

Humber Doucy Lane Inquiry
Appeals APP/R3515/W/24/3350674 and APP/X3540/W/24/3350673

21 January 2025

Following from today and the update provided to the inquiry by the main parties the Inspector has reviewed her own questions on highways and for the agreed matters round table. The following are therefore provided to assist the parties in preparation for tomorrow. Please bear in mind these questions were written when reading the proofs of evidence.

Highways

Please get the position outlined to be verbally today added as a supplement to the highways SOCG

- Views on the suitability of the use of conditions to be provided by all parties to the session re access drawings now provided and the fact it is a full planning permission
- Where is the pedestrian audit referred to?
- Does policy require a walking and cycling strategy?
- Council's position on the station and impacts? Or has this fallen away?
- Section 5 – access junction design, plans changed? Are existing sheets being superseded? – this is potentially answered by the update on approach in Appendices and conditions – please confirm.
- –

Drainage

- Please can the witnesses walk me through the surface water drainage strategy now proposed. It might be helpful to hear from the appellant first and then SCC but I leave this to you to sort out.
- I was not entirely clear on the volumes of attenuation.
- I would also like to understand the site levels and how these influence the strategy.
- Please outline clearly what has been done to address points 6, 7 and 9 from the LLFA objection.
- Status of the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy? And the LLFA Appendix A guidance referred to?

Pollution Mitigation

- Is this about low versus medium pollution category?
- What is the requirement for a treatment compliant swale?
- CIRIA Suds treatment design?
- Need correct design for both attenuation and treatment?

Highway Drainage

- What information would be required to determine if the two swale approach would meet the required standard?

Strategic SUDS features

- BL proof para 53 – can this be addressed by conditions?
- SCC para 54 – DL referred to – relevance here please explain? Or has this fallen away?
- Is the 1m depth of attenuation basins as absolute maximum? If so why?

- TF proof para 6.10 and ref to the DAS – please explain as I could not work it out from docs.
- TF proof 7.6 – acknowledges the basins could be improved upon – therefore please explain how in principle it would be acceptable?
- TF proof 7.13 -fundamentally different approach to SCC – please explain.

Other agreed matters

- Archaeology – primarily I would like to run through the conditions in the SOCG and be clear on their aim and purpose.
- Heritage – my questions answered today and in planning proofs.
- Air quality – nothing.
- Ecology – nothing that cannot be put during the session on HRA matters.

In addition to this parties indicated that the planning witnesses would deal with queries arising from the Sport England statement. To assist the witnesses the following are my questions arising from reading it ready for further into the inquiry:

- I would like to fully understand from the planning witnesses what they consider to be the appropriate policy approach to this issue. This should include national policy, noting the SE document refers to the 2023 NPPF.
- This would include views on approaches to mitigation for loss.
- 5.7 of SE document makes a reference to the 'appeal site' as a whole – what would the witnesses views be on this?
- Para 6.9 – please explain the Ipswich Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Study 2009 – how does it fit in and is there a copy in the CD's as I could not see it.
- Para 6.20 makes a ref to another inspector DL – I could not find it in the CD – can both witnesses look at it and if you consider it is relevant add it as an inquiry document and give me your views on its relevance.