

Good morning and thank you once again for the opportunity to address you.. I will limit myself to responding to the additional legal advice you have received and to matters raised in the new Officer's report. Copies of our submission to the November meeting are available should you wish to refresh your memory.

We are pleased that Ms Ellis agrees that it is a matter for your judgement to decide if the matter before you has been so amended as to effectively form a new application. We also agree that it is not irrational for officers to have come to the conclusion they have, but only if you accept that the sole considerations are the red line and the number of dwellings.

Back in 1997 your predecessors agreed to a development that was 75% sheltered housing and care home with the remaining 25% flats and bungalows, there would be capacity in the development for people as they got older to transit to the care facilities and for those same care facilities to cater for the needs of people in the wider community. Today you are considering a development that is effectively 75% open market housing where that ability to have a continuum from independence to care has been severed. This is a new housing estate with a care home not a retirement community.

That cannot be anything other than a significant material change that quite simply reverses what was agreed all those years ago. The Inverclyde case on which the officer's views are based did not have before it a scenario such as this, the facts are quite different and you are entitled to draw your own conclusion. Our interpretation is supported by the QC opinion sought by Woolverstone.

We strongly dispute that there will be no significant environmental impacts from this development. We state yet again that the decision of the Secretary of State on the 325 application is crucial to this application. It is agreed that the traffic impact of the two developments are similar as is the proposed mitigation. Despite this the report ignores the Secretary of States conclusion that the increase in traffic will have a serious impact on the environment.

This development will have serious adverse impact on the community of Shotley, a community identified in the local plan as unsustainable and not suitable for anything other than infill development. No mitigation or compensation for our community has been proposed.

The demographics used in the Environmental Statement are wrong particularly in regard to children and young people who are entirely absent and to the health impact assessment.

The objections of Suffolk Coasts and Heaths and the inadequacy of the mitigation for the effect on the most heavily protected area in Babergh are again material and to defer making good these impacts to some date in the future is contrary to the precautionary principle.

The officer's report on the design of the development makes no reference to conservation and efficient use of water, sustainable drainage linked with habitat creation, on site recycling points or that the houses and buildings will be built to the highest environmental (BREAAAM) standards; all contrary to local plan policy.

Should you not find these matters compelling I refer you to our substantial comments on the overall inadequacy of the design of the development at paragraphs 130,106, 132, 133 and 142 of the substantive report.

Shotley Parish Council reiterates its total commitment to work with the developer, district and county partners to find a sustainable solution for this site, remove the dead weight of this proposed development and let us move on.

Thank you