

our ref: DM/2024/0005
your ref
please ask for: Rosalynn Claxton
direct dial: 01473 432903
email: rosallynn.claxton@ipswich.gov.uk

Kevin Coleman
Phase 2 Planning and Development
270 Avenue West, Skyline 120
Great Notley, Braintree
Essex
CM77 7AA
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] EMAIL ONLY



IPSWICH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Grafton House
15-17 Russell Road
Ipswich Suffolk
IP1 2DE

www.ipswich.gov.uk

21st May 2024

Dear Mr Coleman

SCREENING OPINION PURSUANT TO REGULATION 6 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2017

Proposal: Up to 675 homes, an early-years setting and up 400m² net of non-residential floorspace.

Ipswich Borough Council, in pursuance of Regulation 6 of the above regulations, hereby provides a Screening Opinion which is based upon the information provided on 05 January 2024 and clarification information sent by email and received 14th February 2024.

The Screening Opinion indicates that an Environmental Impact Assessment for the development **IS NOT REQUIRED**.

Accordingly the Council adopts this Screening Opinion in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 6 (6) of the Regulations to the effect the development is EIA development and that an Environmental Statement is not required. Please note that this conclusion does not mean that Ipswich Borough Council would support any application for the proposed development under any subsequent order.

In accordance with Regulation 23 of the 2017 Regulation the Screening Opinion has been placed on Part 1 of the Planning Register.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

James Mann MRTPI
Head of Planning and Development

**IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
REGULATIONS 2017**

SCREENING OPINION

APPLICATION DETAILS

Application Number (if known)	Not applicable
Address	Land off Humber Doucy Lane, Ipswich
Description of development	Up to 675 homes, an early-years setting and up to 400m ² net of non-residential floorspace.
Application valid	Not applicable

SCREENING OPINION DETAILS

Screening Opinion Reference Number	DM/2024/0005
Date of Request	05.01.2024
Date of Screening Request Due	26.01.2024
Revised date where extension to deadline agreed in writing	24.05.2024

SCHEDULE 1 DEVELOPMENT

Is the project Schedule 1 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA regulations	No
Description of development	N/A

Where a proposal is Schedule 1 development an EIA must be undertaken.

SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT

Is the project Schedule 2 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA regulations	Yes
Schedule 2 section number	Schedule 2, 10 (b)
Description of the development (column 1 of Schedule 2)	10. Infrastructure projects (b) Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas;
Applications thresholds and criteria (column 2 of Schedule 2)	(ii) the development includes more than 150 dwellings; and (iii) the overall area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.

Does the proposal exceed any thresholds	Yes - proposal is an Urban Development project of 640 homes (up to 675 for the purposes of the EIA calculations) on 31.42ha in total. It therefore exceeds the thresholds of 150 homes and 5 hectares.
Is the development or any part of it within a 'sensitive area'	No.

RELEVANT SCREENING OPINION HISTORY

The site identified for development, the subject of this screening opinion, is allocated under Local Plan Policy ISPA4.1. The land within IBC comprises 21.52 ha and the whole allocation within IBC is identified for 449 dwellings and associated infrastructure under Policy ISPA4.1, with 60% allocated for housing and 40% for secondary uses comprising open space and other green and community infrastructure. The land within ESC comprises 9.9ha and is allocated for 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure (Policy SCLP12.24).

ENVIROMNMENTAL STATEMENT

Has the applicant supplied an Environmental Statement for the current or previous (if Reserved Matters or conditions) application	<p>No, an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening report has been submitted, alongside supporting documents - Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and a Geo-environmental Report.</p> <p>A planning application has subsequently been received for the site (reference IP/24/00172/OUTFL) and is being considered.</p>
---	---

SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with Schedule 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 the submission is considered against the relevant selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development as follows:-

Consideration of the proposal in relation to the selection criteria listed under Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations:

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
	Briefly explain answer to Part 2a and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature and proximity to site		Is a significant effect likely, having regard particularly to the magnitude and spatial extent (including population size affected), nature, intensity and complexity, probability, expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact and the possibility to effectively reduce the impact? If the finding of no significant effect is reliant on specific features or measures of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment these should be identified in bold.	
1. NATURAL RESOURCES				
1.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes	The Site is located in a slightly elevated position relative to many of the more central parts of Ipswich and in relation to the Rushmere St Andrew and Kesgrave settlements to the east. Overall development of the site may involve platforming/levelling and raising of levels such that the topography of the site is affected.	No	Major extractive or additive earthworks are not proposed for this development, nor are any high-rise structures proposed. No significant adverse impacts expected subject to consideration of proposals and limitations on height of development and ground level information. Appropriate controls will be secured via conditions and through approved plans.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
		It is noted from the submitted Screening Report submitted that due to the low-rise nature of the proposed development no piling will be required, with spread foundations proposed extending to a minimum depth of 1.5m and locally deepened to glacial clay.		
1.2 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources above or below ground such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy which are non-renewable or in short supply?	Yes	Development will involve standard construction which will require use of non-renewable materials. The scale of the development is such that large quantities of natural resources will be required. It is noted that the majority of the site is not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area with the exception of a small strip of land adjacent to the railway line in the far north of the site.	No	Sustainable methods of construction and development will be a consideration through the planning application and secured by condition. Development is not expected to use resources which are of a particular scarce supply although it will involve non-renewable supplies. It is not proposed to remove minerals in the safeguarded area which is intended to be used for landscaping – this would need to be secured at planning application stage via plans and conditions. The impact is not considered likely to cause a significant effect.
1.3 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project,	Yes	Majority of the site is located on Grade 2 Agricultural land (an ACL grading of Very Good Quality). Suitable for a wide	No	Grade 2 Agricultural land is not considered scarce in the region and the land has been accepted and allocated for housing development as part of the Local Plan process. It is noted that the soil could be

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?		range of agricultural and horticultural crops.		reused in the development for gardens and landscaping given its quality.
2. WASTE				
2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	Waste will be generated during construction.	No	Site waste management plan including re-use and recycling will need to be prepared and followed to reduce impact and avoid significant effect. The operational nature of the development would not produce solid wastes to the extent it would result in a significant effect on the environment.
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	Emissions from construction vehicles and dust would be released into the air. Residential vehicle use will produce emissions. IBC has 4 AQMA designations within town centre.	No	A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be implemented during construction to control environmental impacts and nuisances including dust and vehicle emissions. An Air Quality Assessment and Travel Plan will be required to ascertain and reduced impacts. Transport information submitted with the screening request shows that trip generation from the development

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>would not result in a significant impacts on designated AQMAs.</p> <p>Subject to the above it is concluded that development would not result in a likely significant effect</p>
<p>3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?</p>	Yes	<p>Construction activities will result in noise, vibration and light impacts in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Operational development will result in increased noise levels.</p>	No	<p>There are existing residential properties which surround the application site which would be impacted by the noise and vibration impacts of the development during construction. Once operational the development would generate additional activity and light, in comparison to the site’s current undeveloped status, although it is not expected to be of a level which is out of keeping with the existing level of activity and light which occurs at present from the adjoining urban edge of Ipswich and rugby club. A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be implemented during construction to control environmental impacts and nuisances including noise, light and vibration, and a Lighting plan will be considered and secured for the operational development.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
3.3 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	Yes	<p>Construction activities may result in release of contaminated water or building materials in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Runoff from new roads, roofs and hard surfaces would result in contaminated water potentially being absorbed into surface water or groundwater.</p>	No	<p>A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be implemented during construction to control release of contaminated water or building materials.</p> <p>The design of the drainage management and attenuation features on the site as well as the flood risk and drainage strategy will need to incorporate measures to manage this.</p> <p>Subject to these controls there is not considered to be a likely significant effect.</p>
3.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?	No	The site has not been previously developed, and the site investigation did not identify any existing contamination at the site.	N/A	
4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
4.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?	No	The scale and nature of the construction and proposed land use (a non-industrial development) would have a low likelihood of risk of any major accidents.	N/A	A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy will be undertaken as standard for a development of this size.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
		<p>The Site is not located in the vicinity of any Control of Major Accident Hazard (COMAH) sites. Cliff Quay and Ipswich Cliff Quay are located over 3.5km south of the Site. The nearest airport, Bentwaters St, is located over 17km north-east of the Site and nearest airfield is Elmsett Airfield located over 12km to the west of the Site and Crowfield Airfield located approximately 12km to the north of the Site.</p> <p>The site is located entirely in Flood zone 1 with a consequent low probability of flood risk from rivers and only a very small portion of the site is subject to a low risk from surface water flooding.</p>		
4.2 Will the project present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human health during construction, operation or decommissioning? (for example due to water contamination or air pollution)	Yes	A development of this scale has the potential on its own and in combination with the adjacent development (including Ipswich Garden Suburb) to cause air and water pollution if this is not appropriately managed.	No	Appropriate assessments and management strategies will need to be prepared with regards to contamination, water / flooding and air quality to control and eliminate risks.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
5. WATER RESOURCES				
5.1 Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g. rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	Yes	The River Fynn is located approximately 1km to the northeast of the site beyond the railway line. The site is located in a groundwater source protection zone. The three stage SUDs treatment of surface water prior to infiltration would serve to protect groundwater quality. The site is located within a nitrate Vulnerable Zone, and at risk from agricultural nitrate pollution. The cessation of agricultural use would be likely to reduce risks.	No	A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy will be undertaken setting out how surface water runoff will be appropriately managed and water quality maintained.
6. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)				
6.1 Are there any protected areas which are designated or classified for their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, or any non-designated / non-classified areas which are important or sensitive for reasons of their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project? (e.g. wetlands, watercourses or other water-bodies, the coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands,	Yes	There are no ecological designations that cover the identified site however there are a number of statutory and non-statutory designations located within the vicinity of the identified site. The Stour and Orwell Estuaries Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site has a European level designation and lies approximately 4 km to the south of the site, within its zone of influence. The closest statutory	No	HRA assessments and mitigation will be considered and secured via the planning application. The site is within the zone of influence of the SPA site but due to the distance the impact can be mitigated for. IBC and East Suffolk Council have a mitigation strategy (Suffolk Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy) in place which enables such developments to mitigate their impacts

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
undesigned nature reserves or parks. (Where designated indicate level of designation)		designated nature reserve is the Sandling Local Nature Reserve which is over 2km south of the site.		through financial contributions. A combination of on-site mitigation and contributions to off-site measures can be secured via a planning application. Subject to securing appropriate mitigation the impact is not considered likely to result in a significant effect.
6.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	Yes	As the site has never been developed for anything other than agriculture, it is likely that birds, insects, reptiles and small mammals, both protected and non-protected, are seasonal, regular or permanent inhabitants of the proposed development site. Potential impacts might include forced relocation, impact on breeding patterns, loss of food or habitat, and direct harm during construction.	No	As the site is in agricultural use, a degree of habitat transformation has already occurred, however, there are many small species of animal that will still thrive in a partially transformed habitat but will not be resilient to the construction of housing and associated infrastructure. It is possible for the features within the site which have the highest ecological value to be retained which will include the boundary hedgerows and mature trees. A CEMP can be secured to ensure wildlife and habitats are protected during construction works. Ecological surveys and mitigation will need to be considered and secured through any planning application.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
7. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL				
7.1 Are there any areas or features on or around the location which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated / nonclassified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes	<p>Westerfield House (adjacent to the site along the western boundary) is a Grade II listed building. Consent for a Care Village in its grounds has already been granted.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact assessment that was submitted with the Westerfield Care Village Application concluded that the impact on this Listed Building would be a ‘Low level of harm’. Given the retention of the boundary vegetation no significant additional effect on its setting would occur and the cumulative effects will not therefore be significant.</p> <p>Other listed buildings adjacent to the development (but outside of the Ipswich Borough Local Authority area) include Allen’s House, Lacey’s Farmhouse and the Garden Store within Villa Farmhouse.</p> <p>Tarran Bungalows along Humber Doucy Lane and opposite the</p>	No	<p>The approved care village on the Westerfield House site is currently under construction. The additional buildings on this site, if built, would provide a visual screening and buffer to the proposed development which could reduce any harmful impact on the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>The principal of developing the site for housing has been considered and established via the local plan process whereby a Heritage Impact Assessment was submitted in support and to evidence the level of development which would be acceptable.</p> <p>A Heritage Impact Assessment for the site will be required to determine the impact and any required mitigation, as well as ensuring that the design of development adequately considers the shared boundary.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
		<p>development site are included on the IBC local list as a relic for post-war pre-fab construction.</p> <p>The site falls within the south-western edge of the Suffolk Coast and Heath National Character Area (NCA) – it is noted as being mainly flat or gently rolling, often open but with few commanding viewpoints.</p>		
7.2 Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance)	Yes	<p>Views of the completed development are likely from the open countryside to the north and east, and from the surrounding listed buildings (Allen’s House, Lacey’s Farmhouse and the Garden Store within Villa Farmhouse) as well as from residential properties along Tuddenham Lane and Seven Cottages Lane.</p> <p>In addition, existing residential development along Humber Doucy Lane will face the proposed development, and it will be visible to road users of Humber Doucy Lane.</p>	No	<p>The applicant has stated that a landscape buffer is proposed along the north and east of the Site to ‘soften’ views of the completed development from the open countryside to the north and east, and contends that the limited visual envelope combined with new planting will assist in screening the Proposed Development, ensuring visual effects are limited and not significant.</p> <p>Potential visual impact will however need to be outlined within a Landscape and Visual Assessment to be submitted with the application. Assessment of this will need to take place to determine impact.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>It is noted that the scheme falls below the indicative threshold for EIA and given the surroundings of the development, particularly at the edge of an existing urban area, the proposal subject to the detail would not be of a form and character which would appear significantly abnormal to the location.</p> <p>Overall subject to the detail of the height, layout, landscaping and quantity of development proposed, together with the circumstances of the site the impact on the environment is not likely to be considered significant.</p>
8. CULTURAL HERITAGE / ARCHAEOLOGY				
8.1 Are there any areas or features which are protected for their cultural heritage or archaeological value, or any non-designated / classified areas and/or features of cultural heritage or archaeological importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project (including potential impacts on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where	Not Known	The Site has not been previously developed and therefore there is potential for archaeological resources beneath the Site. A desk-based assessment and geophysical survey (Appendix 8) has been undertaken by RPS including a review of the Suffolk Historic Environment Record and a site visit. The data search identified three entries located within the study area, an	Not known	<p>Based on the desk-based assessment and geophysical survey the potential for Late Prehistoric and/or Roman activity within the study site is considered to be high.</p> <p>The potential for any other significant (i.e. non-agricultural remains) within the site is assessed to be low/ negligible.</p> <p>A Site-based Archaeological Assessment will be required to determine the level of</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).		Iron Age coin and harness fragment, a scatter of Medieval pottery and coins and cropmarks of probable Post-Medieval field. Iron Age coin is of special interest as this is a rare find in the area.		significance and will inform the planning process.
9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
9.1 Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	<p>Vehicular traffic has multiple routes from the site, either along Tuddenham Road to the A1214 Colchester Road or along Humber Doucy Lane to Sidegate Lane, Rushmere Road or Woodbridge Road. All are in active use by the public.</p> <p>In addition there are a number of public footpaths which are located within and around the site.</p> <p>Westerfield Railway station and railway line are in close proximity to the site.</p> <p>Humber Doucy Lane is likely to experience the greatest changes in traffic flows, and is the only link where it is currently anticipated that flows</p>	No	<p>A Transport Assessment (with surrounding planned and approved developments) to accurately establish the impacts and mitigation needed will be required.</p> <p>The size of the development together with range of facilities and services and sustainable transport links which are presently available or can be designed into the development, is considered to reduce and / or minimise potential impacts. The overall significance of the likely impacts resulting from the development are not considered to be at a level which would require an EIA.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
		would increase by more than 30% as a result of the proposal.		
9.2 Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	<p>Some congestion at peak times around Humber Doucy Lane and connections to Tuddenham Road and A12A14 route. Cumulative scenario with surrounding developments including - IGS developments and Westerfield Care Home will need to be tested.</p> <p>Supplementary information requested to clarify trip distribution to ascertain cumulative impacts with IGS developments on Tuddenham Road roundabout.</p> <p>Supplementary information supporting traffic flow analysis submitted which shows that traffic exiting the site would split 60/40, with the majority (60%) heading south-east away from Tuddenham Road, and 40% heading north-east to Tuddenham Road. These would then disperse further on the surrounding road network.</p>	No	<p>The proposal will need a cumulative Transport Assessment to accurately establish the significance of the overall impact on congestion and the environment.</p> <p>The supplementary information submitted suggests the trip distribution is such that proportionally the additional traffic generated on particular roads and when considered in a cumulative scenario with other developments, is not at a level which would warrant an EIA.</p> <p>CEMP will also be required to ensure HGV routing is on main roads and minimises disruption on minor residential streets.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
10. LAND USE				
10.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the project? E.g. housing, densely populated areas, industry / commerce, farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes	<p>The Main parcel comprises primarily arable agricultural land, with the Southern parcel partly comprising playing fields and arable land.</p> <p>The Site is allocated for residential development by both Ipswich Borough Council and East Suffolk Council under Policy ISPA4 the Ipswich Borough Council Local Plan and under Policy SCLP12.24 of the East Suffolk district Local Plan.</p>	No	<p>Grade 2 land is relatively common in the wider area, and therefore the development of agricultural land is not likely to result in a significant environmental impact, when taken in the local context.</p> <p>The loss of the playing field element needs to be assessed, but the allocation of the sites for residential use is noted and the impact of the loss of either agricultural or playing field land uses in this context is not considered a significant impact on the environment for EIA purposes.</p>
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	The proposed development is in alignment with the Local Planning Policy intended land use of the site	N/A	
11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
11.1 Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme /adverse climatic conditions, e.g. temperature	No.	No unusual conditions or particular land instability are present on the application site.	N/A	

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems?				
12. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
12.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	Yes	<p>When considered together with the Ipswich Garden Suburb development and the Westerfield Care Home Development, the proposed development may have cumulative impacts in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heritage 2. Landscape and visual effects 3. Traffic impact (air quality, noise and volume of road use) 4. Ground condition and soils 5. Water resources management and supply 6. Waste collection and landfill impact 7. Carbon emissions 8. Ecology/Biodiversity/protected and sensitive species loss and Recreational disturbance. 9. Socio-Economic Impacts. 	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heritage Impact Assessment required to support proposals and identify mitigation. The cumulative development is at a greater distance and would not have a cumulative impact on heritage in close proximity to the proposals with the exception of Westerfield House which has already had development approved alongside it (Westerfield Care Home) – retention of boundary screening will be important mitigation. 2. Landscape and Visual effects - To be assessed, but likely to be of only moderate significance. In combination impact with IGS development considered but are separated by physical distance and features such as railway line, roads, topography and other development.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>3. Transport Assessment, Noise and Air Quality Assessment to be undertaken to determine impact and mitigation. It is noted that IGS developments have been identified as EIA development with Transport impacts being scoped into the assessments. Humber Doucy Lane is a standalone site with only a proportion of traffic expected to reach junctions which are directly impacted by the IGS developments. Of particular note is the Westerfield junction where approx.2000 homes will be accessing directly on to Westerfield Road with majority of traffic continuing south to the Westerfield Roundabout. HDL represents substantially less houses and below the EIA threshold of 1,000 homes, a small proportion of HDL traffic is expected to reach the Westerfield junction.</p> <p>4. Nature of the scheme suggests significance of contamination is low. Agricultural value of the soil is high,</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>but is not considered scarce so even as a cumulative impact it is not considered significant. The land has been allocated for housing in the Local Plan and consideration of the loss of this land in combination with other developments has been accepted.</p> <p>5. Each cumulative development manages surface water on site and would also be the case for this proposed development. Anglian water/the applicant need to undertake strategic review to determine the impact of the development on water and waste water infrastructure.</p> <p>6. Waste management strategy will need to be prepared and implemented. These would be subject to relevant legislation and policy but overall cumulative impact is not considered likely to be significant for EIA purposes.</p> <p>7. Carbon emissions both embodied and operational will be required to be</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>calculated in a whole life carbon assessment and the development’s construction and operation will need to prepare and implement a carbon emissions reduction strategy.</p> <p>8. Habitats Regulations Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain calculation need to be undertaken with on-site provision of biodiversity net gain required and proportionate recreational disturbance contributions due. A RAMS strategy has been adopted and this sets out the mitigation which needs to be secured to support development in the Ipswich Local Plan. The HRA of the Ipswich Local Plan Review picked up and concluded that the RAMS includes a comprehensive monitoring and review programme that allows for new growth in the 2018-2036 Local Plan to be incorporated into the avoidance and mitigation measures programme. This approach was accepted by Natural England.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>The HRA highlighted that this site is likely to require a bespoke SANGS in addition to contributions towards RAMS (as highlighted through Policy ISPA4). Consideration also needs to be given to the nearby SANG being delivered as part of the Ipswich Garden Suburb and wider footpath network which may be linked to any new SANG provision. It is therefore considered that any impacts can be satisfactorily dealt with through the planning application process, and through conditions to secure appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>9. Impact on health, education and community facilities can be dealt with through the application, with education and health contributions required and open space provided within the scheme.</p>
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is ‘No’, the answer to Part 3a / 3b is ‘N/A’)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ¹	No	Only transboundary in terms of being undertaken in two adjoining Local Authority Areas (East Suffolk District Council and Ipswich Borough Council) Otherwise development is limited to the application site and the nature, scale and location of the proposed development would not result in any transboundary impacts associated with the proposed development.	N/A	

¹ The Regulations require consideration of the transboundary nature of the impact. Due to the England’s geographical location the vast majority of TCPA cases are unlikely to result in transboundary impacts.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been considered against The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and the National Planning Policy Guidance – Environmental Impact Assessment and for the reasons outlined in this report.


The Council have determined that in its opinion the proposed development **does not constitute EIA development and the production of an Environmental Statement will not be required.**

SCREENING DECISION

If a SO / SD has been provided do you agree with it?	
Is it necessary to issue a Screening Decision	Yes

ASSESSMENT (EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT

The development is likely to have a significant effect on the environment	Environmental Statement required	
The proposal is <u>not</u> likely to have a significant effect on the environment.	Environmental Statement not required	X
More information is required to inform the direction	Request further information	Provided by email on the 14 th February 2024

Name	Rosalynn Claxton
Date	22 nd May 2024
Reviewed by	James Mann MRTPI, Head of Planning and Development
Signature	
Date	22 May 2024