on how a previous application was validated, and determined and how planning policy should be applied.</p> <p>The comments do not make specific comments on the wording or content of this document and Local Validation List requirements.</p> <p>Therefore, no changes are proposed to the document in response to these comments.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>wish our concerns to be picked up by the Strategic Planning Management, which oversees Planning and Development Control.</p> <p>It is our view that if a robust validation process had been followed at the time (which it wasn't and may necessitate us making a complaint,) the need for Enforcement may never have arise. There needs to be a review as to why the validation process to date for Westerfield has been so poor.</p> <p>Our comments are material to Planning Enforcement, Building Control and Environmental and Public Health Protection.</p> <p>They affect public confidence and public trust; illustrate concerns, which we hope can be addressed in a partnership approach, with organisations such as East Suffolk Planning Alliance, Parish Councils and residents groups.</p> <p>We will respond to the Consultation on Validation List (and comment on our experiences of the Validation process to date). We welcome the emerging SPD Draft Rural Development Supplementary Planning which, together with a robust validation List, should improve matters by providing guidance on barn conversions, farm diversification, annexes, tourism and agricultural development, and includes guidance on permitted development rights.</p> <p>Our reported incidents relating to planning and development (outstanding from 2021-2023) which are impacting our 2 properties, involve various bodies, which are listed below, 1. East Suffolk, EP/EH, Planning Enforcement 2 The Environment Agency the use of non-mains foul drainage in England is contained within the Water supply, wastewater and water quality, the principles set out in the PPG are expanded upon in Building Regulations 3. SCC Drainage and Flood 4. Building Control Bodies Approved Inspectors and LA BCB 5. Solicitors for various landowners FYI, as we go into 2024, we wish for the important strategic matters highlighted below, specifically on non mains drainage, to be discussed within the East Suffolk</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Strategic Planning Committee as part of the Validation List debate? We understand it met for it’s Annual reviews on the 8th January 2024?</p> <p>There is an urgent need for a revised understanding on Validation requirements as outlined in the 2020 Validation List and a question as to why this list was not routinely followed?</p> <p>As there is the likelihood of new Planning Applications coming through, or retrospective Planning Applications in the near future, for which this needs to be taken into account, we ask politely that the Current Validation process is scrutinised and improved ahead of this revision being adopted please. For the avoidance of any confusion or doubt, at either Planning Officer case validation process stage, or subsequent determination of any applications, (either new or retrospective), <u>case officers must be aware of the requirements/guidance outlined on the Planning Portal for private non mains foul drainage</u>, to ensure proposals for non-mains drainage for non-major development complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), as well as East Suffolk’s Environmental Protection and Planning and Development Control’s responsibilities over it.</p> <p>‘Advice for local authorities on non-mains drainage from non-major development</p> <p>Purpose of the guidance In April 2015 the Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO) Schedule 4 was changed so the Environment Agency is no longer a statutory consultee for non-major development proposing non-mains drainage. This change means it is the local planning authority's (LPA's) responsibility to ensure proposals for non-mains drainage for non-major development complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) without Environment Agency advice. This advice has been provided to help LPAs do this and it is the LPAs choice if they want to use this guidance. This advice can also be used by LPAs for major developments where the Environment Agency locally no longer provides bespoke</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>omments.’https://www.planningportal.co.uk/services/authorities/LPAresources/LPA-advice-drainage/non-mains-drainage</p> <p>It is up to the Environmental Protection and (or Environmental Health Teams) to 'parallel process' the FDA1 checklist and formal document during any planning validation and determination process.</p> <p>‘Foul drainage assessment form (FDA1This form may be used as part of a planning application that incorporates a proposed non-mains foul drainage system. From: Environment Agency Published 25 August 2011</p> <p>Last updated 30 August 2017’https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/fouldrainage-assessment-form-fda1 -----</p> <p>During 2019 and 2020, this process seemed to be outside the radar of East Suffolk Planning and Development Control. It was deemed outside the remit of Environmental Protection, contrary to our understanding of the process required. A complaint remains unresolved on this.</p> <p><u>This must not be allowed to happen in the future with any new or retrospective applications.</u></p>	
<p>Shadingfield, Sotterley, Willingham and Ellough Joint Parish Council (Steve B...</p>	<p>I am writing to let you know that the Parish Council considered the proposals at its meeting on 17 January and has no comments to make.</p> <p>Thank you for offering us the opportunity to consider the document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
<p>Suffolk Constabulary (Jackie Norton)</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed revision.</p> <p>As Suffolk Police Design Out Crime Officers (DOCO’S) we provide input around Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) into all residential, commercial, hospital and school planning applications. Designing out crime is pivotal to the sustainability of an area.</p> <p>Crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour all have negative impacts upon community well-being and quality of life. As well as the direct costs of crime experienced by its victims, fear of crime contributes to social exclusion, particularly for vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Promoting principles of design known to reduce the opportunity for crime to occur is one of the most important ways in which Local Authorities can address crime issues. Layouts and designs have the potential to make crimes more difficult to commit, increase the likelihood of detection of criminal activity and improve public perceptions of safety and improve the health and well-being of residents.</p> <p>Along with CPTED principles Suffolk Police promote Secured by Design (SBD), a police initiative, to guide and encourage those engaged within the specification, design and build of new homes, schools, hospitals or commercial properties to adopt crime prevention measures. The advice given by SBD has been proven to reduce the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime, creating safer, more secure, and sustainable environments. Secured by Design is owned by the Police Service and is supported by the Home Office and referred by the Department for Communities and Local Government in Approved Document Q.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (in particular Section 17) places a duty on local authorities to exercise their functions with regard to the likely effects on crime and disorder in their areas in partnership with the police and other public bodies. Suffolk Police continuously advise developers at the earliest stages of</p>	<p>The inclusion of a Crime Prevention Statement for the types of application referred to in these comments is a reasonable addition. Crime prevention and designing out crime are material considerations in the determination of applications, and there is a policy basis for the consideration of such matters. It is therefore reasonable to require the submission of a statement to enable the applicant/agent to explain how such matters have been considered in their proposal etc.</p> <p>Therefore, a “Crime Prevention Statement” has been added to the Local Validation List.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>project planning to pursue ‘Secured by Design’ accreditation in consultation with their Designing Out Crime Officers.</p> <p>Having reviewed the draft Validation List document there appears to be no reference to any Crime Prevention proposals. Suffolk Police consequently ask that within the updated validation list there is a requirement for developers to seek advice from a Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO) at an early stage to ensure that their proposals positively impact on crime prevention objectives. Even when developers are not intending to apply for SBD accreditation, they should negotiate with the DOCO to ensure that the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) are applied.</p> <p>Suffolk Police were pleased to see that Ipswich Borough Council (IBC) consulted with our Ipswich DOCO, on the review of their validation list, and IBC have now embedded a “Statement of Crime Prevention Proposals” into their validation requirements.</p> <p>Suffolk Police therefore recommend that the following statement is embedded in the East Suffolk Council Validation List please.</p> <p>Statement of Crime Prevention Proposals It is requested that for all major developments (as defined in the draft document) and any applications relating to public buildings, HMOs, or demolition of buildings, are required to produce a statement that demonstrates that crime prevention measures have been incorporated into the design.</p> <p>This should include reference to the relevant Secured By Design (SBD) guide, detailing how issues such as the layout of the whole development, orientation of buildings, natural surveillance, boundary treatments, parking arrangements, access control where appropriate, secure cycle storage provision, lighting and building site security have taken crime prevention guidance into account. Annotated plans should be included where relevant.</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>Members of the public can be directed to Design Guides (securedbydesign.com) for further guidance.</p> <p>This should ensure compliance with: East Suffolk Waveney Local Plan (March 2019) Policy WLP8.29 Design to ‘Take into account the need to promote public safety and deter crime and disorder and 8.173 “Promoting public safety and discouraging crime and disorder are important outputs of a well-designed scheme. Development proposals should incorporate 'Secured by Design' principles and encourage natural surveillance over public areas. Particular care will be required in the design of car parking areas, landscaped areas, public spaces and pedestrian routes in order to avoid creating crime and disorder issues. Development proposals should give early consideration to access by emergency vehicles, plus hard standing and provision of fire hydrants for fire service vehicles. The Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service strongly encourage the provision of automated sprinkler systems.</p> <p>East Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (adopted Sept 2020) Policy SCLP11.1: Design Quality “f) Take into account the need to promote public safety and deter crime and disorder through well-lit neighbourhoods and development of public spaces that are overlooked and Policy SCLP11.2: Residential Amenity outlines “h. Safety and security”.</p> <p>Broads Authority (adopted May 2109) Policy DM43: Design g) Crime prevention: The design and layout of development should be safe and secure, with natural surveillance. Measures to reduce the risk of crime and antisocial behaviour should be considered at an early stage so as not to be at the expense of overall design quality.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require clarification on any of these points.</p>	

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
<p>Suffolk County Council (Luke Cantwell-Forbes)</p>	<p>Please find attached comments on the draft Local Validation List, on behalf of Suffolk County Council in its capacity of the Local Highway Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2.4 – Application Forms and Ownership Certifications: 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). • Section 2.5 – Arboricultural Assessment and Tree Survey: it should be clear that any trees situated within highway maintainable at public expense that are anticipated to be impacted by development should be included within the submitted Arboricultural Assessment. • Section 2.10 – Block Plan / Site Layout Plan: the list details the need for both visibility splays to be included and details of the species, position and all trees within or overhanging the application site. It would be worthwhile specifying that any trees situated within the visibility splays should be included, given that they may be impacted by the visibility splays. • Section 2.16 – Construction Management Plan / Method Statement: should also include: - parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors. - loading and unloading of plant and materials. - piling techniques (if applicable). - storage of plant and materials. - provision and use of wheel washing facilities. - details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction. - monitoring and review mechanisms. - details of deliveries times to the site during construction phase - layout of facilities above to be included on a plan. • 2.31 – Floor Plans: paragraph 2.200 outlines that dimensions should be provided to enable assessment of the space available for the parking of vehicles – this could include cycle parking, where no alternative provision is proposed. 	<p>The comments on the application forms are noted. However, Planning Application forms are produced nationally, and therefore East Suffolk Council can not reasonably set its own requirements for their content. However, details of existing and proposed parking are requirements of the Block Plans/Site Layout Plans.</p> <p>In terms of the comments related to trees within the highway maintainable at public expense that are anticipated to be impacted by the development, these should be included in any case because they would be trees within or overhanging the application site (i.e. the area outlined in red, including the visibility splays etc). However, in the interests of clarity an additional sentence has been added to the document alongside the changes resulting from the comments from the ESC Arboricultural and Landscape Manager.</p> <p>Similar changes have also been made to the Block Plan / Site Layout Plan in terms of adding in reference to ‘trees situated within highway maintainable at public expense that are anticipated to be impacted by development.’</p> <p>The comments relating to Construction Management Plan / Method Statement are</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.42 – Landscape details: paragraph 2.268 outlines that full landscape details will be expected at RM stage or as a pre-commencement condition. The importance of ensuring sufficient space is retained for landscaping – particularly tree planting – early on could be highlighted, given historic problems with securing suitable space for planting. • 2.49 – Parking layout plans: paragraph 2.317 outlines that “it should clearly indicate the proposed parking spaces including any within carports cartlodges or garages”. It could be revised to include the following in bold to highlight the need to provide details of associated infrastructure, particularly what infrastructure is to be provided for cycle parking: ...“it should clearly indicate the proposed parking spaces and associated infrastructure including any within carports cartlodges or garages”. • 2.53 – Refuse storage/presentation plan: it would be useful to highlight that bin presentation and storage areas should be situated outside of highway maintainable at public expense where bins may present an obstruction to highway users. • 2.64 – Transport Statement or Assessment: SCC welcomes the inclusion of considering all modes of travel within this section. SCC would typically expect accident data to be submitted for a 5-year period as a minimum (not 3-years proposed within paragraph 2.402). Reference is made to NPPF 2019 within paragraph 2.401. • General comment: it would be good if there was 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>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 consideration is being given to promoting sustainable travel. As stated by Active Travel England, the planning application</p>	<p>endorsed. These items should be included in such a document. Therefore, the Local Validation List has been amended to include those listed along with details of mechanisms to control noise, vibration and dust. This change should add clarity to applicants/agents in terms of what is expected to be within Construction Management Plan / Method Statement.</p> <p>The recommendation to include dimensions on spaces for cycle parking are sensible and reasonable. The Local Validation List has been amended.</p> <p>The comments relating to Landscaping details are noted and consistent with those from the Arboricultural and Landscape Manager. Amendments have been made to the text within this section of the Local Validation List.</p> <p>The addition relating to Parking Layout Plans is reasonable given that things like electric charging points etc often now need to be provided for parking spaces. Change made to the Local Validation List.</p> <p>The comments relating to ensuring bin areas are outside the highway are reasonable, given that if there is not adequate space the bins can end up in the highway (including pavements) where</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p>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>they create a highway hazard. Amendment made to the Local Validation List.</p> <p>Comments noted about 3/5 year period for accident data and the old version of the NPPF, and the Local Validation List has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>The comments regarding the use of the Active Travel England: Planning Application toolkit, are something which could assist applicants/agents in a positive way to improve development proposals from the outset. An amendment has therefore been made to the Local Validation List suggesting applicants/ agents refer to that toolkit, and relevant ESC guidance documents on sustainable travel and healthy environments.</p>
<p>Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service, (Louisa Cunningham)</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting SCCAS. Please see below for our comments.</p> <p><u>Section 2.6 Archaeological Assessment</u> Overall this is a good section and makes clear the importance of archaeological assessments. It is good to see that early consultation with SCCAS is advised as is use of the Suffolk HER.</p> <p>2.37 – Would the following rewording of this paragraph be appropriate: <i>On sites with known archaeological potential or that have potential to contain heritage assets with archaeological interest, an archaeological assessment must be included with the planning application for development proposals which include</i></p>	<p>Such positive comments on the document are appreciated by officers.</p> <p>The recommended rewording of paragraph 2.37 is appropriate and would make the circumstances where the submission of an archaeological assessment more reasonable. Paragraph amended in the Local Validation List.</p> <p>The changes to paragraph 2.38 are also reasonable, and therefore the changes have been made to the Local Validation List.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	<p><i>works at or below ground level to ensure that provision is made for the preservation of important archaeological remains.</i></p> <p>Our reasoning is that the original statement reads as if all applications will require a full archaeological assessment which is not something we require, it is only necessary on sites of known or potential archaeological interest and often the archaeological assessment can be undertaken via suitably worded conditions rather than at pre-determination stage.</p> <p>2.38 – We would recommend the following rewording of the first and second bullet points: <i>Those which contain or are in the vicinity of sites of archaeological significance as identified on the Suffolk Historic Environment Record (see link below)</i> <i>Are in areas of known high archaeological potential, such as (but not limited to) river valleys, historic settlement cores, and in the vicinity of Scheduled Monuments.</i></p> <p><u>Section 2.36 Heritage Statement or Impact Assessment</u> Overall this section is very comprehensive, particularly section 2.232 describing in detail what should be included in a statement. We would recommend adding to the last point in section 2.232, that photographs should include both internal and external images of any buildings involved in proposals. An additional note is that since NPPF was updated in December 2023, the reference in section 2.226 needs to be updated to paragraph 200 (previously 194).</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions.</p>	<p>In the addition of a reference to photographs being of both the interior and exterior of the building is appropriate, and would add clarify in terms of what is expected. Therefore a change to that effect has been made to the Local Validation List.</p> <p>The paragraph number for the NPPF has been deleted, along with other NPPF paragraph number references elsewhere within the Local Validation List, so that the Local Validation List remains correct in this respect, if/when the NPPF is revised at its paragraph numbers are amended again.</p>
Town Clerk - Southwold town council (LESLEY Beevor)	<p>Ref sect 2.10 -site/ floor block plans.</p> <p>The site/ block/ floor plans provided as 'Existing plans' should be produced in the same scale as those showing 'Proposed plans' so that the 2 are directly comparable.</p>	<p>Officers agree that presenting existing and proposed plans at different scales can make it more difficult to understand what is proposed to be changed. This also applies to other plans such as elevational drawings.</p>

Appendix A – Responses to the consultation on the Local Validation List, and officer response with a summary of any changes made to the ‘List’

Respondent	Comment	Officer Response and summary of any changes made
	Using different scales for each causes confusion and mis understanding as to what amendments are being proposed.	A note has been added to each section of the list where this is relevant.

As part of reviewing the document following the consultation process, a number of other minor changes have been made to the Local Validation List in order to add clarity in terms of what is required and/or enable additional hyperlinks to ease with navigation for future users.