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July 2019
Purpose of Statement

1 This statement has been produced to inform the Inspector of the areas of agreement identified between the Council and Suffolk County Council in order to address the Inspector’s questions and Suffolk County Council’s representations.

2 Suffolk County Council made a number of constructive representations to the Regulation 19 Final Draft Local Plan consultation, around which discussion between the two parties has led to proposed main modifications to the following Local Plan Policies and supporting text:

- Policy SCLP2.2 Strategic Infrastructure Priorities (Rep ID: 1072 and Inspector’s question 2.35)
- Policy SCLP3.5 Infrastructure Provision (Rep ID: 1074 and Inspector’s question 2.39)
- Policy SCLP4.6 Conversion and Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment Use (Inspector’s question 2.28)
- Policy SCLP5.12 Houses in Multiple Occupation (Rep ID: 1077 and Inspector’s question 4.12)
- Policy SCLP7.1 Sustainable Transport (Rep ID: 1079 and Inspector’s question 4.21)
- Policy SCLP11.1 Design Quality (Inspector’s question 4.36)
- Policy SCLP11.6 Non-Designated Heritage Assets (Inspector’s question 4.40)
- Policy SCLP12.18 Communities Surrounding Ipswich (Inspector’s question 3.23)
- Policy SCLP12.19 Brightwell Lakes (Inspector’s question 3.24)
- Policy SCLP12.20 Land at Felixstowe Road (Rep ID: 1107)
- Policy SCLP12.29 South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (Rep ID: 1088 and Inspector’s question 3.40)
- Policy SCLP12.35 Innocence Farm (Inspector’s question 3.49)
- Policy SCLP12.49 Land north of The Street, Darsham (Inspector’s question 3.62)
- Policy SCLP12.52 Land West of Chapel Road, Grundisburgh (Rep ID: 1098)
- Policy SCLP12.59: Land adjacent to Swiss Farm, Otley (Inspector’s question 3.79)
• Policy SCLP12.66 Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, Trimley St Martin (Rep ID: 1104 and 1124)

**Agreed Position**

The parties agree to the main and additional modifications below. The parties agree that subject to the modifications the Plan is sound in respect of matters below. Insertions are shown in underline and deletions are shown in strikethrough.

**Policy SCLP2.2 Strategic Infrastructure Priorities**

Suffolk County Council submitted representations (Rep ID: 1072) referred to locations on the highways network that are likely to experience additional pressure as a result of new development. The representation states that the impacts on the network outside of Ipswich are significant but of a scale that could reasonably be mitigated to an acceptable degree by developer led schemes however that the impact on junctions of the A12 and A14 could require a mix of measures and that funding is less certain. The representation states that subject to further clarity on the delivery of identified measures, the County Council envisages modifications to the Plan through a Statement of Common Ground with the District Council. The Inspector has asked (question 2.35) whether the policy would be effective in dealing with strategic cross-boundary infrastructure issues, and whether the policy serves a clear purpose in seeking to support and enable infrastructure provision outside of the plan area and is justified.

The Council and Suffolk County Council, along with the other authorities in the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area, have been progressing further work to identify with additional certainty a package of measures that would address the issues identified and provide confidence that impacts on the road network would not be severe.

This has involved additional modelling of the impacts of growth on the network, applying adjustments to account for further modal shift that could be reasonably anticipated to be achieved. Based upon the outputs of this, in order to prioritise sustainable transport options and to ensure that significant impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable degree and that any severe impacts can be avoided, Suffolk County Council has undertaken further analysis of potential measures, costs and funding mechanisms as part of the development of a strategy. A Technical Note relating to impacts on the Strategic Road Network accompanies the above reports and considers the potential for infrastructure improvements at the junctions on the A14 in addressing the capacity issues.
An overview of the work described above, and the mitigation measures that will need to be pursued collectively including the likely costs was presented to the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area Board at its meeting on 22rd July 2019. The Draft Action Notes from the meeting (Appended to this Statement of Common Ground) explains that the Board acknowledge there is a need to progress with work to produce a mitigation strategy which would include the identification of appropriate funding sources. This will be taken forward through future Board meetings.

The Council and Suffolk County Council have agreed the following modifications:

“2.15 The provision of new and improved infrastructure is essential to ensure that the growth planned across the area is sustainable. Planning for infrastructure across the area will include schools, sustainable transport measures, improvements to the A12 and A14, improvements to other parts of the road networks and the railways. In addition to infrastructure requirements directly linked to planned growth, there are other cross-boundary projects that would help to grow and improve the economy and quality of life for the area. The Upper Orwell Crossings has been identified as a project to relieve traffic congestion around Ipswich town centre and the A14, involving the construction of three new bridges around the Ipswich docks. However, the overall estimated costs have increased and the project is currently paused. Development in the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area is predicted to collectively add to significant strain on the transport network in and around Ipswich. Additional highway capacity will not on its own address these issues and the ISPA authorities agree that robust steps must be taken to prioritise healthy and sustainable travel. A package of transport mitigation measures has been identified to reduce vehicle movements. Suffolk County Council as the Highway Authority has developed a strategy which contains a package of mitigation measures to deliver modal shift and mitigate impacts on the wider Ipswich highways network. These include:

- Transport infrastructure to encourage and support sustainable modes of transport
- A Bus Quality Partnership
- A Smarter Choices programme
- Review of car parking and pricing strategies
- Review of park and ride strategy
- Junction improvements

The strategy which has been developed by Suffolk County Council identifies the costs of delivering these measures and apportionments based on impacts related to planned growth within each local planning authority area. East Suffolk Council is committed to working with the other authorities across the ISPA to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach to funding the mitigation through the delivery of the Local Plan.”

*Policy SCLP2.2:*
“The Council will work with partners such as the other local planning authorities in the ISPA, Suffolk County Council, Clinical Commissioning Groups, Suffolk Constabulary, utilities companies, Highways England and Network Rail in supporting and enabling the delivery of key strategic infrastructure, and in particular the timely delivery of:

a) Ipswich Northern Route;
b) A12 improvements;
c) A14 improvements;
d) Sustainable transport measures in Ipswich;
e) Improved walking and cycle routes;
f) Increased capacity on railway lines for freight and passenger traffic;
g) Appropriate education provision to meet needs resulting from growth;
h) Appropriate health and leisure provision to meet needs resulting from growth;
i) Appropriate police, community safety and cohesion provision to meet needs resulting from growth;
j) Provision of green infrastructure and Suitable Alternatives Natural Greenspace;
k) Improvements to water supply, foul sewerage and sewage treatment capacity; and
l) Provision of appropriate digital telecommunications to provide mobile, broadband and radio signal for residents and businesses.

The Council will work with Suffolk County Council and with the other Local Planning Authorities in the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area to support, through a package of funding sources, a range of new and enhanced sustainable transport measures in and around Ipswich.”

Monitoring Framework (page 414):

In row for SCLP2.2, add ‘ISPA strategy to deliver highways mitigation’ into Implementation Mechanism column, add ‘ISPA authorities’ to Responsible Organisations column and add ‘Monitoring and review of ISPA strategy to deliver highways mitigation through ISPA Board’ to the Mitigation / contingencies column.

Infrastructure Delivery Framework (page 445):

See attached table. Note this also includes deletion of the Upper Orwell Crossings to reflect that this scheme is no longer going ahead.
Glossary, page 518:

“Modal shift

The change in the mode of transport from car trips, in particular single occupancy car trips, to sustainable modes for example walking, cycling, car sharing and use of public transport.”

Glossary, page 522:

“Smarter Choices

Active engagement with businesses and individuals to influence people’s travel behaviour towards more sustainable options, such as walking, cycling, travelling by public transport and car sharing, delivering modal shift.”

Policy SCLP3.5 Infrastructure Provision

Suffolk County Council submitted a representation (Rep ID: 1074) stating that the sixth paragraph does not make grammatical sense leading to potential confusion over implementation of the policy. The Inspector has asked (question 2.39) whether it is intended that development follows the principles of holistic water management as the policy as drafted is unclear. The changes set out below would address the issue.

Changes to policy

Modification to sixth paragraph:

“Development will be expected to follow the principles of Holistic Water Management as set out in Policy SCLP9.7 and will not be permitted where it would have a significant effect on the capacity of existing water infrastructure and will follow the principles of Holistic Water Management”.

Policy SCLP4.6 Conversion and Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment Use

The Inspector has raised a question (2.28) asking whether criterion b) of the policy is clear, effective in terms of highway safety or consistent with paragraph 109 of the NPPF. The Council and Suffolk County Council (as Highways Authority) agree that the changes set out below would address the issue.

Changes to policy

Modifications to criteria b) and g):
The conversion of rural buildings to employment use will be permitted where:

a) The business use is of a scale and character that is appropriate to its location in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy;

b) The proposal does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, local roads, or the amenity of local residents and exploits opportunities to make the location more sustainable by walking, cycling or public transport and would not have an adverse effect on highway safety and the amenity of local residents;

c) The proposal would not conflict with neighbouring uses;

d) The proposal is complementary to the setting of any historic or architecturally important buildings and reflects the form and character of the existing buildings; and

e) The design and construction do not have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding landscape, the AONB and its setting, or harm the natural or historic environment.

The replacement of rural buildings with employment uses will be permitted where:

f) The proposal is of a similar size and scale to the building that is being replaced;

g) The proposal does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, local roads, or the amenity of local residents and exploits opportunities to make the location more sustainable by walking, cycling or public transport and would not have an adverse effect on highway safety and the amenity of local residents;

h) The proposal would not conflict with neighbouring uses;

i) The proposal is complementary to the setting of any historic or architecturally important buildings and reflects the form and character of the existing buildings;

j) The proposal would not result in a significant adverse environmental impact; and

k) The proposal enables farm, forestry and other land-based businesses to build the buildings and infrastructure they need to function efficiently.

Policy SCLP5.12: Houses in Multiple Occupation

The Inspector has questioned (question 4.12) whether criterion b) of the policy would be effective in dealing with the transport implications of proposals. Suffolk County Council (Rep ID: 1077) have raised concerns regarding the effectiveness of the policy with regards to vehicle parking requirements for HMOs. Suffolk County Council suggested amended wording address this.
Both parties agree that a main modification to the policy would clarify the relationship between levels of parking and access to sustainable modes of travel.

The Council and Suffolk County Council agree that the main modification set out below would address this and that the Plan is therefore sound in respect of this matter.

**Changes to policy**

b) Provision can be made for sufficient parking and where the dwelling is, or can be made to be, accessible to public transport services and main employment and service centres on foot and by cycle; and, or the dwelling is served by good public transport or walking/cycling links which connect the dwelling to main employment and service centres; and

---

**Policy SCLP7.1 Sustainable Transport**

Suffolk County Council representation (Rep ID: 1079) states that the policy does not make specific reference to the requirement in paragraph 108(c) of the NPPF for cost-effective limitation of significant highway impacts. The Inspector has asked (question 4.21) whether the policy would be effective in preventing significant impacts on the highway network.

Further, as per the position in respect of Policy SCLP2.2 above, the parties agree that modifications are appropriate to ensure that the policy addresses the need for mitigation associated with the collective impacts of growth on the highways network in the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area. The changes set out below would address these issues.

**Changes to supporting text**

*Modification through insertion of new paragraph after paragraph 7.4:*

“In order to mitigate the cumulative impacts of growth in the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area on junctions and roads in and around Ipswich, and to promote healthy travel options, a package of transport measures has been identified to reduce vehicle movements. They include:

- Transport infrastructure to encourage and support sustainable modes of transport
- A Bus Quality Partnership
- A Smarter Choices programme
- Review of car parking and pricing strategies
- Review of park and ride strategy
- Junction improvements

Sustainable transport measures will therefore be expected to promote and deliver modal shift in a manner consistent with local strategies.”
Add new sentence to end of paragraph 7.8:
“Travel planning can offer good practice for meeting the requirements set out in this policy for maximising sustainable transport even on sites that do meet the thresholds for a full travel plan.”

Changes to Policy

Modification to Policy SCLP7.1:

“Development proposals should be designed from the outset to incorporate measures that will encourage people to travel using non-car modes to access home, school, employment, services and facilities.

Development will be supported where:

a) It will limit significant impacts on the highways network;

b) It is proportionate in scale to the existing transport network;

c) All available opportunities to enable and support travel on foot, by cycle or public transport have been considered and taken;

d) It is located close to, and provides safe pedestrian and cycle access to services and facilities;

e) It is well integrated into and enhances the existing cycle network including the safe design and layout of new cycle routes and provision of covered, secure cycle parking;

f) It is well integrated into, protects and enhances the existing pedestrian routes and the public rights of way network;

g) It reduces conflict between users of the transport network including pedestrians, cyclists, users of mobility vehicles and drivers and does not reduce road safety; and

h) It will improve public transport in the rural areas of the District; and

i) The cumulative impact of new development will not create severe impacts on the existing transport network.

Development will be expected to contribute to the delivery of local sustainable transport strategies for managing the cumulative impacts of growth.

Opportunities to improve provision of or access to public transport, in particular within rural areas, will be supported.

Proposals for new development that would have significant transport implications should be accompanied by a Travel Plan. A Travel Plan will be required for proposals for:
h) New large scale employment sites;

i) Residential development of 80 or more dwellings; and

j) A development that when considered cumulatively with other developments, is likely to have a severe impact on the local community or local road network.

In consultation with the Highway Authority, the scale, location and nature of development will be considered in determining how the transport impacts of development should be assessed. As indicative thresholds a Transport Statement will be required for development of 50-80 dwellings and a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be required for developments of over 80 dwellings. Non residential development will be considered on a case by case basis dependent on the volume of movements anticipated with the use proposed.”

Policy SCLP11.1 Design Quality

Inspector’s question 4.36 asks whether criterion h) is clear. The Council considers that criterion h) makes sense but could be clearer and more concise. The Council would support the following modification to criterion h), and Suffolk County Council as Highways Authority also support this modification as set out below.

*Changes to supporting text*

*Modification to criterion h) of Policy SCLP11.1:*

“Provide highway layouts with well integrated car parking and landscaping which create a high quality public realm, and avoiding the perception of a car dominated environment. In doing so, proposals will be expected to prioritise and ensure safe, attractive and convenient pedestrian and cycle movement; and that encourage and the use of pedestrian, cycle and other sustainable modes as the most attractive modes of sustainable travel;”

SCLP12.18: Strategy for Communities Surrounding Ipswich

The Inspector has asked, in question 3.23, whether the strategy would be effective in addressing the potential impacts of development on the transport networks consistent with the policies of the NPPF. The Councils would support a modification to this policy in light of the proposed modifications to SCLP2.2 which relate to mitigating the impacts on the capacity of the highway network in and around Ipswich. The modification is set out below.

*Changes to supporting text*

*Additional paragraph below 12.177:*
“Development in the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area is predicted to collectively add to significant strain on the transport network in and around Ipswich. Additional highway capacity will not on its own address these issues and the ISPA authorities agree that robust steps must be taken to prioritise healthy and sustainable travel. A package of transport mitigation measures has been identified to reduce vehicle movements. Suffolk County Council as the Highway Authority has developed a strategy which contains a package of mitigation measures to deliver modal shift and mitigate impacts on the wider Ipswich highways network. The Council will work with the other authorities across the ISPA to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach to funding the mitigation through the delivery of the Local Plan.”

**Changes to Policy**

**Additional text to second paragraph of policy:**

“Provision of appropriate community infrastructure, education facilities and public transport will be supported where the needs are clearly demonstrated. "Provision of appropriate community infrastructure, education facilities and public transport will be supported where the needs are clearly demonstrated. Development will be expected to maximise its contribution to sustainable transport and promotion of modal shift in order to contribute to the delivery of new and enhanced sustainable transport measures in and around Ipswich.”

**Policy SCLP12.20: Land at Felixstowe Road**

Suffolk County Council submitted representations (Rep ID: 1107) relating to the sustainable transport provisions of this policy. Given the location and the nature of the use (as a significant attractor of trips), as well as the overarching need for the plan as a whole to promote sustainable transport, the parties agree that the following amendment is required.

**Changes to policy**

**Modification to fifth paragraph of policy SCLP12.20:**

“Buildings will be expected to provide a high quality attractive environment with areas of green infrastructure and appropriate provision for vehicular parking, walking and cycling. Opportunities to encourage and enable travel to the site by walking and cycling must be realised along with measures to encourage travel to the site by public transport. Opportunities to enhance and link into the existing Public Rights of Way network are encouraged.”
Policy SCLP12.29 South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood

Suffolk County Council representation (Rep ID: 1088) states that this policy is welcomed as it makes provision for a new primary school at Saxmundham. Inspector’s Question 3.40 asks whether the policy would be effective in achieving provision of required education facilities and is it justified to include the provision of early years in both criteria a) and b).

The parties agree that, in order to meet expected demand from residential development in Saxmundham Ward, a new early years setting will be required at the new primary school. Further, additional places will be required. These could be provided elsewhere, off-site, but site 12.29 needs to reserve land in case alternative options are not deliverable. 0.1ha needs to be reserved for the additional places, rather than 0.13ha. The parties have agreed to relevant amendments.

The changes set out below would address the issue.

**Changes to supporting text**

*Insert additional text at end of 12.291:*

“Early years capacity is forecast to be exceeded in the area over the plan period, and therefore new provision is expected to be provided alongside the new primary school. In addition, to meet forecast need, the policy also requires provision for a new early years setting on 0.1ha of land unless suitable and accessible accommodation is available elsewhere. At the time of a planning application, it will need to be demonstrated either that provision is to be made on site, or that there is certainty that suitable provision can be provided elsewhere.”

**Changes to policy**

*Main modifications to criterion b):*

“b) 0.13ha of land on the site should be reserved for a further new early years setting should suitable and accessible alternative provision not be available elsewhere. Proportionate contributions will be required towards the additional early years provision;“

Policy SCLP12.35 Land at Innocence Farm (Question 3.49)

The Inspector has asked (question 3.49) whether additional clarity is required in order to guide decision making in respect of access requirements for land at Innocence Farm.
The parties agree that access via an all-movements east – west junction on the A14 is required to serve the site and that this should be provided as early as possible in the development, in order to avoid aggravating pressures on Junction 58 of the A14 and to avoid unnecessary miles travelled.

The parties agree that an amendment to the Plan would help ensure early delivery of this access and would help ensure that the financial burden of delivering this access would not fall on later phases alone.

**Changes to supporting text**

*New paragraph after 12.384:*

“Whilst it may be possible to deliver some employment development from existing junctions in their current form, provision for access via an all-movement A14 junction must be achieved early in the development. Any planning permission for the site will need to include measures to guarantee early delivery of all-movement A14 access in order to avoid unacceptable significant impacts on the strategic or local highway networks.”

*Modification to paragraph 12.395:*

“Dedicated access from the A14 at the western end of the site making use of existing junctions and utilising land south of the A14 is required to provide vehicular access to the site in both an easterly and westerly direction. Any planning permission for the site must include a requirement to ensure early delivery of this access, to ensure that the site is phased in an effective manner and to avoid significant impacts on the highway network. HGV movements will be restricted to dedicated routes introduced to the satisfaction of Suffolk County Council and Highways England. Opportunities to connect Innocence Farm and the Port of Felixstowe by railway should be investigated and these will be supported where they further reduce the traffic movements on the main road network.”

**Changes to policy**

*Modifications to second paragraph of policy:*

“Dedicated access from the A14 at the western end of the site and utilising land south of the A14 is required to provide vehicular access to the site in both an easterly and westerly direction. Any planning permission for the site must include a requirement to ensure early delivery of this access, to ensure that the site is phased in an effective manner and to avoid significant impacts on the highway network. HGV movements will be restricted to dedicated routes introduced to the satisfaction of Suffolk County Council and Highways England. Opportunities to connect Innocence Farm and the Port of Felixstowe by railway should be
investigated and these will be supported where they further reduce the traffic movements on the main road network.”

*Addition of new paragraph above last paragraph in policy:*

Evidence will need to be provided that all necessary transport infrastructure will be delivered in a timely manner, to the satisfaction of the relevant highway authorities.

Any development which would result in significant adverse effects which could not be appropriately mitigated will not be permitted.

**Policy SCLP12.49 Land north of The Street, Darsham**

Inspector’s question 3.62 asks whether access via Millfields as set out in criterion a) is deliverable and justified. Suffolk County Council have not submitted a representation in relation to this issue, however support the change set out below:

*Changes to supporting text*

12.531 A number of trees along the southern boundary of the site have Tree Preservation Orders, and should be protected wherever possible. Access to the site could be via the adjoining Millfields development or via The Street provided that trees and hedgerows are retained where possible.

*Changes to policy*

1.11ha of land north of The Street, Darsham, as shown on the Policies Map, is identified for the development of approximately 25 dwellings.

Development will be expected to comply with the following criteria:

a) Provision of a safe and suitable access; Access to be provided through the existing Millfields development or via The Street;

b) Existing hedgerows and trees on the frontage of The Street to be retained subject to provision of satisfactory access;

c) Retention of trees on the southern boundary of the site;

d) Enhancements to the existing footway along part of southern boundary linking into the site;

e) A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment;

f) Evidence is required to demonstrate there is adequate Water Recycling Centre capacity and provision for treatment or that this can be provided;

g) Affordable housing to be provided on-site; and

h) An archaeological assessment will be required.
Policy SCLP12.52 Land West of Chapel Road, Grundisburgh

Suffolk County Council submitted a representation (Rep ID: 1098) stating that the text in paragraph 12.580 is incorrect. The modifications below would address this issue.

**Changes to supporting text**

“12.580 Consideration should be given to the topography and geology of the site and the surrounding area in terms of surface water drainage. Infiltration is unlikely to be feasible and an off site drainage solution may be required. Evidence from the British Geological Survey suggests that the site is likely to be suitable for infiltration of surface water, although this will need to be considered through a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy prepared as part of the development management process. There is a 1 in 100 year surface water flood path through the site, which will need to be considered as part of the detailed design of the site. The site is located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) which will need to be considered as part of the drainage strategy.”

**Changes to policy**

None identified

Policy SCLP12.59: Land adjacent to Swiss Farm, Otley

The Inspector asks (question 3.79) whether in the context of the requirements for a transport statement particularly addressing the B1078/B1079 junction, the site be considered to be deliverable or developable. It is agreed that in order to ensure that any potential impacts are appropriately assessed the Council would support a modifications, as agreed through the Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk County Council, as set out below:

**Changes to supporting text**

“12.664 Transport modelling undertaken as part of the production of the Local Plan indicates that there will be potential capacity issues at the junction of the B1079 and B1078 to the south of Otley based upon growth within the area. Due to its proximity a Transport Assessment Statement will therefore need to consider the impacts of development on that junction.”

**Changes to policy**

“f) Provision of a Transport Assessment Statement, in particular to assess impacts on the B1078 / B1079 junction;”
Policy SCLP12.66: Land adjacent to Reeve Lodge, High Road, Trimley St Martin

Suffolk County Council, in their representation (Rep ID: 1124), suggested a modification to criterion c) of this policy to remove reference to the specific amount of land for early years provision as it is deemed to be too prescriptive. The modification below will address this issue.

Suffolk County Council submitted a representation (Rep ID 1104) stating that, given the size of the site and its proximity to existing residential areas, it is unlikely that prior extraction will be feasible. As such, the parties have agreed to modify the supporting text to instead reference the testing of the quality of the on-site mineral resource for the purposes of using in the construction of the site itself. The modification below will address this issue.

**Changes to supporting text**

*Modification to paragraph 12.766:*

“12.766 The site is located within a Minerals Consultation Area as defined by Suffolk County Council as the Minerals Planning Authority. Therefore any planning application should be supported by evidence which assesses the quality and quantity of sand and gravel resources on site in order to help judge whether on-site resources should be used on-site during development. This may help reduce the amount of material transported on and off site during development. Therefore any planning application should be supported by evidence which assesses the quality and quantity of sand and gravel resources. Planning applications should be supported by evidence considering the suitability for prior extraction having regard to the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan and other material considerations. Should the site be considered suitable for prior extraction, having regard to the evidence submitted together with advice from the Minerals Planning Authority, any planning permission for development will be conditioned to take place in phases which allow for prior extraction of some or all of the economic resource.”

**Changes to Policy**

*Modification to criterion c):*

“Provision of 2.2ha of land for a primary school including and 0.1ha of land for early years provision;”
Signatures

Signature: [Blank]
Print name: Philip Ridley
Position: Head of Planning and Coastal Management
Authority: East Suffolk Council

Signature: [Blank]
Print name: Mark Ash
Position: Executive Director for Growth, Highways and Infrastructure
Authority: Suffolk County Council
### Table related to modification 2F6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Lead Provider</th>
<th>Approximate Cost</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Potential Funding Amount</th>
<th>Potential Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Type of Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</th>
<th>Timescale/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Felixstowe branch rail line including - double tracking, a rail line loop near Trimley and improvements to level crossings and signalling.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>£60,400,000</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>£60,400,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>April 2018 – Autumn 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 – Four villages improvements</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>EDF, Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£88,000,000 - £133,000,000</td>
<td>EDF, Suffolk County Council, Central Government</td>
<td>£88,000,000 - £133,000,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medium – Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Upper Orwell Crossings</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£131.5m – £139.8m</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Central Government, Developers, other external funding sources</td>
<td>£77.5m Off Up to £13.1m S278/S106/CI L</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>£34.3 – £43.3m</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation of Shared Space Scheme at Felixstowe Town Centre</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Felixstowe Town Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council, Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Felixstowe Town Council, Suffolk Coastal District Council, Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106/CI L</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable transport, traffic management and cycle route improvements at Felixstowe</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Developers, Suffolk Coastal District Council, Felixstowe Town Council</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S106/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to improve capacity at Garrison Lane / High Road junction</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£250,000 - £300,000</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to improve capacity at Garrison Lane / Mill Lane junction</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£250,000 - £300,000</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to A14, junction 55 (Copdock)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Highways England</td>
<td>£65,000,000 - £100,000,000</td>
<td>Developers, Highways England, Central Government</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Highways England, Central Government, other ISPA authorities</td>
<td>Over entire plan period; local (Suffolk Coastal) contribution derived from traffic modelling of proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress of trips derived from Suffolk Coastal Local Plan growth: One decision plan period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to A14, junction 56 (Wherstead)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Highways England</td>
<td>£5,000,000 - £10,000,000 TBC</td>
<td>Developers, Highways England, Central Government</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Contribution unknown – potential contribution from development proposal in Babergh District to be funded via CIL</td>
<td>DfT/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer contributions from ISPA authorities, Highways England (RIS or Minor Works Fund), Central Government</td>
<td>Over entire plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to A14, junction 57 (Nacton)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Highways England</td>
<td>£5,000,000 - £10,000,000</td>
<td>Developers, Highways England, Central Government</td>
<td>£1,075,000 - £2,150,000 Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>DfT Minor Works Fund</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Highways England, Central Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to A14, junction 58 (Seven Hills)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Highways England</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>Developers, Highways England, Central Government</td>
<td>Unknown (if under s278)</td>
<td>Unknown 100%</td>
<td>CIL/s278/s106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Highways England, Central Government, other ISPA authorities</td>
<td>Over entire plan period. Contributions expected from sites SCLP12.19 and SCLP12.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable transport measures in Ipswich in Smarter Choices, Quality Bus Partnership and other measures</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>Unknown £7,300,000 - £8,400,000</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council, Developers, ISPA Authorities Suffolk Coastal District Council Ipswich Borough Council</td>
<td>Unknown £2,100,000 - £2,400,000</td>
<td>Unknown £2,100,000 - £2,400,000</td>
<td>S106/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer contributions from ISPA authorities Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period (figures to 2026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure improvements to support sustainable</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£16,000,000 - £20,000,000 (up to 2026)</td>
<td>Developers, Suffolk County Council, ISPA</td>
<td>Unknown £4,500,000 - £5,600,000</td>
<td>£4,500,000 - £5,600,000</td>
<td>S106/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer contributions IPSA Authorities Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period (figures to 2026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transport measures and junction improvements</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£200,000 - £250,000</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown Full</td>
<td>Unknown Full</td>
<td>CIL s106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>from ISPA authorities</td>
<td>2026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to increase capacity on Foxhall Road (from A12 to Heath Road)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£1,000,000 - £4,000,000</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown. Proportion from East Suffolk TBC</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer contributions from ISPA Authorities</td>
<td>Over entire plan period. Note: there is a requirement for permitted site SCLP12.19 to deliver these improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to increase capacity on A1214</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£250,000 - £300,000</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown Full</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to improve capacity at Melton crossroads</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>£300,000 - £350,000</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown Full</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to improve capacity at A12/B1079 junction</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Central Government Funding, NSIPs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access improvements to</td>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Greater Anglia</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Greater Anglia, Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Over entire plan period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail stations and enhancement of ancillary rail station facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, cycle and footway improvements for North Felixstowe Garden</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106/CLL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood (SCLP12.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and connectivity improvements at Land north of Conway Close and</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£50,000 - £150,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£50,000 - £150,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallow Close, Felixstowe (SCLP12.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and cycle enhancements at Land at Brackenbury Sports Centre,</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe (SCLP12.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land at Sea Road</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (SCLP12.6) | | | | | | | | | | developme
| Access improvements at Bridge Road, Felixstowe (SCLP12.8) | Essential/Critical | Developer | £50,000 | Developer | N/A | £50,000 | S278/S106 | Unknown | Unknown | Short – Medium term (with developme
| Junction Improvements at Land at Carr Road/Langer Road, Felixstowe (SCLP12.9) | Essential/Critical | Developer | £100,000 - £150,000 | Developer | N/A | £100,000 - £150,000 | S278/S106 | Unknown | Unknown | Short – Medium term (with developme
| Sustainable pedestrian and cycle connectivity at Land at Haven Exchange (SCLP12.10) | Essential | Developer | £50,000 | Developer | N/A | £50,000 | S278/S106 | Unknown | Unknown | Short – Medium term (with developme
| Significant access improvements and improvements to the wider Land at Felixstowe Road (SCLP12.20) | Critical | Developer | £350,000 - £500,000 | Developer, Suffolk County Council, Highways England | Unknown | £350,000 - £500,000 | S278/S106 | Unknown | New Anglia LEP | Short – Medium term (with developme
| Footway improvements at Ransomes, Nacton Heath (SCLP12.21) | Essential | Developer | £100,000 | Developer | N/A | £100,000 | S278/S106 | Unknown | Unknown | Short – Medium term (with developme
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Lead Provider</th>
<th>Approximate Cost</th>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Potential Funding Amount</th>
<th>Potential Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Type of Developer Contribution</th>
<th>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</th>
<th>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</th>
<th>Timescale/Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access, junction, cycle and footway improvements at Suffolk Police HQ, Portal Avenue, Martlesham (SCLP12.25)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>£278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and junction improvements at Land rear of Rose Hill, Saxmundham Road, Aldeburgh (SCLP12.27)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£25,000 - £45,000 (footway works)</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£25,000 - £45,000 (footway works)</td>
<td>£278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, sustainable transport, cycle and footway improvements for South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (SCLP12.29)</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>£278/S106/CIL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term During plan period (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>£278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements along with maximisation of cycle and pedestrian connectivity at Land north-east of Street Farm, Saxmundham (SCLP12.30)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medium term During plan period (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to improve capacity at B1121/Chantry Road junction, Saxmundham</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and junction improvements at Land at Woodbridge Town Football Club (SCLP12.33)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant access and footway improvements and improvements to the wider network at Land at Innocence Farm (SCLP12.35)</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Developer, Suffolk County Council, Highways England</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New Anglia LEP</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the East of Aldeburgh Road, Aldringham (SCLP12.43)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£50,000 - £70,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£50,000 - £70,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle and footway improvements at Land south of Forge Close between Main Road and Ayden, Benhall (SCLP12.44)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£40,000 - £100,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£40,000 - £100,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land to the South East of Levington Lane, Bucklesham (SCLP12.45)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle and footway improvements at Land to the south of Darsham Station (SCLP12.48)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£15,000 - £25,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£15,000 - £25,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land off Laxfield Road, Dennington (SCLP12.50)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and footway improvements at Land west of Chapel</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Development</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road, Grundisburgh (SCLP12.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and pedestrian connectivity improvements at Land south of Amble</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£15,000 (pedestrian connectivity)</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and pedestrian connectivity improvements at Land south of Ambleside, Main Road, Kelsale cum Carlton (SCLP12.53)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£30,000 (pedestrian connectivity)</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction and footway improvements at Land at School Road, Knodishall</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£5,000 - £10,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£5,000 - £10,000 (footway improvements at Land at School Road, Knodishall (SCLP12.56))</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction and footway improvements at Land at School Road, Knodishall</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£30,000 (footway improvements at Land at School Road, Knodishall (SCLP12.56))</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Way and access improvements at Land adjacent to Swiss Farm, Orley</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£30,000 (Rights of Way and access improvements at Land adjacent to Swiss Farm, Orley (SCLP12.59))</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land adjacent to Swiss Farm, Otley (SCLP12.59</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£30,000 (Footway improvements at Land adjacent to Swiss Farm, Otley (SCLP12.59))</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with developme nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farthings Sibton Road, Peasenhall (SCLP12.60)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£95,000 - £115,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£95,000 - £115,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land between High Street and Chapel Lane, Pettistree (SCLP12.61)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian connectivity improvements at Land east of Redwald Road, Rendlesham (SCLP12.63)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and pedestrian improvements at Land opposite The Sorrel Horse, The Street, Shottisham (SCLP12.64)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£200,000 - £300,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£200,000 - £300,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, footway and cycle connectivity improvements at Land off Howlett Way, Trimley St Martin (SCLP12.65)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Rights of Way improvements at Land off Keightley Way, Tuddenham (SCLP12.67)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land south of Lower Road, Westerfield (SCLP12.68)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£25,000 - £45,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£25,000 - £45,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land west of B1125, Westleton (SCLP12.69)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and footway improvements at Land at Mow Hill, Witnesham (SCLP12.71)</td>
<td>Essential/Critical</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£20,000 - £40,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£20,000 - £40,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway improvements at Land at Street Farm, Witnesham</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>S278/S106</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Short – Medium term (with development of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Lead Provider</td>
<td>Approximate Cost</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Potential Funding Amount</td>
<td>Potential Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Type of Developer Contribution</td>
<td>Potential Remaining Funding Gap</td>
<td>Potential Funding Sources to Fill Gap</td>
<td>Timescale/P (SCLP12.72) Progess nt of site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SCLP12.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£16,700,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£9,630,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£166,075,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£148,400,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£219,125,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£345,655,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£324,255,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£254,730,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£233,430,000 000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Funding sources are not provided in the document.*