

# SHOTLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Chair: R Wrinch, Hill House, Wades Lane, Shotley, Ipswich IP9 1EW

*Please address all correspondence to the temporary clerk:*

**Mrs Carol Williamson,**  
**Brook Vale House, Stowmarket Road, Rattlesden, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP30 0RR**  
Tel: 01449 736362 Email: [ecwil@hotmail.com](mailto:ecwil@hotmail.com)

February 6<sup>th</sup> 2006

**Richard Watson**  
**Head of Planning Control**  
**Babergh District Council**  
**Corks Lane**  
**Hadleigh**  
**IP7 6SJ**

Dear Mr Watson

**Application No: B/03/01085/OUT**  
**Location: Former HMS Ganges Site**  
**Section 106 Issues**

We have been provided with a copy of the proposed s106 Developer Obligations Version 9 by Haylink and have also had time to consider the points made in your email of 21 December 2005 and your recent meeting with Councillor Steel.

Does this document represent the conclusion of negotiations between the District Council and Haylink, subject to the drawing together of a legal contract?

We have noted that in total the cost to the developer of the measures they have proposed is £11477 per unit based on the 325 units or £7460 based on the 500 units. It is our view that this sum amounts to development on the cheap. In Milton Keynes the local authority is requiring developers to provide £18500 per unit. It would be stating the obvious to say that Shotley bears no comparison to that area in terms of infrastructure. You mentioned that this may reflect a difference in property prices. If so then you may wish to note that in September 2005 the average house price in Milton Keynes was £182 117 in Babergh it was £190 792.

## **Affordable Housing**

We have noted that the Haylink offer for on and off site is a total of 67 units which is slightly ahead of Babergh's requirement for 20% of the total to be committed to affordable housing. We have provided evidence in our Parish Plan showing that housing need locally exceeded the estimate in the Babergh Housing Needs Survey. For this reason and because the development should be contributing towards meeting housing need in the whole district we consider that the 35% affordability policy should be pursued.

We trust that you are now in a position to respond to the points we have made regarding provision of sheltered housing and a foyer type project on the site. We

believe that it is fundamental to the sustainability of the site and the area, that vulnerable elderly people remain close to their family and social support networks and that young people are able to make real choices about education, training and the transition to adulthood.

We are concerned that for the off-site provision a five year clawback is being proposed. Securing sites at appropriate locations is very difficult. I believe Holbrook have been seeking sites for almost this length of time.

## **Education**

We will defer to the County Council on whether the sum for Shotley Primary and Holbrook High Schools is sufficient. However, we would reiterate the point that the agreement should specify that the sum is ringfenced to these two schools.

We have noted the amount proposed for local pre-school provision and we assume that this refers to Shotley Kidzone. It falls significantly short of the additional resources that the management committee and professional staff believe will be required. Kidzone provides a range of services in addition to pre-school education. Recent information from the South Suffolk Community Cluster investigating the potential locations for Children's Centres shows that Berners ward is the second most deprived in the cluster for children's services. The bid prepared by Kidzone is attached both as evidence of existing need and how the development will require significant additional resources.

## **Library**

I understand that the County Council have already indicated to you that this sum is inadequate.

## **Transportation Fund**

The granting of the permissions for Bathside Bay and Felixstowe South make this requirement redundant as this facility will now be funded in total by the port developer.

## **Highway Improvements**

We understood from Cllr. Steel's meeting that there were to be no proposals made on these matters other than the Freston and Wherstead junctions and that there would be a binding commitment to local consultations and funding the outcome of the same. What we now see is that the County Council have, without any consultation with this Parish, agreed a set of five measures and that future consultation will be limited to them alone. This is wholly inadequate.

Clarification is sought as to what precisely is meant by "Shotley Village School improvements." The only matter outstanding is, we believe, the cycle route from Shotley Gate to the school.

## **Community Fund**

The sum proposed falls well short of our estimation of what is required. Have Haylink provided any justification for the figures they have proposed? In the absence of a

feasibility study it is not possible to say if the developers' wish for a 5 year clawback period is justified.

### **Travel Plan and Construction Management Plan**

Without any detail it is very difficult to comment. If there are drafts of either plans we would wish to comment on them.

### **Health Care Provision**

We have noted that this falls short of the sum requested by the PCT. We have discussed the view that the Ambulance Trust do not support our view that the increase in population requires a community paramedic and our position has not changed. The proposal to form a community responder scheme is in our view inadequate and effectively puts the responsibility for providing adequate emergency health services on to volunteers in the community. In the absence of any meaningful response from the Ambulance Trust we stand by our request.

### **Public Open Space and Heritage**

We have noted that Haylink themselves propose to take responsibility for the care and maintenance of these elements of the development. Will the s106 agreement seek a financial bond in order to insure against the developer reneging on this commitment? If not, how will the commitments be secured?

We have mentioned before that there are items of archaeological worth still on the site and that these need to be recovered, restored and given over to the H.M.S. Ganges Association. We are pleased to see that the care and maintenance of the listed structures is now part of the s106.

### **Reasonable Legal and Other Costs**

This Parish Council has incurred substantial costs representing community interest on this application. A commitment to meet our costs in reviewing the agreements if necessary would be welcome.

Our previous correspondence and submission have referred to our need for a Community Development Worker and working budget for a period of no less than five years. We still believe this to be necessary for the management of projects and the proper integration of the new residents.

Previous correspondence also noted our desire to be included in consultations on conditions and detailed design.

If you have any questions or clarifications please contact Cllr. Steel in the first instance

Yours sincerely

Carol Williamson  
Temporary Clerk to Shotley Parish Council