

Minutes of a Special Planning Meeting of Shotley Parish Council held on Thursday 27 April 2006 at 7.30pm in the Large Committee Room, Shotley Village Hall.

Present: Councillors R Wrinch (Chair), N Bugg, B Hooper, A Long, M Matthews, J Peters, C Sullivan, M Connell, G Steel, and Clerk L Rowlands

In attendance: District Councillor W Sadler, Richard Lingard and Jeremy Aslan of Shotley Marina Ltd (SML) and approximately 11 members of the public

Meeting commenced 7.30pm

The Chairman welcomed all to this Special Planning Meeting.

1. **Apologies for absence** – District Councillor P Clarke and County Councillor D Wood (prior engagements)
2. **To receive declarations of interest and additions to register** – None
3. **To discuss planning application B/06/00606/ROC/CLD: Removal of conditions 04, 05 and 06 attached to PPB/91/00723/0/OUT for Shotley Marina Ltd, King Edward Drive, Shotley Gate, IP9 1QJ**
 - 3.1 Conditions – These related to the construction of a new roundabout junction to the B1456, a new link road from the roundabout to King Edward VII Drive via Laundry Hill and roadways from the dwellings to the link road. Clerk noted that copies of these conditions were not enclosed with Babergh DC's letter of 12 April 2006 and had had to request copies from them.
 - 3.2 History - Cllr C Sullivan requested that the meeting look at the history of the original planning application (PPB/91/00723/0/OUT) and stated that it was the Parish Council's view in 1991 that King Edward VII Drive (KEVIID) was unsuitable to sustain the amount of traffic which would be generated by the 150 dwellings to be built at the Marina. It was felt then that the traffic congestion and parking problems created by the new dwellings would be detrimental to the area and the three conditions added to the planning permission went some way to alleviating these problems. She felt that nothing had changed since then and that the road still could not sustain the amount of traffic that would be generated.. (At this point Cllr Sullivan had to leave the meeting due to a prior engagement and was thanked for her contribution).
 - 3.3 General comments
 - There were approximately 20 houses on Bristol Hill and as nothing had changed in the intervening 15 years, there was still a need for the Haylink/Ganges link road as it was felt that the impact of the new traffic generated by the 70 dwellings would be huge on the residents of Bristol Hill
 - It was noted that all traffic ending up down at Bristol Hill/KEVIID had of course to come past The Street
 - It was noted that the area had been gridlocked during the recent bank holiday period
 - 3.4 Questions were put to SML
 - 3.4.1 **Q** - Why remove conditions and rebuild KEVIID, why not wait until Haylink built their link road?
A – SML felt that it may be some considerable time before Haylink were able to build the Ganges link road
 - 3.4.2 **Q** - Of the 150 dwellings, which have planning permission, 70 were planned for development now. When would the other 80 be developed?
A – Once the Haylink/Ganges road had been built as previously envisaged. Only 70 houses could be built allied to the planning permission for the improved KEVIID. There was paperwork outlining this although it appears Babergh had not forwarded a copy of this paperwork on to the PC.

3.4.3 Q – What provisions were there for construction traffic?

A – *There were already provisions within the original planning permission for the regulation of construction traffic.*

4. **To discuss planning application B/06/00607/FUL/CLD - Shotley Marina Ltd, King Edward Drive, Shotley Gate, IP9 1QJ - Improvements to King Edward VII Drive to include 6m wide carriageway, 3m wide promenade, retaining wall and 3 No cantilevered viewing platforms. Erection of mast and lifebuoy station.**

4.1 The plans were on show so that the full extent of the alterations could be viewed. SML went into some detail as to the methods that were going to be used.

4.2 Concerns were raised with regard to the road being used as a racetrack etc. SML replied that as it was hoped that this road would be adopted by Suffolk County Council (SCC) (negotiations were ongoing) then it would be for SCC to decide on appropriate measures. Talks however had taken place with regard to traffic calming

4.3 It was generally felt that the rebuilding of KEVIID to an SCC adoptable standard was to be applauded and would be a benefit to all in the local vicinity.

5. **To discuss planning application B/06/00608/FUL/CLD - Shotley Marina Ltd, King Edward Drive, Shotley Gate, IP9 1QJ - Improvements to King Edward VII Drive to include 6m wide carriageway, 3m wide cantilevered promenade, retaining wall and 3 No cantilevered viewing platforms. Erection of mast and lifebuoy station.**

As this proposal was only slightly different to that of 4. above it was felt that the same comments would suffice.

6. **To receive comments from members of the public**

Encompassed within 3 and 4 above.

7. **To consider response to Babergh District Council Planning Department**

7.1 Application 606 - Clerk to write to BDC advising that Shotley Parish Council (SPC) was not in favour of the application to remove the three conditions and advise that no background information (ie copies of previous application and conditions) were enclosed with their letter of 12 April 2006 to interested parties.

7.2 Applications 607/608 – Clerk to write to BDC that SPC supported in principle both applications subject to:

7.2.1 An archaeological investigation of the site prior to work commencing;

7.2.2 An impact assessment on the ecology of the cliff to be made prior to work commencing and proposals for mitigating any damage e.g. through compensatory planting to be agreed;

7.2.3 The Environment Agency being satisfied that the plans would have no negative impact on the sea defences, coastal erosion and deposition;

7.2.4 Further consultation on, and agreement with, the Parish Council on traffic calming measures on King Edward VII Drive, Bristol Hill and The Street; and

7.2.5 Provision for cyclists.

7.2.6 SPC had no preference in regard to the design of the proposals believing them both to be of a high order.

8. **To consider any further urgent items - None**

9. **Date of next meeting: APM - 4 May 2006 at 7.30pm**

Meeting ended 8.55pm