

The overwhelming majority of our parish residents believe that you should reject this Reserved Matters application. We fully support the legal representations made by Shotley and Woolverstone and we submit 4 major additional objections:

1)

Within the Reserved Matters many legitimate questions remain unanswered. For example, the much revised Environmental Impact Assessment is still unsatisfactory. It does not properly deal with the issue of how the proposed development will impact on the adjacent AONB and Conservation areas. The purpose of Environmental Statements is to assess impacts to the environment **before** the development starts. What is being proposed to you today seems to reverse that principle.

2)

The Traffic Assessment data are totally inadequate and misleading. The traffic Assessment which accompanies the application is largely the same as the one which was considered in the 2006 Inquiry, and which the Inspector found to constitute, on that count alone, enough reason to reject the application. He said : *“The shortcomings that have been identified suggest that planning permission should be refused on highways and transportation grounds.”* If that was the case for the 325 application, then it applies equally to the “retirement community” application, whose traffic generating potential has been considered equivalent.

3)

Mitigation measures proposed in the Reserved Matters to off-set traffic increase are woefully inadequate. Chelmondiston Parish Council protests in the strongest terms about the derisory “traffic calming” measures offered to our village. These costly measures would do little or nothing to reduce the damaging effects of traffic increase. We are angry that our council’s requests to be involved before any decisions are made seem to have been completely ignored. Our AONB and the Pin Mill Conservation area are amenity areas enjoyed by people from throughout Suffolk and beyond, and which sustain a significant rural economy. We cannot allow them to become so urbanised with traffic and congestion that their chief qualities are extinguished.

4)

The Green Travel Plan proposed for this development is less than the minimum expected for a development of this size and amounts to providing future residents with a bus timetable and a helpline number. There is no serious attempt to provide alternatives to the car for people who will have to travel off the development for their employment, shopping, medical and leisure time activities.

Many Peninsula residents are still very angry about the decision made by this committee to give planning permission for a development proposal on the Ganges site which was overturned by the Public Inquiry in 2006. If these Reserved Matters are agreed, that will give the go-ahead to the so-called “fall-

back” scheme which is (and I quote the Inspector’s conclusion) “*an inferior development package, that could have substantial repercussions outside the site.*” He also said: “*The limited extent of available services underlines the fact that this is an unsustainable location and its development would be in direct conflict with national, regional and local policy on sustainable development*”.

We look to you now to support us this time with a decision which will reflect what we know is right for this area and is in keeping with local and national planning policy. Reject this Reserved Matters application so that a more suitable and sustainable solution can be achieved for the Ganges site.