

Appendix B - Summary of harm/weighting

Scale:

No weight/harm/benefit

Minimal weight/harm/benefit

Medium weight/harm/benefit

Substantial weight/harm/benefit

Very Substantial weight/harm/benefit

Alleged Harm	Appellant	LPA	SCC	Appellant Comment
Main Matter 1/RfR 1 – Procedural matters	No harm	Very Substantial harm		
Main Matter 1/RfR 1 – “substantive” matters	No harm			
Main Matter 2/RfR 3 and 4 – impact on character and appearance of the area.	Medium harm	Substantial harm Substantial harm (in terms of the buffer to the countryside) Medium harm (in terms of the buffer to Humber Doucy Lane)		Ms Evans says “substantial harm” at para 5.66, and then also gives the separate alleged harms to the countryside transition/impact on Humber Doucy Lane as separate items in her later summary of the benefits/harms.
Main Matter 3/RfR 4 – heritage impacts	Low end of less than substantial harm	Minimal harm		
Main Matter 4/RfR 3 – Main access	No harm	Very Substantial harm		
Main Matter 4/RfR 2 – highway safety arising from	Minimal harm			I should clarify that my use of the word “safety” in the first column was simply

trip generation and trip distribution.		Very Substantial harm	Very Substantial harm	reflecting the Inspector's terminology for Main Matter 4. The harm I identified was not safety, but general impact of traffic on the highway network, likely to arise for any development around Ipswich.
Main Matter 4/RfR 2 – pedestrian and cycle connectivity.	No harm to moderate benefit			
Main Matter 5/RfR 5 – risk of flooding	No harm	(Very) substantial harm	Substantial harm	Ms Evans says "substantial weight" at 5.75 and "very substantial weight" at 7.26
Main Matter 6/RfR 6 – impact on ecology	No harm			
Main Matter 7/RfR 7 – impact on off-site protected habitats	No harm	Very Substantial harm		This is essentially a legal test rather than a planning balance factor.
Main Matter 8/RfR 8 – archaeology	No harm			
Main Matter 9/RfR 9 – air quality	No harm			
Main Matter 10/RfR 10 – loss of sports pitches	Medium harm	Very Substantial harm		'Very substantial' is the highest level of harm in the scale agreed between the parties. By affording this matter 'very substantial' harm, Ms Evans is clearly therefore not taking into account the restricted lawful use of the site (otherwise what weighting would she give to playing fields that were not restricted to 2.5 hours per week?).
Main Matter 11/RfR 11 – exceedance of 599 homes.	No harm			
Main Matter 12/RfR 12 – open space provision	No harm to minimal harm.			

Main Matter 13/RfR 13 – contributions to infrastructure.	No harm		<p>Substantial harm for absence of primary, secondary and sixth form.</p> <p>Very substantial harm for absence of special needs.</p> <p>Medium harm for absence of library contribution.</p>	<p>The harm suggested by SCC is theoretical only, as planning permission will not be granted without a s106, and that s106 will need to include the extent of mitigation which the Inspector considers necessary to ensure no harm arises.</p> <p>Therefore in reality, none of the harms identified by SCC will actually arise.</p>
--	---------	--	--	--