



**APPEAL REFS: APP/R3515/W/24/3350673 (A) & APP/R3515/W/24/3350674 (B)**

**Land north-east of Humber Doucy Lane, Humber Doucy Lane, Ipswich, IP4 3QA**

**Wednesday 5 February 2025**

**Inquiry Round Table Session – Matters in Dispute - s106 contributions**

**The agenda has been set in response to the proofs of evidence provided by the relevant witnesses and SOCG6. The matters in dispute are those sought by Suffolk County Council (Rule 6). As such the broad format of the session will in principle be:**

- Outline of position and CIL compliance from SCC
- Any additional contributions from the Joint Councils
- Response from Appellant
- Questions and clarification – Interested parties
- Any Inspector questions not covered (queries from documents listed in bullet points below).

#### 1 – Secondary School

- There is a reference to a 'change in strategy' by SCC for these contributions. What is the change? What effect does it have?
- Reference to 'review of need' – where is this in document and how would it operate?
- 4.32 JK – please explain
- JK table 1 – please explain to me

#### 2 – Sixth Form Expansion

- Calculations – explain the effect of DfT figures (4.40 and 4.41 JK proof)

#### 3 – Library Improvements

- What evidence do SCC offer to support/justify this requirement?
- Is it just about refurbishment – if so how would this be directly related to the development to be permitted?
- LA – Arts Council England and National Archives (OT26 and OT12) – national documents – what is the status for decision making?
- What is the link to the Libraries Needs Assessment?
- Link between para 3.7 where you (LA) are specific about the 'Children's area, disabled access and new area for young persons provision' to the preceding generic 'fit out costs'?
- 3.9 (LA) – would all of this requirement arise directly from the appeal scheme?

4 – SEND

- SCC need to explain the contribution – LA proof does in part at 2.7 onward – but the data source is not completely clear...
- Appellant to explain why it would be overstated please...and what are you offering? 4.71 of proof unclear to me...
- SCC say calculation is supported by a well established national methodology (LA proof 2.11) – so why is it not justified?

5 – Other

- Three appeal DLs in LA proof – directly relevant? Each party to give a view
- Early years – JK paras 4.6 and 4.7 of proof – is this linked to note?
- Also 2.13-2.15 of LA proof – this relies of DfE guidance – what is the status of that document for decision making?
- ~~Affordable housing – justifications – YES in CIL compliance statement~~
- Overall compliance with ISPA4 (f)? – views from all parties at the end.

*D J Board*

INSPECTOR

31 January 2025