



SuffolkCoastal District Council

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Navigus Planning

Final Report

May 2014

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	POLICY CONTEXT AND LOCATIONS FOR GROWTH	2
	National policy.....	2
	Local policy	3
3	EDUCATION	7
	Early Years and Childcare	7
	Primary Education	10
	Secondary Education (including sixth form).....	12
	Free Schools and Academies.....	14
4	HEALTH.....	15
5	UTILITIES.....	19
	Water – used water	19
	Water – potable supply	21
	Gas	22
	Electricity	22
6	TRANSPORT.....	25
7	EMERGENCY SERVICES	31
	Police	31
	Fire Service	34
	Ambulance.....	35
8	LEISURE AND COMMUNITY	37
	Sports pitches and children’s play facilities.....	37
	Youth facilities.....	43
	Other sports facilities	43
	Allotments	44
	Community centres.....	46

Libraries	49
9 GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE	50
10 FLOODING AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT.....	53
11 WASTE	57
12 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS	59
Appendix A	Scenarios tested
Appendix B	Suffolk Constabulary - breakdown of needs

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This study was undertaken by Navigus Planning to inform Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC) on the creation of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Specifically, the commission requires that Navigus Planning supports SCDC in updating its infrastructure evidence base and also helps it to produce a CIL Charging Schedule.
- 1.2 It covers the following infrastructure areas:
- Education (schools, early years and childcare and other education provision);
 - Health;
 - Utilities (potable water, used water, electricity, gas and telecommunications);
 - Transport;
 - Emergency services (police, fire, ambulance);
 - Leisure and community facilities (sport facilities, children’s play facilities, youth facilities libraries, allotments and community centres);
 - Green infrastructure;
 - Flooding and coastal management; and
 - Waste.
- 1.3 The requirement is to create an infrastructure plan which will show the following:
- What infrastructure is required and how it will be provided (e.g. co-location, etc).
 - Who is to provide the infrastructure.
 - How will the infrastructure would be funded.
 - When the infrastructure is required.

2 POLICY CONTEXT AND LOCATIONS FOR GROWTH

National policy

National Planning Policy Framework

- 2.1 The context for this Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 156 states:

"Local planning authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:

- *the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);*
- *the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities."*

- 2.2 Paragraph 162 goes on to state that:

"Local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to:

- *assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and*
- *take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas."*

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 2.3 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a planning charge that came into force on 6 April 2010. The levy allows local authorities in England and Wales to raise contributions from developers to help pay for infrastructure that is needed as a result of development.

- 2.4 The updated statutory CIL Guidance sets out what infrastructure evidence is needed. It states that a charging authority needs to identify the total cost of infrastructure that it desires to fund in whole or in part from the levy. In order to do this, the charging authority must use 'appropriate available evidence' to consider:

- What additional infrastructure is needed in its area to support the development and growth needs set out in the Local Plan and
- What other funding sources are available (for example, core Government funding for infrastructure; anticipated section 106 agreements; and anticipated necessary highway improvement schemes funded by anyone other than the charging authority).

- 2.5 The Guidance is clear that for infrastructure, the 'appropriate available evidence' "...should be directly related to the infrastructure assessment that underpins their Plan". In other words, it should be drawn from the IDP.

- 2.6 Statutory Guidance also states that “a charging authority needs to identify the total cost of infrastructure that it desires to fund in whole or in part from CIL”. At CIL examination, a Charging Authority (CA) must demonstrate that a CIL is a necessity because there is not enough funding from all other sources to pay for the infrastructure the area needs, i.e. that there is an “infrastructure funding gap”.
- 2.7 The purpose of CIL is to pay for “infrastructure to support the development of the area”. The CIL Regulations require that CIL must be applied by a charging authority only for the “the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure”. CIL can therefore be used to contribute to the capital costs of providing infrastructure as well as any ‘ongoing’ costs of infrastructure required to support the development of the area.
- 2.8 CIL Regulation 123 provides for an authority to set out a list of those infrastructure projects or types it “...intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL...”. This list is not part of the charging schedule, and agreeing its content is not part of a CIL examination. It serves two purposes: giving an indication of where CIL is likely to be spent; and drawing the local boundary between the use of CIL and S106 planning obligations for funding infrastructure (the regulation stipulates that anything on the list cannot be required through S106 as part of awarding planning permission). In 2014, the government made further changes to the regulations to extending this to apply also to local use of agreements under S278 of the Highways Act.
- 2.9 The CIL Statutory Guidance expects the authority to work proactively with developers to ensure they are clear about infrastructure needs and what they will be expected to pay through which route. It then requires a draft Regulation 123 list to be set out at examination, alongside an authority’s policy on the continued use of S106 for infrastructure. In February 2014 the Government amended the Regulations to make the draft Regulation 123 list part of the “appropriate available evidence” informing the charging schedule, although the list will remain outside of the Schedule and will still not itself be subject to examination. This makes a legal requirement of what was previously in guidance and only serves to increase focus on the list and complementary S106 policy.
- 2.10 Therefore, for the purposes of a CIL evidence base an IDP should, as part of the funding and delivery picture, consider: which matters are likely to be funded wholly or partly through CIL, either new infrastructure or ‘ongoing’ maintenance costs related to new and existing infrastructure; which will continue to be funded via S106; which by S278; and which by other sources of funding. The anticipated timing of development coming forward and the order of priority for the delivery of supporting infrastructure will be an important factor in considering the funding required for delivery.

Local policy

- 2.11 The Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management policies) was adopted in July 2013. It covers the period 2010 to 2027. In recognition of the lengthy time period involved in the development of the Plan, the District Council has committed to an early review of the Plan, with full up-to-date evidence, commencing no later than 2015.

Strategy for growth - Housing

Strategic allocations

- 2.12 The Local Plan makes provision for at least 7,900 dwellings over the period 2010 to 2027. The housing requirement is to be distributed as shown in Table 2.1 (reflecting the position at April 2013 in respect of completions and outstanding planning permissions).

Table 2.1: Distribution of housing by location, April 2013

	Eastern Ipswich Plan area	Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	Market Towns	Key & Local Service Centres	Rest of district	Windfalls	Total
Completions, 2010-13	130	90	240	320	30	0	810
Outstanding planning permissions (less 10% non-implementation)	180	300	390	320	60	0	1,250
Identified previously developed land	0	20	150	0	0	0	170
Outstanding housing allocations from previous local plan	0	0	0	80	0	0	80
Windfall	0	0	0	0	0	850	850
Residual new allocations	2,010	1,350	740	630	10	0	4,740
Total	2,320	1,760	1,520	1,350	100	850	7,900

Source: Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, Table 3.3; subsequently updated by SCDC officer monitoring

2.13 Between 2010 and 2013, 810 dwellings have been completed. In addition, 1,389 dwellings have planning permission but the Local Plan assumes that only 90% of these will be delivered, so this reduces the figure to 1,250 dwellings. Therefore, 2,060 dwellings are already assumed to have their infrastructure needs addressed. This leaves a total outstanding requirement to be found of 5,840 dwellings.

Scenarios for Market Towns and Key & Local Service Centres

2.14 The Market Towns are expected to deliver at least 1,520 dwellings over the plan period, plus a proportion of the 850 windfall dwellings expected. As at April 2013, a total of 240 dwellings had been completed and 433 dwellings had planning permission. Assuming 10% of outstanding planning permissions are not implemented, this reduces the outstanding requirement to a minimum of 890 dwellings. There is no split between the five market towns of Aldeburgh, Framlingham, Leiston, Saxmundham and Woodbridge although it is known that Aldeburgh and Woodbridge have potential environmental limits to their growth. At March 2014, Framlingham and Leiston parishes were both undertaking neighbourhood plans which, it is expected, will establish the appropriate scales of growth for the respective market towns.

2.15 For the purposes of testing possible growth levels with infrastructure providers, two scenarios were presented:

- Scenario 1: 250 dwellings in each of the five market towns
- Scenario 2: 500 dwellings in any one of the five market towns

2.16 This is shown in detail for every settlement in Appendix A, but is summarised in Table 2.2 below:

Table 2.2: Summary of growth scenarios tested

Location	Number of dwellings	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Austral Park)	2,100	2,100
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	1,470
Market Towns	990	1,525
<i>Key Service Centres</i>	<i>1,150</i>	<i>1,150</i>
<i>Local Service Centres</i>	<i>950</i>	<i>950</i>
Key and Local Service Centres - combined	2,100	2,100

- 2.17 Whilst these levels of growth are in excess of the outstanding requirement, this requirement is not a maximum figure so more growth could come forward; for example, the 850 windfall dwellings have not been apportioned because it is not possible to know where these will come forward. In addition, it is not known how the growth could be distributed between the five market towns so the approach has been to look at growth scenarios for each individual market town, rather than as an aggregate figure.
- 2.18 Where infrastructure needs have been derived based on a per-person or household standard, the dwelling figures in Table 2.1, excluding windfalls and dwellings in the 'rest of the district', have been used. These have been excluded because they are only expected to come forward as small-scale schemes that, whilst creating needs, are not expected to be significant.
- 2.19 The Key and Local Service Centres are expected to deliver approximately 1,350 dwellings over the plan period, plus a proportion of windfalls. There are 23 Key Service Centres and 38 Local Service Centres – these are listed in Table 4.1 of the Local Plan. As at April 2013, a total of 320 dwellings had been completed and another 356 dwellings had planning permission. This reduces the overall requirement, assuming 10% of outstanding planning permissions are not implemented, to 710 dwellings.
- 2.20 Clearly it is not possible to be definitive where this will be delivered, other than adopting the basic principles of their respective roles, i.e. the focus of growth will be the Key Service Centres with the Local Service Centres only accommodating small-scale growth to address particular local needs.
- 2.21 For the purposes of testing possible growth levels with infrastructure providers, a single scenario was presented whereby any single Key Service Centre was to accommodate 50 dwellings and any single Local Service Centre, 25 dwellings. Again, as with the market towns, these growth scenarios look at the potential of growth going into any single centre at these dwelling levels, rather than suggesting that these are the scales of growth that would come forward in every single settlement.
- 2.22 This approach enabled service providers to identify 'showstoppers' to high levels of growth in any of these lower order centres where individual sites have not been identified.

Strategy for growth - Employment

2.23 The Local Plan states in Strategic Policy SP5 that it will make allocations for at least 8.5 hectares of new employment land. This is expected to be focused on three areas:

- Felixstowe Port
- Martlesham Heath Business Campus, including Adastral Park
- RansomesEuropark as part of a wider employment corridor extending into Ipswich Borough.

2.24 The IDP considers whether any of these allocations have particular infrastructure needs.

3 EDUCATION

- 3.1 All new housing must have reasonable access to education provision. In the case of primary education, it is particularly important that new development is co-located with or close to a primary school in the interests of pupil wellbeing and sustainable development. Furthermore, the education authority (Suffolk County Council) does not have the resources to fund and operate the bussing of significant numbers of children to primary school sites elsewhere in the district. At present, SCC is liable to pay for school transport where there is no safe walking route of less than two miles for children up to the age of 8 and less than three miles for older children. A point identified by Suffolk County Council is that, as an education authority, it does not presently have funding available to meet growth arising from development.
- 3.2 All the schools across Suffolk Coastal district operate on a two-tier basis (i.e. primary and secondary schools), with a number of changes from a three-tier system having been completed prior to the 2012/13 academic year. Of the six secondary schools in Suffolk Coastal, five include sixth form provision (11-18) and one, Saxmundham Free School, caters for 11-16 year-olds only. Some pupils in parts of the district attend schools outside the area such as those close to Ipswich.
- 3.3 The approach is therefore to consider the needs arising from growth under the two-tier system for children aged from 4-18.
- 3.4 The assessment is based on the total number of dwellings in each school's catchment and the number of pupils generated against the pupil forecasts data – which only extends five years ahead. The shortfall of places is therefore calculated using the 2017/18 pupil forecasts and the school capacities as they are known at present. It is not possible for SCC to forecast further ahead.
- 3.5 Cost multipliers are based on figures announced by the Department for Education for Suffolk (costs per primary, secondary and sixth-form places). The Sixth Form multiplier is used by SCC in calculating current developer contributions. These will change with time so by the time the later developments come forward, costs per pupil place will be expected to have changed.

Early Years and Childcare

- 3.6 Suffolk County Council has a statutory duty to secure free early years' and childcare (EY&C) provision for pre-school children aged between three and four (Childcare Act 2006) and a statutory duty to ensure provision of early education for every disadvantaged two-year-old by 2013 (Education Bill 2011). Commonly such provision is made within or associated with primary schools.
- 3.7 Notwithstanding its statutory duties of provision, Suffolk County Council defines the entitlement of free early education as being for two- to five-year-olds. This is provided through maintained nurseries in primary schools, pre-schools, playgroups, day care and accredited child-minders throughout Suffolk.
- 3.8 Suffolk County Council uses local knowledge of the registered places at maintained nurseries at primary schools, pre-schools and accredited child-minders, alongside submissions from providers on funding returns to measure the capacity of early education provider provision. When examining the potential impact a development could have on the sufficiency levels, the existing capacity of providers within a one-mile radius of the development will be investigated.

- 3.9 It should be noted that Suffolk County Council does use Section 106 contributions to enhance private facilities where this is more effective than putting those funds into public facilities.

Needs

Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

- 3.10 It is considered that additional pre-school provision of all types will need to be made for the planned growth. SCC currently works on the same basis that every 100 new dwellings will create a cohort of 10 children of pre-school age (ages 2-4). So, for normal pre-school provision, 2,000 new dwellings will create 200 pre-school aged children. The average size of a pre-school in Suffolk is 24 places so there theoretically would be a need for up to 8 new pre-schools if all children took up these places. SCC works on an average uptake of around 60%, therefore, the likely need will be for 5 new pre-schools, or 120 new places, to serve an area with 2,000 new dwellings. In practice, this may be provided as a smaller number of larger facilities, particularly if a new facility is attached to the proposed primary school.

Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys

- 3.11 On the same basis as the calculation used for the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area, there would be 135 pre-school aged children created by growth of 1,350 dwellings. Based on the average size of a pre-school in Suffolk (24 places), this would create a theoretical need for 5 new pre-schools if all children took up these places. Based on the average uptake (60%), the need is for 3 new pre-schools, or 72 new places.

Market Towns

- 3.12 On the same basis as the calculation used for the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area, there would be the following requirements in the Market Towns:

Table 3.1: EY&C needs by Market Town

Location	Number of places	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Aldeburgh	1	5
Framlingham	23	30
Leiston	22	30
Saxmundham	11	21
Woodbridge	2	6
Total	59	92

Source: Suffolk County Council

N.B. The two scenarios shown are those described in paragraph 2.15 and in Appendix A

- 3.13 Table 3.1 shows that the greatest need would be in Framlingham and Leiston under the high growth scenario, whereby a new EY&C facility would be needed. In all other locations and in all other scenarios, the need would be less than a new facility.
- 3.14 It is not considered that there are any needs for additional EY&C provision to serve the Key or Local Service Centres.
- 3.15 It is important to stress that this takes no account of existing provision. Whilst strategic growth of the scale proposed in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area would require new provision on-site, it is likely that existing facilities may be able to accommodate the needs arising from other growth. This will depend on the location and scale of growth.

Costs and Funding

- 3.16 The cost of providing new facilities or extensions to existing facilities is to be addressed through developer contributions.
- 3.17 SCC would expect that, where additional places are required to meet the needs generated by new residential developments across Suffolk Coastal district, these will be funded by contributions from developers. With local demographic change, such as a great proportion of younger people within the existing housing stock, SCC will seek funding from alternative sources.
- 3.18 The cost of new EY&C provision to be funded by developer contributions includes the land and the full build costs. Suffolk County Council has produced a S106 Developers Guide and this requires a contribution of £609 per new dwelling. For the required new dwellings, this equates to the amounts shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Levels of funding towards EY&C provision from developer contributions

Location	Level of contribution	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Adastral Park)	£1,278,900	£1,278,900
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	£895,230	£895,230
Market Towns (Aldeburgh, Framlingham, Leiston, Saxmundham and Woodbridge)	£602,910	£928,725
Key & Local Service Centres	£1,278,900	£1,278,900
Total	£4,055,940	£4,381,755

Source: Suffolk County Council

N.B. The housing numbers for each scenario are shown in Table 2.2 and Appendix A

- 3.19 As the table shows, the total amount of funding to address the needs arising from the proposed growth is between £4.01m and £4.38m. Suffolk County Council considers that this will address all EY&C needs arising from growth.
- 3.20 It is important to remember that the two scenarios for the market towns represent costs that are likely to be higher than the aggregate level of development that will be delivered across the five settlements. It considers alternative levels of housing growth for each individual settlement and when these are aggregated together – as shown in Appendix A – they result in excessively high levels of growth compared to what is likely to occur. This will need to be revised once there is greater certainty over the levels of growth in each market town. This will be achieved through the production of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) or neighbourhood plans for each town.

Timing of provision

- 3.21 The timing of payments is difficult to state at this time as many factors will influence this. As Suffolk’s population is growing at a fast pace, then where a new school or EY&C facility is required then the trigger point for first developer contributions will be required early in the development, e.g. after 300 or 500 dwellings. Each case is dependent on local circumstances; timing of a new school has to ensure the school does not fill with pupils not related to the development.
- 3.22 The County Council’s guide on Section 106 agreements states that, unless otherwise agreed, contributions for the additional of new facilities at existing schools and EY&C facilities should be

paid prior to commencement of the development. Again, all agreements are different and will reflect circumstances at the time.

Primary Education

- 3.23 Suffolk County Council has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient places at Suffolk's primary schools now and in the future (Education Act 1996) and a statutory duty to secure diversity of provision of schools and increasing opportunities for parental choice (Education and Inspections Act 2006).

Needs

Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

- 3.24 A new two-form-entry (420-place) primary school is required to serve the proposed development at Adastral Park. The impact of other development in the East of Ipswich Plan Area adds further demand requiring mitigation.

Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys

- 3.25 The pupil forecasts at the Trimleys do not currently take account of planning applications for houses approved by SCDC since April 2013.
- 3.26 Most pupils from the 1,470 dwellings could take up spare places at primary schools in the town. However, most of the primary schools in Felixstowe itself are almost at capacity; it is the infant/junior schools of Maidstone and Causton that have most of these spare places. There are presently very few infant and junior schools in Suffolk and it is possible that, by 2027, proposals may come forward to establish one school from these two existing schools, thus reducing their surplus capacity.
- 3.27 In order to maximise sustainable transport, pupils are expected to travel to the nearest school. Therefore, and whilst relevant, the town-wide capacity should not be considered when the location of development become more certain. An additional 1,470 dwellings will generate 331 primary pupils.
- 3.28 The distribution of these dwellings will be important in determining the impact on primary schools in the area. It should be noted that the spatial strategy is dispersed but there might be different scenarios of sites that come forward. For example, the developments might take up the remaining capacity from an area wider than Felixstowe.
- 3.29 As a guide, if the additional dwellings were to be provided on one main site, the provision of pupil places would be simplified; SCC would expect a site for a new 420-place primary school to be reserved within the development. It would also be expected to be provided at no cost to SCC, with pro-rata build costs to be paid by the developer(s) for the number of pupils generated.
- 3.30 Should the dwellings be distributed across the town then we would expect most pupils to attend their catchment schools and the need for a new primary school would be reduced. However, this will depend on the distribution and capacity at that time.

Market Towns

- 3.31 Of the five market towns, Saxmundham and Framlingham will be adversely affected by the proposed levels of developments under both scenarios.
- 3.32 Saxmundham Primary School is already a site below minimum guidelines and unable to expand owing to a confined site. There might be space within Saxmundham Free School to expand the

age range down to age 5, but the Free School would need to agree to a significant change to its age range.

- 3.33 The Sir Robert Hitcham Primary School in Framlingham is already on a site below minimum guidelines and unable to expand due to a confined site. A second primary school site may be required or, as an alternative, the existing school might be relocated and increased in size. However, this is subject to securing the necessary agreements and capital funds.
- 3.34 The number of dwellings proposed for Woodbridge will not significantly impact on the local schools although contributions towards addressing needs are likely to be required.

Key and Local Service Centres

- 3.35 Primary schools in eight Key Service Centres will be unable to accommodate pupils from the future housing growth without creating more places, some more than others. There should not be any requirements for new school sites. The main schools affected would be at Eyke, Hollesley, Witnesham and Yoxford.
- 3.36 Primary schools in seven Local Service Centres will be unable to accommodate pupils from the future residential growth without creating more places, some more than others. There should not be any requirements for new school sites. The main schools affected would be at Benhall St Mary and Wenhaston.
- 3.37 Rushmere Hall Primary School is located in Ipswich Borough. This school is currently included in the County Council's plans for expansion under Basic Need even before additional development is included. This expansion will take the school to its maximum size; any pupils from additional 50 houses might become be a problem for the school to accommodate.

Costs and Funding

- 3.38 It is expected that 100% of the costs of new primary education provision are provided for by developer contributions. This is either in the form of new school provision or additional facilities at local catchment schools, i.e. school extensions. In the case of the latter, contributions per pupil place are sought and SCC will not normally seek a contribution towards land costs but will require free land if additional land is necessary for extending a school.
- 3.39 The cost of a new primary school (420-places) is in the region of £6.90m. Therefore, if a new school is needed at Adastral Park the cost would be £6.90m and if one is also need to serve development in Felixstowe, the cost would be £13.80m.
- 3.40 SCC has produced a S106 Developers Guide and this requires a contribution of £3,045 per new dwelling for off-site provision ***where there are insufficient school places at present***. For the required new dwellings this equates to the following amounts:

Table 3.3: Total cost of primary education provision

Location	Level of contribution	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Adastral Park)	£6,900,000	£6,900,000
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	£1,546,987	£1,546,987
Market Towns (Aldeburgh, Framlingham, Leiston, Saxmundham and Woodbridge)	£1,900,204	£2,752,906
Key & Local Service Centres	£5,152,563	£5,152,563
Total	£15,499,754	£16,352,456

Source: Suffolk County Council

N.B. The housing numbers for each scenario are shown in Table 2.2 and Appendix A

- 3.41 The aggregate figure for the Key and Local Service Centres is £2.25m for the Key Service Centres and £2.90m for the Local Service Centres.
- 3.42 As the table shows, the total amount of funding from the proposed growth is between £15.50m and £16.35m. SCC considers that this will address all primary education needs arising from growth.

Timing of provision

- 3.43 The timing of payments is difficult to state at this time as many factors will influence this. As Suffolk’s population is growing at a fast pace, where a new school is required then the trigger point for first developer contributions will be required early in the development, e.g. after 300 or 500 dwellings. Each case is dependent on local circumstances; timing of a new school has to ensure the school does not fill with pupils not related to the development.
- 3.44 The County Council’s guide on Section 106 agreements states that, unless otherwise agreed, contributions for the addition of new facilities at existing schools should be paid prior to commencement of the development. Again, all agreements are different and will reflect circumstances at the time.

Secondary Education (including sixth form)

- 3.45 As with primary education, SCC has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient places at Suffolk’s secondary schools now and in the future and a statutory duty to secure diversity of provision of schools and increasing opportunities for parental choice.

Needs

- 3.46 Only two secondary schools will be unable to accommodate all pupils from the accumulation of developments in their respective catchments – Farlingaye High (690 dwellings) and Kesgrave High (175 dwellings) Schools; both are academies.
- 3.47 Farlingaye High School is at capacity and is forecast to continue as such. Should all 690 dwellings come forward throughout its catchment they would generate 130 secondary and 36 sixth form pupils. The school site has no room in which to expand. Provision may therefore need to be made at alternative secondary schools. A site for a new secondary school is to be reserved within the proposed development at Adastral Park which may represent the most appropriate option.

- 3.48 Kesgrave High School is the main school in East Ipswich. Discussions have previously progressed to provide an extension to this school within the Adastral Park development. There are calculated to be an additional 42 places from the new dwellings throughout its catchment.
- 3.49 In Felixstowe a new facility for Felixstowe Academy has been completed for 1,800 places on the old Orwell High School site. Numbers on roll and pupil forecasts clearly show the school will be able to accommodate the additional number of pupils generated by the proposed growth.
- 3.50 All other secondary schools within the district have sufficient capacity to accommodate the levels of growth in the scenarios.

Costs and Funding

- 3.51 SCC would expect all additional places generated by new residential developments across Suffolk Coastal district to be funded by contributions from developers. Where SCC has calculated that further places are needed to relieve pressure on existing schools not caused by the new dwellings, then it will seek finding from alternative sources.
- 3.52 The cost of new secondary school provision to be funded by developer contributions includes land and the full build costs. Suffolk County Council has produced a S106 Developers Guide and this requires a contribution of £3,304 per new dwelling for off-site provision of secondary education and £796 per new dwelling for off-site provision of sixth form education. This equates to a total of £4,100 per dwelling. This is a broad indication of cost and individual cases will vary owing to existing capacity and the type of school provided.
- 3.53 The additional pupil generation within the catchments of the respective schools that require expansion equates to the costs shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Total cost of secondary education provision

School	Level of contribution	
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
New school provision in East Ipswich	£3,102,802	£3,326,166
Kesgrave High School	£783,326	£783,326
Total	£3,886,128	£4,109,492

Source: Suffolk County Council

- 3.54 This creates a total cost of new provision of between £3.89m and £4.11m.

Timing of provision

- 3.55 The timing of payments is difficult to state at this time as many factors will influence this. As Suffolk’s population is growing at a fast pace, then where a new school is required then the trigger point for first developer contributions will be required early in the development, e.g. after 300 or 500 dwellings. Each case is dependent on local circumstances; timing of a new school has to ensure the school does not fill with pupils not related to the development.
- 3.56 The County Council’s guide on Section 106 agreements states that, unless otherwise agreed, contributions for the additional of new facilities at existing schools should be paid prior to commencement of the development. Again, all agreements are different and will reflect circumstances at the time.

Free Schools and Academies

- 3.57 Free Schools and Academy Schools are outside local authority control but it is still necessary to consider them in pupil place planning. Of relevance to infrastructure planning is that, if there is insufficient capacity in existing schools, the local authority is not able to expand Free Schools or Academies to take additional children without the prior approval of these schools. It is then the responsibility of these schools to apply to the local authority to fund the school expansion with the use of developer contributions (if the need for additional places was created by new development).

4 HEALTH

- 4.1 Primary healthcare services and facilities in Suffolk are commissioned by NHS England (NHSE).
- 4.2 The role of NHSE is to commission all healthcare services, incorporating the provision of primary care facilities within its administrative area, including within Suffolk Coastal District.
- 4.3 It is noteworthy that an increased draw down of NHS funding for the provision and maintenance of healthcare facilities and services over the plan period, would be experienced in Suffolk Coastal district independently of the proposed growth. This is due to the ageing of the population and the associated increase in the proportion of patients with long-term limiting conditions, by the increased disease burden and the increased incidence of obesity, smoking and alcohol consumption, which would all have a significant impact on the future health of the patient population and health care capacity.
- 4.4 The growth identified in the Local Plan would also necessitate additional (developer funded) healthcare provision, which would principally be focused on GP-related medical services and supporting community health services, such as physiotherapy and chiropody.
- 4.5 Existing provision of GP services is at 14 main GP practices across the district (four of which have branch surgeries). People are not restricted to seeing a GP within their district so growth on the fringe of Ipswich could result in people using medical centres within the administrative area of Ipswich Borough.

Needs

- 4.6 The need for increased primary healthcare capacity is required to address both existing shortfalls in provision and the new growth that is proposed.

Existing deficits

- 4.7 There is currently patient list size capacity for an additional 14,377 patients but a floorspace and funding deficit of 3,068.5m² and £7.40m respectively, associated with the capital cost required to bring existing floorspace provision up to a standard suitable to manage natural population growth.
- 4.8 This is required at following existing surgeries:
- Eastern Ipswich Plan Area
 - The Birches Medical Centre, Kesgrave
 - Martlesham Surgery, Martlesham Heath
 - Felixstowe
 - Central Surgery, Felixstowe
 - Haven Health, Felixstowe
 - Howard House Surgery, Felixstowe
 - Walton Surgery, Felixstowe
 - Market Towns
 - Church Farm, Aldeburgh
 - Framlingham Surgery, Framlingham

- Leiston Surgery, Leiston
- Saxmundham Health Centre, Saxmundham
- Framfield Farm Surgery, Woodbridge
- Little St John Street Surgery, Woodbridge
- Key Service Centres
 - Alderton Surgery, Alderton
 - Wickham Market Medical Centre, Wickham Market

Needs arising from growth

4.9 Capacity building measures may comprise new and enhanced GP floorspace achieved through the extension, reconfiguration, refurbishment and re-equipping of the existing GP practices to meet Department of Health standards. Alternatively, developer land and contributions may be directed towards provision of a new GP facility, should such an approach be warranted in NHS Business case terms, on future planned sites.

4.10 At all of the growth locations, it is expected that new GP floorspace provision could be necessary. In total, this would need to support 4.62 additional GPs across the district. These would either be at new surgeries or as part of expansion of the following existing surgeries:

- Eastern Ipswich Plan Area
 - The Birches Medical Centre, Kesgrave
 - Martlesham Surgery, Martlesham Heath
- Felixstowe
 - Central Surgery, Felixstowe
 - Haven Health, Felixstowe
 - Walton Surgery, Felixstowe
- Market Towns
 - Framlingham Surgery, Framlingham
 - Leiston Surgery, Leiston
 - Little St John Street Surgery, Woodbridge
- Key Service Centres
 - Alderton Surgery, Alderton

4.11 However, this could only be properly determined through full assessments which are undertaken as part of ongoing discussions at planning application stage.

Costs

4.12 The total cost of providing for the primary healthcare needs associated with growth are £1.20m. The breakdown of this is shown below in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Cost of healthcare provision to support growth in the district, March 2013

Location	Infrastructure provision	Budget	Developer funding	When required
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Adastral Park)	New and enhanced GP floorspace provision – extension, reconfiguration, refurbishment and re-equipping of surgeries	£400,400	Section 106 agreements/ CIL	Phased over IDP periods in line with hosing growth
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	New and enhanced GP floorspace provision – extension, reconfiguration, refurbishment and re-equipping of surgeries	£304,200	Section 106 agreements/ CIL	Phased over IDP periods in line with hosing growth
Market Towns (Aldeburgh, Framlingham, Leiston, Saxmundham and Woodbridge)	New and enhanced GP floorspace provision – extension, reconfiguration, refurbishment and re-equipping of surgeries	£262,600	Section 106 agreements/ CIL	Phased over IDP periods in line with hosing growth
Key & Local Service Centres	New and enhanced GP floorspace provision – extension, reconfiguration, refurbishment and re-equipping of surgeries	£234,000	Section 106 agreements/ CIL	Phased over IDP periods in line with hosing growth
Total		£1,201,200		

Source: Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd on behalf of NHS Property Services

4.13 The approach which has been used to derive this total is as follows:

- Ascertain the space capacity in existing surgeries. Capacity is based on 1,800 patients per whole time equivalent GP and this is compared to patient lists at each surgery.
- Assess the needs arising from growth. The population is calculated using an average household size of 2.3 persons – this comes from the 2011 Census¹.
- Based on the 1,800 patients per GP, the requirement for additional GPs can be calculated.
- The additional floorspace to accommodate the additional GPs is calculated based on a standard of 130m² per whole time equivalent GP.
- The cost of providing the additional floorspace is calculated based on a standard cost multiplier for primary healthcare facilities in East Anglia of £2,000/m². This is provided by the BCIS (Q1 2013 Price Index).

¹ The figure of 2.3 persons per household is slightly higher than the 2.21 persons per household figure for 2021 in the DCLG 2011-based household projections. NHSPS, in undertaking IDP assessments across Suffolk, uses the 2011 Census figure and therefore this has been used for consistency. However, it is not considered that the difference in needs, depending on the dataset used, is significant.

- 4.14 The grand total cost of providing for the primary healthcare needs associated with growth are £1.20m.

Funding

- 4.15 Funding to mitigate these impacts is expected to come from developer contributions.

Timing

- 4.16 The provision of appropriate primary healthcare facilities to support growth is a critical item. The necessary expansion of existing surgeries should be delivered as new growth comes forward to ensure that healthcare impacts are appropriately mitigated. If any on-site provision is required as part of strategic sites then this would need to be provided in a timely manner once a patient orientated critical mass has been achieved.

5 UTILITIES

Water – used water

- 5.1 The provider of used water services to Suffolk Coastal district is Anglian Water Services (AWS).

Needs

- 5.2 The requirements for used water provision relate to the network for delivering used water (i.e. the sewerage pipes) and the facility at which it is treated, i.e. the Water Recycling Centre (WRC).
- 5.3 For used water treatment, two of the key facets to consider are flow consent and process treatment capacity.

Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

- 5.4 In the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area, there is available capacity within the flow permit to accommodate the development proposed. However, the WRC is at its process treatment capacity so would need to be expanded before any growth could connect. It is considered that to support the Adastral Park development, a strategic solution(s) is required. This could either be to connect the proposed sites direct to the Woodbridge WRC or invest in upsizing the existing sewerage infrastructure to accommodate the additional flows. Which option is best, when taking the whole-life cost into account, is yet to be determined. Considerable in-depth appraisals are required to understand this. This is however what is going to be investigated within the larger used water strategy for the northern and eastern fringes of Ipswich which will incorporate the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area.
- 5.5 In addition, the Woodbridge WRC is currently operating at capacity so would need to be expanded. It is expected that additional land owned by AWS within the existing WRC area will be sufficient to facilitate this expansion. However, even if this is done, it would separately need to be determined as to whether the receiving water course would be able to sustainably receive these extra flows.
- 5.6 Any significant development at Rushmere and Kesgrave would be within the Cliff Quay WRC catchment area. A strategic solution to accommodate these developments is also currently being investigated.

Felixstowe, Walton and The Trimleys

- 5.7 AWS advises that there is used water treatment capacity available for the full extent of growth, subject to further detailed assessment of development sites. However, the sewerage network in the area of the Trimleys, and to the north of Candlet Road has limited capacity, and improvements will be required. Furthermore, the sewerage network in Felixstowe has capacity constraints and major improvements will be required to accommodate any future development.

Other areas

- 5.8 There are several other WRCs which, if they are to accommodate significant levels of growth, could need expansion of capacity:
- Benhall WRC, serving Saxmundham, would potentially need increased discharge consent. However, this was based on the Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study Stage 2 Report² (WCS) which modelled a scenario of 704 dwellings and 13 hectares of employment land. If the

² Royal Haskoning (2009) *Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study: Stage 2 Report*, Haven Gateway Partnership

employment land was not delivered, then there would be sufficient capacity to deliver all of the residential growth in this scenario. It is therefore important that an assessment is undertaken of the likely demand for employment land in Saxmundham over the plan period - certainly if a much lower amount of employment land was delivered in this location then this would serve to free up capacity. Since the WCS was published, approximately 350 dwellings have been either constructed or granted planning permission within the catchment of the Benhall WRC. Therefore, in respect the two residential scenarios assessed, the lower growth scenario would be within the limits and the high growth scenario would only slightly exceed it. It is considered therefore that the likelihood of requiring an upgrade in provision is minimised, notwithstanding the need to assess the future demand for employment land.

- Melton WRC, serving the northern half of Woodbridge, is currently operating at its full permitted dry weather flow consent. The WCS assessed its capacity based on a scenario of 232 dwellings and 10.4 hectares of employment growth. Since the WCS was published, approximately 70 dwellings have been either constructed or granted planning permission within the catchment of the Melton WRC. Therefore, in respect the two residential scenarios assessed, both would require an upgrade to the WRC.
- Leiston WRC is close to the capacity of its discharge consent. The WCS assessed its capacity based on a scenario of 189 dwellings and 16 hectares of employment growth. Since this time, the amount of employment growth has been reduced to 5 hectares. At the Core Strategy Examination in Public, AWS submitted a joint position statement with the Environment Agency which stated that, along with 5 hectares of employment growth, the existing capacity could accommodate a total of 250 dwellings without the need for upgrade. If growth were to exceed this, then additional capacity at the works would need to be found whilst continuing to safeguard the Special Area of Conservation/Special Protection Area downstream. Since the WCS was published, approximately 160 dwellings have been either constructed or granted planning permission within the catchment of the Leiston WRC. Therefore, in respect the two residential scenarios assessed, both would require an upgrade to the WRC which could be an issue.

5.9 Whilst there are other WRCs that could have capacity issues in the future, including Gedgrave, Grundisburgh and Levington, the likely levels of growth that these WRCs would serve is considered to be minor.

Costs

5.10 Anglian Water has stated that it is not possible to provide costs for the additional used water infrastructure to serve growth. This will need to be determined when particular schemes are assessed.

Funding

5.11 In general, used water treatment infrastructure upgrades to provide for residential growth are wholly funded by Anglian Water through its Asset Management Plan (AMP). AWS has submitted its draft business plan to OFWAT for the next five-year AMP period (2015-2020) but this does not include schemes to address growth capacity at the key WRCs in the Suffolk Coastal District area. Therefore in order for AWS to fund specific upgrades, it will be necessary to put forward growth schemes for inclusion within the next AMP (post-2021). The only other alternative is that developers forward fund this work; however, given the potential costs involved, this is unlikely for all but the largest schemes. In the case of development at Adastral Park, the need for

developer funding of upgrades via an agreement with AWS was established at the Core Strategy Examination in Public.

- 5.12 Network improvements (on-site and off-site) are generally funded or part-funded through developer contributions. The cost and extent of the required network improvement are investigated and determined when a planning application is submitted and an appraisal is carried out. It is therefore not possible to provide costs to inform this assessment.

Timing of provision

- 5.13 The timing of upgrades to the existing WRC works depends on when sites are expected to come forward. As shown, some WRCs that would serve development require upgrades immediately, with others still having some spare capacity available.
- 5.14 Major strategic solutions to address network issues in respect of the major sites would require significant levels of planning. Therefore, sites where network issues require a strategic solution must come forward later in the plan period (particularly given the fact that they are not in the draft AMP for 2015-2020), unless they can be forward funded by the developer.
- 5.15 Based on the expected time for sites to come forward, the land at Adastral Park will need a strategic solution to be planned for if it is expected to come forward in the short term. As stated above, it is understood that this will be developer-funded and so will require agreement between the developer and AWS.
- 5.16 The remaining sites are expected to come forward later in the plan period.

Water – potable supply

- 5.17 The providers of potable water services to the Suffolk Coastal district are Essex and Suffolk Water (ESW) and Anglian Water Services (AWS). ESW covers the northern half of the district, including the market towns of Aldeburgh, Framlingham, Leiston and Saxmundham. AWS covers the southern half of the district, including the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area and the Felixstowe area.

Needs

- 5.18 Both ESW and AWS have confirmed that there are sufficient water resources available to support the levels of growth in the Core Strategy. Any strategic requirements to support growth have already been planned for and are funded.

Costs

- 5.19 There are no additional costs associated with growth.

Funding

- 5.20 Both ESW and AWS, in common with all water companies in England, already have a mechanism in place to ensure they are able to fund their infrastructure needs associated with growth from new development. This is a combination of general investment funding from customers' bills and charges to new developers.
- 5.21 Any new development would be funded by the developer in accordance with the requirements of the Water Industry Act. In reality, the actual payments made by the developer for any on-site water main would be significantly less than the cost of the asset. Any new service connection would be charged in accordance with standard rates and standard infrastructure charges would also apply.

Timing of provision

- 5.22 Connection to the network will be provided as sites come forward.

Gas

- 5.23 Gas is delivered through seven reception points into the United Kingdom and distributed through a National Transmission System (NTS). National Grid is responsible for the NTS which covers the whole of Great Britain.
- 5.24 A series of off-take points in the NTS supplies gas to twelve Local Distribution Zones. In the SuffolkCoastal area, National Grid Gas is the licensed gas transporter.

Needs

- 5.25 National Grid Gas has reported that if the full allocation in the Eastern Ipswich Plan area is fully delivered then there is not enough capacity in the system. As a result, major reinforcement works to the gas infrastructure would be required.
- 5.26 In Framlingham, both scenarios would require major reinforcement works to the gas infrastructure.
- 5.27 There is available capacity to support growth in all other areas.

Costs

- 5.28 The cost of addressing the identified needs would depend on the extent of growth that comes forward on individual sites. National Grid Gas states that, in the absence of detailed allocations, it is not possible to assign a cost to the provision of new infrastructure.

Funding

- 5.29 Gas supplies are funded by developers and National Grid. When a request for a supply is received, developers are quoted a Connection Charge. If the connection requires reinforcement of the network then a Reinforcement Charge may also be applied. The apportioning of reinforcement costs are split between the developer and National Grid, depending on the results of a costing exercise internally.
- 5.30 The funding of improvements to serve development at Adastral Park will have to be addressed in the short term.

Timing of provision

- 5.31 Connection to the network will be provided as sites come forward.
- 5.32 The improvements required to support growth in the Eastern Ipswich Plan area would not be needed until the later stages of the development come forward.
- 5.33 The improvements required to support growth in Framlingham would be needed in years 1-5 of any growth.

Electricity

- 5.34 Electricity supplies are provided by UK Power Networks. The main infrastructure required us sub-stations and cabling to the developments.

Needs

- 5.35 Development in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area would require a significant reinforcement of the local electricity distribution network. This would possibly including Rushmere and Kesgrave. For these areas, a new 33/11kV substation will be required, fed from Cliff Quay Grid. Part of this need is based on the expansion of employment needs proposed at Adastral Park as well as the proposed residential development. The new substation will require a land area of about 40m by 40m.
- 5.36 Felixstowe town and the surrounding areas are fed from two 33/11kV substations at Dock Road and Langley Avenue, both of which currently have spare capacity to address the levels of growth in the Core Strategy.
- 5.37 UK Power Networks have indicated that a single large proposal for an industrial or off-site port related development could remove the existing headroom at either site. Additionally, depending on any new job creation as a result of growth, which will have an impact on capacity, there may be a requirement for an additional 33/11kV substation, possibly between the Trimleys. This would need approximately 400m² of land.
- 5.38 In terms of housing growth in Felixstowe, it is unlikely to cause any specific issues. However each development would be assessed individually for the need for off-site reinforcement which would likely be needed for larger scale developments.
- 5.39 Small housing developments in other parts of Suffolk Coastal might not require significant upstream reinforcement but may need more local reinforcement, depending on the precise location.

Costs

- 5.40 For the requirements in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area, the current cost of a new 33/11kV substation would be in the region of £2.5m and the off-site network cable works are likely to be between £1-3m, dependent on the extent to which operational and upgrading works are needed to serve the developments. This excludes the cost of the land.
- 5.41 For the remainder of the district, since no specific requirements for infrastructure have been identified at this stage, their costs will also need to be assessed at the time of their identification, dependent on the extent to which operational and upgrading works are needed to serve the developments.

Funding

- 5.42 The existing charging methodology is for developers to support the capital investment needed to extend or reinforce the electricity network to their developments. The charges made to existing connected customers do not support network extension; it supports maintenance, repairs and generic reinforcement. Where a development prompts infrastructure reinforcement they will be required to contribute towards the reinforcement on a total or a proportional basis.
- 5.43 UK Power Networks will proportionally fund some strategic infrastructure if that has the benefit of usefully reinforcing supply to the existing networks. However, the developer will be charged the remaining proportion of the total costs. This relates to employment development as well as housing.
- 5.44 The funding of strategic infrastructure is normally planned for in the electricity company's asset management plans and pricing proposals. These are agreed with OFGEM on a five yearly basis, with the current plan covering the period 2010 – 2015. The proposed works are based on actual

and reasonably certain or non-speculative growth. Not all proposed works are accepted by the regulator, as there needs to be sufficient justification of need and appropriate value for money.

- 5.45 Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a proportion of the total costs are to be funded by UK Power Networks. However, at this stage it is not possible to be clear as to what proportion of the total that will represent. This is partly a function of whether the scheme is included in the asset management plan and partly the detail of the particular needs of a development proposal.
- 5.46 If a developer does want to bring forward additional infrastructure ahead of when UK Power Networks can fund it, then it can forward fund the requirements and then claim the cost back once this has been secured by the provider.

Timing of provision

- 5.47 The need for a strategic upgrade to the substation serving the Eastern Ipswich Plan Areas akey item which will be expected to be needed in the earliest phases of development.
- 5.48 For the remaining sites, any developments coming forward in the first five years of the plan period will have to secure the infrastructure upgrades in the short term. This will require early engagement by the developer with UK Power Networks.

6 TRANSPORT

6.1 Road and public transport as well as walking and cycling requirements have been assessed by Suffolk County Council.

Needs and costs

6.2 The assessment of needs has principally been provided by the 'Suffolk Coastal Housing Allocations: Proposed Strategy Transport Appraisal' Study³ from 2009 which informed the Core Strategy. This considered the major allocations and broad implications for other areas. Because this work was not directly aligned with the scenarios in the IDP, there may be differences in actual needs depending on the growth that is experienced.

6.3 It is important to identify the fact that all costs are 2009-based and therefore will need to be updated to the present day.

6.4 Since this study, the new Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for Norfolk and Suffolk – the New Anglia LEP – has published its Strategic Economic Plan (SEP)⁴. This sets out the priorities for securing economic growth and is part of a bid to Central Government for funding. The document identifies the A12 as a key link and also lists specific priorities which are identified in this section of the IDP.

Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

6.5 For the option that is in the Local Plan of 2,100 dwellings at Adastral Park, the following needs were identified:

Table 6.1: Transport infrastructure needs partly or fully associated with growth in the Eastern Ipswich Plan area

Item	Cost
Road	
New access junction and on-site infrastructure	£750,000
Junction improvements at 4 junctions along A12, including A12/A14 Sevenhills junction	£4,000,000
Bus	
Junction improvements along Woodbridge corridor, including A12/Woodbridge Road junction	£2,000,000
Junction improvements to support bus travel along Foxhall Road corridor	£1,500,000
Improved direct service to Felixstowe	£2,000,000 for five years
New direct service to Ipswich	£2,000,000 for five years
Pedestrian/cycling	
Pedestrian and cycle improvement scheme from Kesgrave across A12	£2,000,000 including land costs and possible CPO
TOTAL	£14,250,000

Source: AECOM

6.6 Table 6.1 shows that there are transport improvements required totalling £14.25m although not all of these are directly related to growth at Adastral Park.

³ AECOM (2009) *Suffolk Coastal District Council Local Development Framework Housing Allocations Proposed Strategy Transport Appraisal*, Suffolk County Council

⁴ New Anglia LEP (2013) *Strategic Economic Plan*

- 6.7 With respect to noise, there are a number of Important Areas as designated under Defra's National Noise Action Plan on the A12 in the vicinity of Martlesham Heath and Woodbridge. The highway authority is expected to investigate mitigation provision and identify any potential measures. These could include the provision of quieter road surfacing, barriers or noise insulation. Costs are not known at this stage but the use of developer contributions towards mitigation may be appropriate.
- 6.8 The New Anglia SEP identifies Junction 58 of the A12/A14 (the Seven Hills junction) as a priority for a major upgrade. The costs are unknown but the New Anglia LEP intends to fund this improvement from 2015/16 so that it can be included in the Highways Agency's national road building programme as soon as possible.

Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys

- 6.9 For growth in Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys, the AECOM study looked development in the following locations:
- Northern side of High Road/High Street - 400 dwellings
 - Southern side of High Road/High Street - 200 dwellings
 - Dispersed across remaining greenfield sites – 400 dwellings
- 6.10 The remainder of growth as identified in Table 2.1 would be expected to be dispersed around the area and therefore it was not possible to be definitive about the needs that would arise from it. However, this was not considered to be significant.
- 6.11 The following needs were identified:

Table 6.2: Transport infrastructure needs partly or fully associated with growth in the Felixstowe/Trimleys area

Item	Cost
Road	
Provision of on-site infrastructure and a new access junctions	£500,000 - £1,500,000
Junction improvements at A12/A14 Sevenhills junction	£4,000,000
Provision of new link road	£600,000
Improvements to 3 junctions along High Road, High Street	£1,500,000
Rail	
Improvements to Trimleys Railway Station	£350,000
Bus	
Improved bus frequencies to Ipswich and Woodbridge	£1,000,000 for five years
Improvements to existing bus shelters and provision of 'Real Time Passenger Information' facilities	£50,000
Pedestrian/cycling	
Pedestrian and cycle improvements connection to Felixstowe and adjacent amenities, including railway stations	£747,000
TOTAL	£8,747,000 - £9,747,000

Source: AECOM

- 6.12 Table 6.2 shows that there are transport improvements required totalling between £8.75m and £9.75m although not all of these are directly related to growth in the area. The table does show some items that are also included within Table 6.1 for the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area; however it has been ensured that there is no double counting of costs as these have been apportioned between the respective areas.

Market towns

- 6.13 The distribution to market towns for either scenario has not been fully considered because it was not considered by the AECOM report. SCC has reported that they do not appear to raise any specific transport infrastructure needs of significance. However, this is not to say that certain growth scenarios would not create need for improvements to existing transport infrastructure.
- 6.14 Further consideration needs to be given to the interaction of the cumulative needs arising from growth within and around the market towns as well as the direct impact of any specific development. For example, for Saxmundham, the Core Strategy aims to “make it an integrated transport hub on the East Suffolk rail-line, thereby serving the local area for the benefit of residents and tourists”. Achieving the hub will be about improving the hinterland as well as the hub itself.
- 6.15 In Framlingham, the AECOM study identified that there may be the need to undertake transport management initiatives and also to provide an improved package of sustainable transport measures. In particular, the need to improve bus services was identified as an issue for Framlingham. However, the levels of growth do not justify the provision of new services.
- 6.16 Actual service provision must be considered as an infrastructure item and not just the on road facility provision. The service provision to mitigate the impact of development and to maximise sustainable transport will be detailed in transport statements and assessments.
- 6.17 In the market towns, the critical issue with regards to improving sustainable transport is the routes for non-car modes of transport. In addition, there is the need for improvements in the provision of bus shelters and real time passenger information.
- 6.18 Such mitigation measures for these towns, and the implementation of the local transport plan will be considered further as the IDP is developed.
- 6.19 The New Anglia SEP identifies the Four Villages Bypass as a priority. This would be a bypass of the villages of Stratford St Andrew, Farnham, Little Glemham and Marlesford, with the principal aim of keeping HGV traffic from travelling through them. This would also serve to improve access to the market towns north of this location, namely Leiston, Saxmundham, Aldeburgh and, to a lesser extent, Framlingham. This also recognises the impact that the construction of Sizewell C will have in terms of construction traffic. The costs of the bypass are unknown but the New Anglia SEP document states that the main part of the spend on this is due to take place in 2018 to 2021, with Suffolk County Council starting preparatory work in 2015/16 to ensure that the scheme is ready to utilise funding when it becomes available.

Public rights of way

- 6.20 Investment in the public rights of way network will be necessary for three reasons:
 - The direct impact of increased use of existing public rights of way by influx of new residents in the area.
 - The need to develop promoted routes that assist in managing the impact of visitors in the countryside. The management of impact is relevant to mitigation measures required from the Appropriate Assessment - alternative recreational opportunities for routine use.
 - To improve health and wellbeing.
- 6.21 A further aspect is the role that the rights of way network has in economic development such as increasing the level of visitor spend. The Core Strategy seeks to expand the tourism offer and,

under the second objective, the 2013 Tourism Strategy has a range of objectives directly relating to rights of way, such as:

- maximising the value of the three long distance trails;
- encouraging greater use walking trails;
- developing a series of safe cycle trails (on-road and off-road) to be promoted to existing and new visitor markets; and
- developing horse riding as a tourism driver through the development of trails.

- 6.22 There is an interaction between the expanding the tourism offer and the mitigation of impact to protected sites. For example, maximising the value of the long distance trails includes developing circular trails off these strategic paths, which could help to managing the impact of visitor pressure.
- 6.23 The direct impact of more people using the network will depend on local factors with each development and the need to access services, facilities and green infrastructure within, and in the vicinity of, each development. Improvements would normally be required on completion of a development, but this is dependent on size and scale.
- 6.24 The cost of provision will depend on infrastructure requirements but may include surfacing, legal costs and structures.

Funding

- 6.25 Funding for transport improvements will come from a mix of developer contributions and Local Transport Plan funding.
- 6.26 Funding for rights of way improvements will come from developer contributions.
- 6.27 The Norfolk and Suffolk Local Transport Body (LTB) has been set up to devise and manage the delivery programme of major transport schemes across the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk. These are schemes which have been defined as costing £2m or more and funded – or part-funded – using Government major scheme money that has been devolved directly to the LTB. At present, the LTB technically remains responsible for the devolved funding, but in July 2014 the arrangements will change as the growth deal is concluded, and all money will be paid as part of Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF) to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). By way of example, funding for Norfolk and Suffolk is likely to be around £39m from April 2015 to April 2019.

Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

- 6.28 Table 6.3 shows that approximately £7.0m is assumed to come from developer contributions. Again, the table does show some items that are also included within Tables 6.1 and 6.2 but it has been ensured that there is no double counting of costs.

Table 6.3: Developer contributions assumed from growth in the Eastern Ipswich Plan area

Item	Cost
Road	
New access junction and on-site infrastructure	£750,000
Junction improvements at 4 junctions along A12, including A12/A14 Sevenhills junction	£2,000,000
Bus	
Junction improvements along Woodbridge corridor, including A12/Woodbridge Road junction	£1,000,000
Junction improvements to support bus travel along Foxhall Road corridor	£750,000
Improved direct service to Felixstowe	£1,000,000 for five years
New direct service to Ipswich	£1,000,000 for five years
Pedestrian/cycling	
Pedestrian and cycle improvement scheme from Kesgrave across A12	£500,000
TOTAL	£7,000,000

Source: AECOM

- 6.29 This leaves a shortfall of £7.25m to be addressed through the Local Transport Plan (LTP) or other sources.

Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys

- 6.30 Table 6.4 shows that between £5.35m and £6.35m is assumed to come from developer contributions. As with Table 6.3, it has been ensured that there is no double counting of costs.

Table 6.4: Developer contributions assumed from growth in the Felixstowe, Walton and Trimleys area

Item	Cost
Road	
Provision of on-site infrastructure and a new access junctions	£500,000 - £1,500,000
Junction improvements at A12/A14 Sevenhills junction	£1,000,000
Provision of new link road	£600,000
Improvements to 3 junctions along High Road, High Street	£1,500,000
Rail	
Improvements to Trimleys Railway Station	£200,000
Bus	
Improved bus frequencies to Ipswich and Woodbridge	£1,000,000 for five years
Improvements to existing bus shelters and provision of 'Real Time Passenger Information' facilities	£50,000
Pedestrian/cycling	
Pedestrian and cycle improvements connection to Felixstowe and adjacent amenities, including railway stations	£500,000
TOTAL	£5,350,000 - £6,350,000

Source: AECOM

- 6.31 This leaves a shortfall of between £2.40m and £4.40m to be addressed through the LTP or other sources.

Market towns

- 6.32 Given that no specific items have been identified, it is not possible to ascertain what level of contributions will come from each source. Certainly the provision of a package of sustainable transport measures is likely to require a mix of LTP and developer contributions funding.

Timing of provision

- 6.33 Depending on the detail of individual development schemes, certain items will be needed to enable development to proceed. In addition, many of the public transport initiatives should ideally be in place once the number of occupations of any given scheme reach a certain critical mass. This will need to be carefully planned as part of the application process.

7 EMERGENCY SERVICES

Police

- 7.1 The Suffolk Constabulary (SC) provides the appropriate police services in Suffolk Coastal district.
- 7.2 The 29 Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT's) in Suffolk work closely to address the priorities that are important to their local communities, and are made up of police officers, police community support officers (PCSOs) and partner organisations. Together with the emergency response and criminal investigation teams, they comprise essential social infrastructure which contributes to the building of safe and sustainable communities.
- 7.3 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (Section 17) places a duty on local authorities to reduce crime and disorder within the community. It is therefore necessary to ensure that adequate (developer funded) mitigation measures are brought forward to achieve safe, and cohesive communities within new developments.
- 7.4 The proposed growth will have a significant impact on SC's ability to provide effective police resourcing across the District, to discharge its duties under the above Act and to build safe and cohesive (sustainable) communities.

Needs

- 7.5 SC has reported that the levels of growth proposed would give rise to an increased incidence of crime and disorder which would require appropriate mitigation in the form of new police and community safety infrastructure. This would be provided where possible by developers as part of their particular developments.
- 7.6 In general, there would be a requirement for physical infrastructure provision, e.g. sites/premises and parking facilities, as well as other resources, which may comprise:
- Additional or enhanced police station floorspace and facilities including fit out and refurbishment and related transport facilities;
 - Custody facilities;
 - Mobile Police Stations;
 - Communications, including ICT;
 - Funding for additional staff resources, such as PCSOs, and equipment.

Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

- 7.7 The only proposed growth location where it has been possible for SC to accurately assess needs is in respect of the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area. The assessment is based on an additional population of approximately 4,800 people at Adastral Park, based on an average household size of 2.4 persons.
- 7.8 Tables 7.1 and 7.2 show the rise in both crime and incidents, resulting from the proposed development, this information has been broken down to show some of the key areas that would see an increase, as well as the total increase in crime/incidents across SCDC.

Table 7.1: Forecast increase in crimes per annum, Suffolk Coastal district

Crime	Average 2011/2013	Per 1,000 Population	Forecast growth per annum
Violence against the person (VAP)	818	6.6	31.68
Sex	79	0.6	2.88
Burglary	670	5.4	25.92
Vehicle	530	4.3	20.64
Other Theft	1,385	11.1	53.28
Criminal Damage	1,010	2.6	12.48
All Crime Total	6,064	48.8	234.24

Source: Crime Input Data and Polaris/STORM

Table 7.2: Forecast increase in incidents per annum, Suffolk Coastal district

Crime	Average 2011/2013	Per 1,000 Population	Forecast growth per annum
Anti-social behaviour	4,062	32.7	156.96
Public safety and welfare	8,174	65.8	315.84
Crime	4,443	35.7	171.36
Transport	4,313	34.7	166.56
All Incidents Total	20,992	168.9	810.72

Source: Crime Input Data and Polaris/STORM

- 7.9 To assist with a better understanding of the impact growth has on crimes/incidents and the cost this generates, Table 7.3 gives an indication of costs that will arise from the types of crimes that make up the total increase that will arise from the proposed growth.

Table 7.3: Forecast cost per annum for projected increase in Police activity, Suffolk Coastal district

Crime	Average Cost per Incident	Cost, as per forecast growth, per annum
VAP	£3,924	£178,173
Sex	£1,890	£7,806
Burglary	£518	£19,244
Vehicle	£53	£1,577
Other Theft	£237	£18,100
Criminal Damage	£94	£5,238
Forecast increase in total crime per annum	£6,064	£621,809

Based on average cost of £1,852

Source: Crime Input Data and Polaris/STORM

- 7.10 SC will seek to deploy additional staffing and infrastructure to a new development at the same level as is delivered to existing communities policed by SC.

- 7.11 In view of the size of the proposed development at Adastral Park, a police facility for the increased policing levels would be required within close proximity.
- 7.12 This additional requirement, when combined with the existing staff policing the area in question, would act as a tipping point for the current facility used to house staff policing the area that incorporates the Adastral Park development. Therefore, the facility requested for the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area reflects the housing of all these posts.
- 7.13 In addition to a new facility, there will be a requirement for additional personal equipment for staff. This typically comprises workstations, radios, protective equipment, uniforms and bespoke training in the use of these. In general this equipment is retained when existing staff leave and are replaced. However, additional staff will require additional equipment. There are practical limits to the extent to which existing equipment can be re-used e.g. with uniforms or where technology has moved on.
- 7.14 There will be a need for a further three Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). It should be noted that the services provided by the PCSO posts would be overlaid with additional resources dealing with Response, CID, Traffic, Air Support and Contact and Control Room, etc.
- 7.15 There will be a need for a further three police vehicles. Vehicles are used by officers and staff on patrol, deployed to deal with emergency responses and for follow-up of recorded crimes e.g. by Scene of Crimes Officers.
- 7.16 A further three Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras are needed. ANPR is a proven crime fighting tool which is used by SC in the Suffolk Coastal district area.
- 7.17 Appendix B shows the additional requirements to service development at Adastral Park and, in doing so, maintain the current level of policing in Suffolk Coastal district.

Rest of district

- 7.18 In line with Government policy to achieve savings through modernisation, SC's estate across the County is currently being reviewed to meet the police and community safety needs of residents and businesses in a more cost effective manner. As such, it is not feasible at the current time to determine the specific infrastructure and funding requirements arising from the proposed levels of growth within the individual growth areas.
- 7.19 Where a requirement for new floorspace is identified, SC would propose to liaise with the developer and the District Council to identify the optimum location for provision, which may involve combining police service provision with other infrastructure or facilities provision as part of the floorspace within a local centre.

Costs

- 7.20 Table 7.4 summarises the identified costs, which are broken down in more detail in Appendix B.

Table 7.4: Summary of costs arising from growth in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area

Item	Cost
Recruitment and equipping of staff	£80,548
Three PCSOs (three-year funding)	£241,227
Police vehicles	£84,483
ANPR	£180,221
Premises	£582,500
Total	£1,168,979

Source: Suffolk Constabulary

- 7.21 The main funding streams for the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) are based on the Government’ 3-year revenue and capital settlement. This formula is used by the Government to calculate grants payable to the PCC.
- 7.22 Projections are for three-year periods and much depends on the speed at which census data is introduced into the funding formula and the accuracy of the ONS projections. Inevitably this will not reflect on the immediate need for additional posts that need funding as a result of a new development.
- 7.23 Therefore the three-year funding period for the newly established post reflects the time it will take, until the funding formula reflects the increase in the components that calculate funding.

Funding

- 7.24 The Police Service does not receive sufficient funding to cater for new growth related to infrastructure provision. Further, the money received by SC is comparatively low relative to the size of the population in its area. Whilst revenue funding is provided by the Home Office and the Council Tax precept, although with a time lag of three-years, capital projects are mostly financed through borrowing.
- 7.25 Borrowing to provide infrastructure has an impact on the delivery of safe and sustainable communities as loans have to be repaid from revenue budgets, the corollary of this is a reduction in the money available to deliver operational policing.
- 7.26 SC would seek to secure developer funding to provide the necessary infrastructure.

Timing of provision

- 7.27 Provision to address needs arising from growth will be as sites come forward.

Fire Service

- 7.28 The Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service provides the appropriate fire services in SuffolkCoastal district. There are currently seven fire stations within the district:
 - Woodbridge
 - Framlingham
 - Orford
 - Aldeburgh
 - Leiston

- Saxmundham
- Felixstowe

- 7.29 All are operated by an on-call crew, with the exception of Felixstowe Fire Station which is a day-crewed fire station supported by an on-call crew.
- 7.30 In addition, there are fire stations close to the border of the district at Ipswich East (a wholetime fire station), as well as at Debenham, Halesworth and Reydon&Southwold (all on-call crews) which would serve the needs of certain parts of the district.
- 7.31 None of the generic areas for growth have raised any immediate infrastructure concerns. However, the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service has made clear that specific water and access requirements will need to be considered during the detailed planning stage.

Ambulance

- 7.32 The East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST) provides emergency and unscheduled care and patient transport services in Suffolk.
- 7.33 EEAST is required to reach 75% of all life threatening emergencies within 8 minutes. This target is measured from the time the Trust receives the call to arrival on scene.
- 7.34 The Trust's main objectives are to:
- meet these mandatory standards in service delivery;
 - deliver current priorities and new despatch systems;
 - begin work on projects to deliver the vision, particularly the technical preparation for building a knowledge management system and reshaping Health Emergency Operations Centres (HEOCs) – formerly known as Control Rooms - to move to the emergency and urgent care assessment centre concept; and
 - prepare the organisation to apply for Foundation Trust status.
- 7.35 EEAST has a service level agreement (SLA) with the respective Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to deliver its services across the area.

Needs

- 7.36 The Trust continues to see a significant rise in demand year on year above what the CCGs commission, so any increase in development will place additional pressure on this service.
- 7.37 Demand in the Martlesham/Kesgrave area dictates that the Trust needs to identify a new support facility within a Multi-Functional Health Centre or a 24/7 response function in order to achieve the trust target of 75% response within 8 minutes to all life-threatening emergencies. This should be a room with kitchen and storage facilities, along with parking for up to eight vehicles.
- 7.38 There are no other needs across the district that cannot be serviced with the existing infrastructure network.

Costs and funding

- 7.39 It is not possible to accurately cost the provision of a new facility to serve the Martlesham/Kesgrave area. Where possible, EEAST looks to share facilities on order to minimise costs.

7.40 Generally all infrastructure needs are funded from within the ambulance service. However, EEAST reports that it is in a period of significant change so its needs could change over time.

Timing of provision

7.41 The need for a new facility in the Martlesham/Kesgrave area is a short- to medium-term priority.

8 LEISURE AND COMMUNITY

Sports pitches and children's play facilities

8.1 Policy SP16 of the Core Strategy adopts the national standard of 2.4 hectares per 1,000 population for the provision of children's play areas and sports pitches. The Council has existing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG15) on outdoor play space that remains in place until it is replaced by any supplementary planning document (SPD). This states that the 2.4ha/1,000 population standard is broken down as follows:

- 0.7ha/1,000 population for children's play space
- 1.7ha/1,000 population for sports facilities

8.2 It is understood that a Leisure Strategy is being undertaken that will include an audit and assessment of pitch and non-pitch requirements. Until that has been completed, the following assessment provides a broad assessment of needs.

Sports facilities

Needs and costs

8.3 The 1.7ha per 1,000 population standard is for the provision of sports grounds for adult and youth use.

Capacity of existing provision

8.4 The Council carries out an audit of facilities on an annual basis. The most recent completed audit, by parish, was completed in December 2012. The approach taken has been to assess existing deficiencies in the parishes where the greatest growth is expected, i.e. in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area, Felixstowe and the Trimleys and the market towns. Whilst there may be existing deficiencies in the Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres, these are considered to be comparatively small. The work on the Leisure Strategy will be able to assess needs in more detail.

8.5 In assessing the existing deficiencies in the main growth areas, the audit in the relevant parish was reviewed:

- Eastern Ipswich Plan Area – Martlesham parish
- Felixstowe and Trimleys – Felixstowe, Trimley St Martin, Trimley St Mary
- Market towns – the respective parishes

8.6 Table 8.1 shows the shortfall/surplus of provision of sports facilities. The final column identifies the possible new items identified by the respective audit in each parish.

Table 8.1: Assessment of capacity of existing sports facilities

	Local Plan requirement (ha)	Local Provision (ha)	Shortfall/ surplus (ha)	Sports facilitiesneeds
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	9.31	10.43	1.12	None
Felixstowe, Walton &the Trimleys	49.80	48.66	-1.14	None
Aldeburgh	4.20	5.19	0.99	None
Framlingham	5.68	8.49	2.81	None
Leiston	9.36	11.12	1.76	None
Saxmundham	6.19	15.17	8.98	None
Woodbridge	13.17	5.95	-7.22	Additional land

8.7 This shows that most areas, apart from Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys and Woodbridge, have a surplus of provision against the adopted standard. For each location, the parish audit identified the possible need for new or improved facilities. However, the only requirement was identified in Woodbridge, this being a need for new land to provide additional pitches.

Needs arising from growth

8.8 The adopted standard for the provision of sports facilities is 1.7ha/1,000 population. The DCLG 2011-based household projections (published in April 2013), show that the average household size in Suffolk Coastal district in 2021 will be 2.21 persons. This is therefore applied to the housing scenarios tested to derive a total area of sports facilities required to support growth.

8.9 Applying Sport England’s recommended space standards of 7,420m² per football pitch⁵ creates a theoretical need for between 34 and 37 adult-sized football pitches. A junior pitch is the equivalent of half an adult-sized pitch, so in reality the overall number of pitches could be higher, this being a combination of adult and junior pitches.

8.10 Table 8.2 shows the needs for each area.

⁵ Source: Sport England guidance document: <http://www.sportengland.org/media/197610/kitbag-nt-football-senior-2-2013.pdf>

Table 8.2: Requirements for sports pitches arising from growth

	Dwellings	Population	Sports pitch needs (ha)	Sports pitch needs - items
SCENARIO 1				
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	4,641	7.89	11 pitches
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	3,249	5.52	7 pitches
Market Towns	990	2,188	3.72	5 pitches
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	4,641	7.89	11 pitches
SCENARIO 2				
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	4,641	7.89	11 pitches
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	3,249	5.52	7 pitches
Market Towns	1,525	3,370	5.73	8 pitches
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	4,641	7.89	11 pitches

Ave. household size of 2.21 persons taken from 2011-based DCLG projections for Suffolk Coastal district in 2021

- 8.11 The items listed in the final column for each scenario represent a possible breakdown of provision based on the area of sports facilities required. It only provides this in terms of sports pitches but there may be other alternative needs for particular sports facilities that it may be preferable to provide.
- 8.12 It should also be remembered that the analysis does not focus on the Key or Local Service Centres which may have additional needs depending on the levels of growth that occur there.

Costs

- 8.13 Guidance on costs from Sport England⁶ shows that the cost of providing an adult football pitch is £80,000. This includes all fees but excludes the ongoing maintenance of such facilities, as this would be a revenue cost.
- 8.14 Given the lack of specific facilities required to address historic deficits, it is not possible to identify a cost for this.
- 8.15 Table 8.3 shows the cost of provision of the items identified in Table 8.2:

⁶ Sport England Facilities Costs, Q4 2013: <https://www.sportengland.org/media/198443/facility-costs-4q13.pdf>

Table 8.3: Cost of provision of sports facilities needs arising from growth

	Sports facilities needs - items	Sports facilities needs - costs
SCENARIO 1		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	11 pitches	£850,642
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	7 pitches	£595,449
Market Towns	5 pitches	£401,017
Key & Local Service Centres	11 pitches	£850,642
TOTAL	34 pitches	£2,697,749
SCENARIO 2		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	11 pitches	£850,642
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	7 pitches	£595,449
Market Towns	8 pitches	£617,728
Key & Local Service Centres	11 pitches	£850,642
TOTAL	37 pitches	£2,914,460

8.16 This shows that the cost of provision, based on the suggested requirements, would be between £2.70m and £2.91m. This also excludes the potential need for changing rooms, particularly where there are larger requirements that may be provided in larger blocks of pitches, e.g. in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area and at Felixstowe, Walton and the Trimleys.

Funding

8.17 Outside of local authority budgets, there is no known source of funding available for the provision of additional play space as would be required by the development options. It is assumed that these would be funded solely through developer contributions.

Children’s play facilities

Capacity of existing provision

8.18 The approach taken to assessing the capacity of existing provision is the same as that undertaken for sports pitches.

8.19 Table 8.4 shows the shortfall/surplus of provision of children’s play space. The final column identifies the possible new items identified by the respective audit in each parish.

Table 8.4: Assessment of capacity of existing children’s play facilities

	Local Plan requirement (ha)	Local Provision (ha)	Shortfall/surplus (ha)	Play space needs - items
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	3.83	1.48	-2.35	3x LEAPs 2x NEAPs
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	20.51	17.35	-3.16	6x LEAPs 10x NEAPs
Aldeburgh	1.73	1.23	-0.50	1x LEAP
Framlingham	2.34	1.91	-0.43	3x LEAPs 1x NEAP
Leiston	3.86	5.09	1.23	1x LEAP
Saxmundham	2.55	1.02	-1.53	None
Woodbridge	5.42	7.87	2.45	2x NEAPs

8.20 This shows that most areas, apart from Leiston and Woodbridge, have a shortage of provision against the adopted standard. For each location, the parish audit identified the possible need for new or improved facilities, mainly in the form of Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAPs) and Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAPs). The audits also identified needs in Leiston and Woodbridge, despite there being a surplus of provision against the adopted standard.

Needs arising from growth

8.21 The adopted standard for the provision of children’s play space is 0.7ha/1,000 population. The DCLG 2011-based household projections (published in April 2013), show that the average household size in Suffolk Coastal district in 2021 will be 2.21 persons. This is therefore applied to the housing scenarios tested to derive a total area of children’s play space required to support growth.

8.22 Table 8.5 shows the needs for each area.

Table 8.5: Requirements for children’s play space arising from growth

	Dwellings	Population	Play space needs (ha)	Play space needs - items
SCENARIO 1				
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	4,641	3.25	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	3,249	2.27	3x LEAPs + 1x NEAP
Market Towns	990	2,188	1.53	2x LEAPs + 1x NEAP
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	4,641	3.25	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs
SCENARIO 2				
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	4,641	3.25	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	3,249	2.27	3x LEAPs + 1x NEAP
Market Towns	1,525	3,370	2.36	3x LEAPs + 1x NEAP
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	4,641	3.25	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs

Ave. household size of 2.21 persons taken from 2011-based DCLG projections for Suffolk Coastal district in 2021

8.23 The items listed in the final column for each scenario represent a possible breakdown of provision based on the area of children’s play space required. This is not the definitive requirement and it may be assessed, depending on the existing deficiencies in particular areas, that an alternative mix is more appropriate.

Costs

8.24 Based on an assessment of developments elsewhere, the typical cost of a LEAP is £40,000 and a NEAP, £80,000. This includes all fees but excludes the ongoing maintenance of such facilities, as this would be a revenue cost. It also excludes the cost of the land.

8.25 Table 8.6 shows the cost of provision of the items identified in Table 8.4:

Table 8.6: Cost of provision of children’s play space to address historic deficits

	Play space needs - items	Play space needs - costs
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	3x LEAPs 2x NEAPs	£280,000
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	6x LEAPs 10x NEAPs	£1,040,000
Aldeburgh	1x LEAP	£40,000
Framlingham	3x LEAPs 1x NEAP	£200,000
Leiston	1x LEAP	£40,000
Saxmundham	None	£0
Woodbridge	2x NEAPs	£160,000
TOTAL		£1,760,000

8.26 This shows that the cost of provision to address existing deficits would be £1.76m.

8.27 Table 8.7 shows the cost of provision of the items identified in Table 8.5:

Table 8.7: Cost of provision of children’s play space needs arising from growth

	Play space needs - items	Play space needs - costs
SCENARIO 1		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs	£280,000
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	3x LEAPs + 1x NEAP	£200,000
Market Towns	2x LEAPs + 1x NEAP	£160,000
Key & Local Service Centres	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs	£280,000
TOTAL		£920,000
SCENARIO 2		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs	£280,000
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	3x LEAPs + 1x NEAP	£200,000
Market Towns	3x LEAPs + 1x NEAP	£200,000
Key & Local Service Centres	3x LEAPs + 2x NEAPs	£280,000
TOTAL		£960,000

8.28 This shows that the cost of provision, based on the suggested requirements, would be between £920,000 and £960,000.

Funding

8.29 Outside of local authority budgets, there is no known source of funding available for the provision of additional play space as would be required by the development options. It is assumed that these would be funded solely through developer contributions.

8.30 It should be noted that CIL cannot be used to address historic deficits in provision. However, if that deficit is partially addressed by the provision of new infrastructure to address the needs arising from growth, then CIL can be used. Therefore, the final cost of provision will depend on where growth comes forward, when it comes forward and whether there are opportunities to provide new facilities (or improvements to existing facilities) in places that will serve both new and historic needs.

Youth facilities

Needs and costs

- 8.31 The parish audit, undertaken to ascertain existing needs for children’s play facilities and sports facilities, also identified needs related to youth provision. This is shown in Table 8.8:

Table 8.8: Needs and costs of youth facilities to address historic deficits

	Youth needs - items	Youth needs - costs
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2x MUGAs	£230,000
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	4x MUGAs	£460,000
Aldeburgh	None	N/a
Framlingham	MUGA	£115,000
Leiston	MUGA	£115,000
Saxmundham	MUGA	£115,000
Woodbridge	MUGA	£115,000
TOTAL		£1,150,000

- 8.32 This shows that there is a needs for at least one Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) in each location, with the exception of Aldeburgh. The parish audit sometimes said that such facilities should also provide another activity such as a skateboard park, which would be an extra cost. The cost of a new MUGA, based on provision elsewhere, is £115,000. This is for a floodlit and fenced facility that can be used for a range of different activities.
- 8.33 Table 8.8 shows that the total cost for such provision is £1.15m.
- 8.34 It should be remembered that the analysis does not focus on the Key or Local Service Centres which may have additional needs depending on the levels of growth that occur there.
- 8.35 The needs arising from growth will be identified through the Leisure Strategy. It is therefore not possible at this time to provide an understanding of the need for youth facilities arising from growth.

Funding

- 8.36 Outside of local authority budgets, there is no known source of funding available for the provision of additional play space as would be required by the development options. It is assumed that these would be funded solely through developer contributions.
- 8.37 It should be noted that CIL cannot be used to address historic deficits in provision. However, if that deficit is partially addressed by the provision of new infrastructure to address the needs arising from growth, then CIL can be used. Therefore, the final cost of provision will depend on where growth comes forward, when it comes forward and whether there are opportunities to provide new facilities (or improvements to existing facilities) in places that will serve both new and historic needs.

Other sports facilities

- 8.38 The SPG15 standard applies to outdoor facilities and in the main, to ‘standard’ sports facilities, as opposed to facilities for specialist or indoor sports. There are other identified sports needs that must be addressed in order to create adequate provision in the district.

- 8.39 There is not an up-to-date audit of the provision of other sports facilities in the district. The District Council has reported that a new Leisure Strategy is being prepared and it is important that the quality and quantity of existing provision of other sports facilities is included as part of that work.
- 8.40 In 2007, Sport England and the East of England Development Agency (EEDA) published 'Creating Active Places – Sports Facilities Strategy for the East of England.' This assessed future needs for sports facilities across the region, broken down by county. The Strategy identified that there is very limited facility provision (built and outdoor) in rural areas in the south and east of Suffolk. Another general point is that a number of facilities, including swimming pools and fitness facilities are sufficient in numbers, however there are issues with accessing them, which lead to deficits.
- 8.41 More specifically, the Study identified the need for the following facilities relevant to the Suffolk Coastal area:
- Badminton – 4 court facilities;
 - Traffic free cycling;
 - Hockey;
 - Martial arts;
 - Netball;
 - Squash;
 - Swimming; and
 - Volleyball – indoor facilities.
- 8.42 In the absence of a specific district-wide assessment of needs for indoor sports facilities, particularly swimming pools and sports halls, it is not possible to accurately determine the level of need for additional facilities to serve the proposed growth. It is recommended that this is included as part of the work on the Leisure Strategy being undertaken by the District Council.

Allotments

- 8.43 Allotment provision is not commonly undertaken by one specific body. Many allotments were provided several decades ago when funding and provision regimes were very different. Today it is more reasonable to expect developers to provide allotments as part of large developments. The maintenance and upkeep of allotments is commonly undertaken by parish councils.

Needs

- 8.44 A full list of allotments across the district unavailable. However, the Martlesham Allotment & Leisure Gardeners Association (MALGA), operating in the Eastern Ipswich Fringe Area, has stated that, following its formation and registration of those looking for allotment space, it has an estimated need for 50 plots. The average size of a plot is 250m², meaning that the total shortfall in existing provision is 12,500m², or 1.25ha.
- 8.45 Felixstowe Town Council owns five different allotment sites, at Cemetery Field, Cowpasture, Ferry Road, Railway Hill and Taunton Road. The biggest site is Cowpasture with 213 plots. There are 70 plots at Ferry Road, 38 plots at Railway Hill, 29 plots at Cemetery Field and 12 plots at Taunton Road. Additionally, there are some allotments at Trimley St Mary. There are currently waiting lists for all sites, however the precise extent of the shortfall in existing provision is not known.

- 8.46 In the remainder of the district, it was not possible to ascertain the level of allotment provision or any shortfalls.
- 8.47 In terms of determining the need for allotment space in response to new housing development, it is necessary to consider an appropriate standard of provision. There is no local standard of provision for the district. The 1969 Thorpe Report into demand for allotments, undertaken for the Ministry of Natural Resources, suggests a standard of 0.2ha per 1,000 population. Due to various factors such as the price of supermarket food and concern over the unsustainable levels of food miles that supermarket foods accrue, there has been a general upsurge in demand for allotments; therefore this standard, although dated, is considered to be reasonable.
- 8.48 The following needs are created by new growth:

Table 8.9: Needs for allotment facilities to address growth

	Dwellings	Population	Allotment needs (ha)
SCENARIO 1			
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	4,641	0.93
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	3,249	0.65
Market Towns	990	2,188	0.44
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	4,641	0.93
TOTAL			2.94
SCENARIO 2			
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	4,641	0.93
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	3,249	0.65
Market Towns	1,525	3,370	0.67
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	4,641	0.93
TOTAL			3.18

Ave. household size of 2.21 persons taken from 2011-based DCLG projections for Suffolk Coastal district in 2021

- 8.49 Table 8.9 shows that between 2.94 hectares and 3.18 hectares of allotment space is required to address needs arising from growth. A reasonable rule of thumb is that a single 0.25ha allotment will hold 10 plots, therefore the total need is for between 118 and 127 plots.

Costs

- 8.50 Costs for allotments are usually assessed on a 'one-off' basis, so it is most appropriate to determine this individually according to the particular development. As a guide, Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council considered proposals to create new allotments and derived a cost per hectare of £100,000. This would cover the provision of facilities such as sheds, access, fencing and drainage. Allotment fees would cover the maintenance of the access and fencing. This does not include the cost of purchasing the land.
- 8.51 Table 8.10 summarises the cost of addressing the identified needs:

Table 8.10: Cost of addressing the identified need for allotment facilities to address growth

	Allotment needs (ha)	Allotment needs - costs
SCENARIO 1		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	0.93	£92,820
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	0.65	£64,974
Market Towns	0.44	£43,758
Key & Local Service Centres	0.93	£92,820
TOTAL	2.94	£294,372
SCENARIO 2		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	0.93	£92,820
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	0.65	£64,974
Market Towns	0.67	£67,405
Key & Local Service Centres	0.93	£92,820
TOTAL	3.18	£318,019

8.52 This shows that the total cost would be between £294,000 and £318,000, plus the cost of the land.

Funding

8.53 There may be small pots of local funding available for the provision of allotment space. However, these are unlikely to cover anything other than a small proportion of the overall costs. It is therefore assumed that allotment space would be funded solely through developer contributions.

Timing of provision

8.54 There is no particular need for allotments to be provided at a certain time. However, it is expected that allotment provision should be made as residential development comes forward.

Community centres

8.55 Like allotments, there is no common provider of community halls. Most are provided by the local authority, with some provision by private charities.

8.56 In the main growth locations, there are several community centres serving local needs. In Martlesham Parish there are the following:

- The Village Hall
- Community Hall/Richards Room/Parish Room
- St Michael’s Church Centre/Pavilion/Scout Hut

8.57 In Kesgrave Parish, there is the Community Centre which also has a sports centre adjacent to it, consisting of a sports hall and all-weather pitch.

8.58 Within the Felixstowe area, there are the following halls:

- Broadway House Orwell Road;
- Felixstowe Town Hall Undercliff Road West, Felixstowe
- Walton Community Hall High Street, Walton, Felixstowe

- Trimley Memorial Hall, Trimley St Martin
- Trimley St Mary Welcome Hall

8.59 In the Market Towns there are various halls and community centres available for use by the local population.

8.60 There has been no clear audit of the capacity of these facilities and usage.

Needs

8.61 There is no clear and accepted standard for the provision of community halls. Other districts have adopted a range of standards, such as:

- Horsham District Council - 0.15m² per person;
- Taunton & Deane Borough Council - 0.2m² per person for village halls;
- Reigate & Banstead Borough Council 0.2m² per person (0.5m² per dwelling, based on an average of 2.4 people per dwelling);
- Bracknell Forest Council - 0.13m² per person for a community centre (0.33m² per dwelling based on 2.4 people per dwelling).
- Wycombe District Council and Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council - 0.3m² per person.
- Broxbourne – 0.55 community facilities per 1,000 people (within 15-minute walk time)

8.62 We therefore consider that a reasonable standard to adopt would be approximately 0.2m² per person, or 0.44m² per dwelling, based on an average of 2.21 people per dwelling (from the DCLG 2011-based household projections). Based on a reasonable assumption of 500m² for a large community centre and 200m² for a small meeting hall, the following provision is likely to be required to address the needs arising from new growth:

Table 8.11: Need for community centres to address growth

	Dwellings	Community centre needs (sqm)	Community centre needs - facilities
SCENARIO 1			
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	924	1 large centre + 2 small centres
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	647	3 small centres
Market Towns	990	436	2 small centres
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	924	4 small centres
TOTAL			1 large centre 11 small centres
SCENARIO 2			
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	2,100	924	1 large centre + 2 small centres
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	647	3 small centres
Market Towns	1,525	671	3 small centres
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	924	4 small centres
TOTAL			1 large centre 12 small centres

Ave. household size of 2.21 persons taken from 2011-based DCLG projections for Suffolk Coastal district in 2021

- 8.63 Table 8.11 shows that one large community centre would be needed in the Eastern Ipswich Plan area along with between 11 and 12 smaller centres to serve the other growth areas in the district.
- 8.64 It is too simplistic to say that this is exactly what is required in terms of the number of facilities. It may be preferable to provide community facilities as part of one large, multi-use facility. Community centres are often used for sporting activities. However, if such sporting facilities are already to be provided (either as a stand-alone facility or through use, for example, of secondary school facilities) then it is not necessary for such a large centre to be provided.

Costs

- 8.65 The capital cost⁷ of constructing a typical community centre ranges from £1,200/m² to £1,800/m². This covers construction and fees, with the higher end of the range allowing for equipment used for sports activities. Assuming that sports facilities are not required, then a figure of £1,300/m² is reasonable. This would create the following costs by growth location:

Table 8.12: Cost of provision of community centres to address needs arising from growth

	Community centre needs - items	Community centre needs - costs
SCENARIO 1		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	1 large centre + 2 small centres	£1,201,200
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	3 small centres	£840,840
Market Towns	2 small centres	£566,280
Key & Local Service Centres	4 small centres	£1,201,200
TOTAL	1 large centre 11 small centres	£3,809,520
SCENARIO 2		
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	1 large centre + 2 small centres	£1,201,200
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	3 small centres	£840,840
Market Towns	3 small centres	£872,300
Key & Local Service Centres	4 small centres	£1,201,200
TOTAL	1 large centre 12 small centres	£4,115,540

- 8.66 Table 8.12 shows that the cost of provision would be between £3.81m and £4.12m. It is important to note that this does not include the cost of the land for such facilities. It is also important to consider that there is a revenue cost attached to running new community facilities.

Funding

- 8.67 New community facilities are either provided from local authority capital expenditure budgets or through developer contributions. In certain circumstances, funding can be sought from Sport England if the facility is to provide a significant level of sports facilities.

⁷ A typical community centre consists of a large hall, a separate smaller meeting room, kitchen facilities and WCs (including disabled facilities)

8.68 Commonly as part of major developments such land is provided as free land in lieu of other charges, so a developer may offer either the land and a capital contribution towards the construction of a community building, or the identification of a site and construction of the building with subsequent transfer to the local planning authority or parish council.

Timing of provision

8.69 There are no particular issues in respect of timing.

Libraries

Needs

8.70 Due to changing forms of delivery and service rationalisation, it is difficult at this time to be precise about the new requirements for library provision. By way of an example about how the physical provision of library services is changing, SCC is now looking at hosting a pick-up/drop-off library service at its new care facilities.

Costs

8.71 The cost of providing additional library services has been established through the Suffolk County Council S106 Developers Guide. Costs are therefore a function of funding, which is addressed below.

Funding

8.72 Funding is expected to come from developer contributions. Suffolk County Council has produced a S106 Developers Guide and this requires a contribution of £216 per new dwelling (£90 per person).

8.73 The total cost of provision – and therefore funding – is as follows:

Table 8.11: Cost of library provision

Location	Dwellings	Cost
SCENARIO 1		
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Austral Park)	2,100	£453,600
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	£317,520
Market Towns	990	£213,840
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	£453,600
Total		£1,438,560
SCENARIO 2		
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Austral Park)	2,100	£453,600
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	£317,520
Market Towns	1,525	£329,400
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	£453,600
Total		£1,554,120

Source: Suffolk County Council

8.74 Table 8.1 shows the total cost of provision would be between £1.44m and £1.55m.

Timing of provision

8.75 All provision of improvements to existing library services can be provided as and when it is appropriate.

9 GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

- 9.1 Green infrastructure is the term used to describe a network of green spaces, green linkages, protected sites and nature reserves that is multi-functional, providing recreational and cultural experiences whilst also delivering landscape, historical and ecological benefits. Ownership of land can be both public and private and levels of public accessibility can range from being limited to public rights of way to being less constrained on open access land.
- 9.2 The Haven Gateway Partnership produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS) in April 2008. Production of this document was a condition of New Growth Point status for the Haven Gateway. Its principal purpose is to provide a framework for the delivery of high quality green infrastructure to complement planned housing and employment growth over the next 20 years. This was updated at a district level by the Suffolk Coastal Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011⁸. Reducing the fragmentation of wildlife habitats by creating ecological corridors and networks is a critical part of the strategy.
- 9.3 The scope of the Haven Gateway GIS extended beyond the boundaries of the district and the vision and principles contained in the strategy apply equally throughout the sub-region. So the green areas within the district will be serving a wider population which principally relates to Ipswich borough. It is important that Suffolk Coastal district works with its neighbouring authorities, including Ipswich Borough to understand collective green infrastructure needs and agree a common approach to charging development for their provision.
- 9.4 In the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area, the Adastral Park allocation is in close proximity to the boundary of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the European Protected Site (Natura 2000) on the Deben Estuary. Generally there is a lack of accessible natural green space and poor access links to the surrounding countryside from existing residential areas. The locally available accessible natural greenspace comprises predominantly lowland heathland (i.e. having Biodiversity Action Plan – BAP - priority habitat and species) with seasonal sensitivities.
- 9.5 In the Felixstowe area, the majority of green space is located along the seafront, with very little green space located inland. Felixstowe records green space deprivation at the district and regional levels.
- 9.6 Elsewhere in the district, large areas away from the coastal sites do not have provision of Accessible Green Space at the neighbourhood level. This appears to be the case even in Framlingham, which is the main market town in the area. Thus most residents away from the coast are deficient at the neighbourhood level of Accessible Natural Greenspace (ANG).

Needs

- 9.7 Based on standards promoted by Natural England, people should have access to:
- 2ha+ of ANG within 300m of home – this has been termed the Neighbourhood Level
 - 20ha+ of ANG within 1.2km of home – the District Level
 - 60ha+ of ANG within 3.2km of home – the Sub-regional Level
 - 500ha+ of ANG within 10km of home – the Regional Level
- 9.8 The Haven Gateway GIS identifies the following deficiencies:

⁸ The Landscape Partnership (2011) *Green Infrastructure Strategy for Suffolk Coastal District Council*

Table 9.1: Identified deficiencies in accessible natural green space

	Regional	Sub-regional	District	Neighbourhood
Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	Yes	No	Yes	No
Market Towns and surrounding rural areas	Yes	Some	Some	Yes

Source: Haven Gateway Partnership (2008) *Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Study*

Costs

9.9 The Haven Gateway and Suffolk Coastal Green Infrastructure Strategies identify various projects within the vicinity of the study area which could address the regional and local deficiencies. These include:

- Visitor Centre at Tangham Forest – in excess of £500,000
- Melton to Snape Green Corridor – less than £200,000
- Sandling Forest re-wilding project – in excess of £500,000
- Pound Farm Woodland Trust site – cost unknown
- River valleys access and enhancements (for Deben, Orwell, Alde and Blythe rivers) - cost unknown
- Deben Greenspace projects - cost unknown
- Ipswich Northern Fringe Green Corridor – in excess of £500,000
- Whitehouse Green Bridge – in excess of £500,000
- Foxhall Road Green Corridor – between £200,000 and £500,000
- Long Stropps Open Space – in excess of £500,000
- Mill River Corridor Enhancement - between £200,000 and £500,000
- Purdis Heath and Martlesham Heath SSSI – in excess of £500,000
- Walk Farm Open Space – in excess of £500,000
- Foxhall Country Park – in excess of £500,000
- North Felixstowe Fringe Green Corridor - between £200,000 and £500,000
- Trimley Marshes Extension – in excess of £500,000
- Trimley Green Bridge – in excess of £500,000
- Framlingham Castle and Mere – cost unknown
- Framlingham existing greenspace – cost unknown
- Framlingham potential new GI – cost unknown
- The Brownsord Way, Framlingham – cost unknown
- Framlingham to Pound Farm – cost unknown
- Saxmundham Links – cost unknown

- A12 crossing at Saxmundham – cost unknown
- East Suffolk Line – cost unknown
- Walks from Halesworth to Chediston – cost unknown

9.10 Clearly it will be necessary to cost particular schemes once more specific proposals have been drawn up. Other green infrastructure initiatives such as ongoing wardening/management projects may be required if housing developments result in significant impacts on nearby sensitive areas such as the European designated estuaries and heathlands.

Funding

9.11 A proportion of the costs of green infrastructure requirements can be sought by way of developer contributions. In order to make provision for the future growth of the population, two elements need to be secured, capital costs for implementation and a commuted sum for maintenance during an established period.

9.12 Public funding for new capital schemes has been significantly reduced over the past five years. It is not known at present the extent to which funding can be sought for new capital projects from mainstream sources.

Timing of provision

9.13 Landscaping is to be provided as schemes are brought forward. Other items are similarly to be provided in line with development.

10 FLOODING AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT

- 10.1 The Environment Agency has a strategic overview is responsible for of strategic flooding issues, Suffolk County Council is the lead local flooding authority (under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010), with lead responsibility for managing the risk of flooding from surface water, groundwater and ordinary watercourses. As independent public bodies responsible for water level management, the East Suffolk Drainage Board is a significant partner in the management of water as they look after critical infrastructure such as watercourses, pumping stations and other water-level control structures.
- 10.2 Local matters are dealt with principally by Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council. However, one of the most sensitive areas requiring coastal management is the estuary of the Rivers Alde and Ore. The Alde and Ore Estuary Partnership was set up in 2012 with a membership representing parishes and local interests, to take on the responsibility for managing a sustainable future for river defences in the estuary. This is in recognition of the fact that, with Government funding reduced, particularly in rural areas, it will be up to the local community to help fund areas that do not meet the Government cost benefit assessments.
- 10.3 A similar local assessment has been provided for the River Deben estuary.
- 10.4 In respect of the needs arising from proposed new development, these are normally addressed through conditions attached to planning consents.

Needs and costs

- 10.5 The Environment Agency’s Partnership and Strategic Overview Team has identified the following projects in the catchment area of Suffolk Coastal:

Table 10.1: Flood defence schemes and costs

Scheme	Cost (£)
Aldeburgh Town Frontage Works	2,900,000
Bawdsey Manor and Deben Estuary Mouth Works 2	1,000,000
Bawdsey Manor and Deben Estuary Mouth Works 1	615,000
Felixstowe North - Works to recharge, improve groynes and part seawall 2027	1,500,000
Felixstowe North - Works to recharge, improve groynes and part seawall 2017	1,495,000
Felixstowe South - Works to renew and raise seawall	3,000,000
Felixstowe South and Central -Works to recharge Central and South beaches	2,300,000
Felixstowe South - Works to replace groyne navigation marks over SCDC and EA frontages	483,000
Central Felixstowe Coast Protection Works	1,495,000
Felixstowe South - Works to replace old timber / concrete groynes	2,000,000
Ipswich - Stone Lodge Park Sustainable Urban Drainage	39,000
Lowestoft (Lake Lothing) Flood Defence Scheme	5,050,000
Sudbury-Great Cornard	1,050,000
Leiston Flood Alleviation Scheme	130,000
TOTAL	23,057,000

Source: Environment Agency

- 10.6 As Table 10.1 shows, fifteen schemes have been identified with a total cost of over £23m. Not all of these schemes are solely to address issues Suffolk Coastal district; the scheme at Ipswich, Lowestoft and Sudbury-Great Cornard also serve to address issues outside of the district.
- 10.7 These costs do not include maintenance costs for flood defences.
- 10.8 Even though these projects have been identified by the EA, it does not mean that they will go ahead. Whether or not approval is given for an individual flood defence project depends to a large degree on the outcome of the cost-benefit analysis carried out on that project, rather than a need caused by reaching a certain trigger level.
- 10.9 It should be noted that the schemes and costs shown in Table 10.1 are considered to be out of date and will require updating. The tidal surge experienced along the East Anglian coast in December 2013 has had a significant impact on the schemes required.
- 10.10 In addition to the EA projects listed in Table 10.1, there are further community-based projects for the Deben and the Alde Ore Estuaries. The works identified in these projects (which are under preparation) are uncertain at the moment but likely to have a cost of about £7.0m for the Alde Ore Estuary and £4.0m for the Deben Estuary. The cost of the Alde Ore Estuary works is based on the need to upgrade flood defences in nine flood cells. This is shown in Table 10.2.

Table 10.2: Upgrade costs for the Alde & Ore Estuaries, by flood cell

Flood cell	Cost (£)
Boyton	1,016,710
Butley	54,125
Chillesford	312,470
Orford	2,010,287
Iken	759,456
Snape	242,080
Ham Creek	89,016
Hazelwood	355,310
Alde	434,121
10% supervision and VAT	1,687,544
TOTAL	6,961,119

Source: Alde & Ore Estuary Partnership

- 10.11 Work on the Deben Estuary Plan is currently ongoing and the Environment Agency is unable to provide a breakdown at this stage.
- 10.12 The grand total of costs for flooding and coastal management is £34.0m. This consists of:
- EA schemes - £23.06m
 - Alde Ore Estuary - £6.96m
 - Deben Estuary - £4.00m

Funding

- 10.13 Table 10.3 shows the required funding still to be found for the identified schemes. The funding reflects a combination of Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGIA) money, funding secured through local levies, publicly funded contributions, including funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership, and privately funded contributions. The majority comes from FDGIA and here it should be noted that even though a flood defence scheme has been approved in principle, such approval only makes it eligible for FDGIA funding purposes. Essentially an approved flood defence scheme is

entered into a funding pot and because priorities can change, there is no absolute guarantee that funding will become available in accordance with the project programme.

Table 10.3: Funding of flood defence schemes, as at March 2013

Scheme	Cost (£)	Potential funding available (£)	Potential funding gap (£)
Aldeburgh Town Frontage Works	2,900,000	400,000	2,500,000
Bawdsey Manor and Deben Estuary Mouth Works 2	1,000,000	240,000	760,000
Bawdsey Manor and Deben Estuary Mouth Works 1	615,000	88,000	527,000
Felixstowe North - Works to recharge, improve groynes and part seawall 2027	1,500,000	160,000	1,340,000
Felixstowe North - Works to recharge, improve groynes and part seawall 2017	1,495,000	300,000	1,195,000
Felixstowe South - Works to renew and raise seawall	3,000,000	3,000,000	0
Felixstowe South and Central -Works to recharge Central and South beaches	2,300,000	2,300,000	0
Felixstowe South - Works to replace groyne navigation marks over SCDC and EA frontages	483,000	460,000	23,000
Central Felixstowe Coast Protection Works	1,495,000	45,000	1,450,000
Felixstowe South - Works to replace old timber/concrete groynes	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Ipswich - Stone Lodge Park Sustainable Urban Drainage	39,000	39,000	0
Lowestoft (Lake Lothing) Flood Defence Scheme	5,050,000	5,050,000	0
Sudbury - Great Cornard	1,050,000	1,050,000	0
Leiston Flood Alleviation Scheme	130,000	118,000	12,000
TOTAL	23,057,000	15,250,000	7,807,000

Source: Environment Agency

10.14 Table 10.3 shows that if all of the identified schemes were approved and the potential funding secured, then there would still be a funding gap of over £7.8m.

10.15 It is important to note that the aim of FDGIA funding is to provide protection to existing properties rather than new development. Any flood protection required for new development will need to rely on non-FDGIA funding sources such as developer contributions. However, it is likely that these flood defence schemes will provide some protection for new development, depending on its location.

10.16 In respect of local flood defence schemes, such as those being take forward by the Alde and Ore Estuary Partnership, they are likely to attract some EA funding but not enough to fully cover the cost of provision. It is likely therefore that there will be a call on alternative funding either through developer funding or direct from Suffolk Coastal District Council.

Timing of provision

10.17 As stated earlier, all identified flood defence schemes are to address existing deficiencies in provision, rather than new development. Table 10.4 summarises their likely start dates, assuming that they are approved by the EA and the necessary funding is available.

Table 10.4: Flood defence schemes and likely start dates (as at April 2014)

Scheme	Likely start date
Aldeburgh Town Frontage Works	2023
Bawdsey Manor and Deben Estuary Mouth Works 2	2021
Bawdsey Manor and Deben Estuary Mouth Works 1	2015
Felixstowe North - Works to recharge, improve groynes and part seawall 2027	2029
Felixstowe North - Works to recharge, improve groynes and part seawall 2017	2019
Felixstowe South - Works to renew and raise seawall	2031
Felixstowe South and Central -Works to recharge Central and South beaches	2031
Felixstowe South - Works to replace groyne navigation marks over SCDC and EA frontages	2014
Central Felixstowe Coast Protection Works	2022
Felixstowe South - Works to replace old timber/concrete groynes	2036
Tunstall Flood Alleviation Scheme	2015
Ipswich - Stone Lodge Park Sustainable Urban Drainage	2016
Lowestoft (Lake Lothing) Flood Defence Scheme	2018
Sudbury - Great Cornard	2019
Leiston Flood Alleviation Scheme	2016

Source: Environment Agency

10.18 The needs arising from new development should be addressed as these developments come forward. More strategic-scale infrastructure needs may require delivery in advance of schemes coming forward.

11 WASTE

Needs

- 11.1 There is a need for additional Waste Transfer Stations (WTSs) to address waste needs arising from growth. At present, two new WTSs to serve the county are expected to be provided, at Bury St Edmunds and to the east of Ipswich. These are expected to address needs but, depending on the extent of growth, may require upgrading in order to intensify operations.
- 11.2 There is likely to be a need for a new Household Waste and Recycling Centre (HWRC) to serve the market towns. The preferred location for such a facility would be along the A12 corridor. There is an existing HWRC site at Saxmundham but it is not possible to expand this. The provision of a new HWRC site would also provide a better spread of services.
- 11.3 No developments have any specific infrastructure needs in respect of waste disposal provision. All development is required to have a waste management and minimisation strategy, as a minimum.

Costs

- 11.4 The cost of a new HWRC facility would be approximately £1,500,000 to construct, with land costs estimated at £1,250,000. The total cost is therefore £2,750,000.
- 11.5 The cost of providing additional waste services to support the growth in population has been established through the Suffolk County Council S106 Developers Guide. Costs are therefore a function of funding, which is addressed below.

Funding

- 11.6 The need for additional waste provision is a function of population growth and Suffolk County Council has established a standard charge approach to contributions which reflects the fact that every additional person places additional requirements on the waste provision service. Therefore, every new development should make a contribution to the improvement and expansion of the existing waste network.
- 11.7 In terms of funding from developer contributions, Suffolk County Council has produced a S106 Developers Guide and this requires a contribution of £97 per new dwelling.
- 11.8 In broad terms, and based on the SCC S106 Developers Guide, the level of funding from residential development is as follows:

Table 11.1: Funding towards waste provision arising from development

Location	Dwellings	Cost
SCENARIO 1		
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Austral Park)	2,100	£203,700
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	£142,590
Market Towns	990	£96,030
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	£203,700
Total		£646,020
SCENARIO 2		
Eastern Ipswich Plan area (Austral Park)	2,100	£203,700
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	£142,590
Market Towns	1,525	£147,925
Key & Local Service Centres	2,100	£203,700
Total		£697,915

Source: Suffolk County Council

11.9 Table 10.1 shows the total funding towards provision would be between £646,000 and £698,000.

Timing of provision

11.10 All provision of improvements to existing waste provision services can be provided as and when it is appropriate.

12 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

- 12.1 A summary of the infrastructure costs is shown in Table 12.1.
- 12.2 In total, the costs of infrastructure are over£105m. There are several important considerations in assessing this figure.
- 12.3 Firstly, this represents a 'worst case' scenario under Scenario 2 which considered high levels of growth in each of the growth locations. It is unlikely that such levels of growth will occur in all of these locations. In particular this relates to the market towns and this will need to be revised once there is greater certainty over the levels of growth in each market town. This will be achieved through the production of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) or neighbourhood plans for each town.
- 12.4 Secondly, not all of these costs are expected to be borne by the developer. Many of the providers will provide this as part of their investment programmes, e.g. UK Power Networks has said that it expects to fund some of these costs, but it is not known at present exactly how much because this depends on their forward funding programme.
- 12.5 Equally, this does not reflect the potential from as yet identified other funding sources. The identified funding from alternative sources is very limited at present so does not materially affect the overall funding gap. However, it is important that this position is regularly reviewed as new funding sources become available.
- 12.6 However, there are some costs which are not known which could add to costs and therefore increase the funding gap. It will be important for Suffolk Coastal District Council to work with the respective agencies to identify the specific needs and any funding implications at the earliest possible stage.
- 12.7 A proportion of the funding gap is to address historic deficits. In particular, the figures for sports facilities and children's play facilities reflect existing shortfalls in provision. This is relevant because CIL is not permitted to address historic deficits, only the needs arising from growth. In many circumstances, an item will address both an existing deficit and also the needs created by new growth. But it is important to ensure that CIL funding is not used to solely address an historic deficit.
- 12.8 At present, based on the information available on known funding sources (which total £21.85m), the funding gap totals £83.34m.
- 12.9 Table 12.2 shows the responsibility for each infrastructure area and the relative level of importance of delivering that infrastructure. Red items are the most critical, green the least critical.
- 12.10 This shows that there are some critical items which must be delivered in the short term in order for one or more of the strategic sites to come forward.

Table 12.1: Summary of infrastructure costs (rounded to the nearest £1,000)

Item	Eastern Ipswich Plan Area	Felixstowe, Walton & Trimleys	Market Towns	Key & Local Service Centres	Rest of District	Total	Funding mechanism
Education - EY&C*	£1,278,900	£895,230	£928,725	£1,278,900	£0	£4,381,755	CIL, S106
Education - primary*	£6,900,000	£1,546,987	£2,752,706	£5,152,563	£0	£16,352,256	CIL, S106
Education - secondary*	£783,326	£0	£3,326,166	£0	£0	£4,109,492	CIL, S106
Health	£400,400	£304,200	£262,600	£234,000	£0	£1,201,200	CIL, S106
Used water	Not known	Not known	Not known	£0	£0	Not known	Anglian Water
Potable water	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	n/a
Gas	Not known	£0	Not known	£0	£0	Not known	n/a
Electricity	£5,500,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	£5,500,000	UK Power Networks, CIL, S106
Transport	£14,250,000	£9,747,000	Not known	Not known	Not known	£23,997,000	LTP, CIL, S106
Police	£1,168,979	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	£1,168,979	CIL, S106
Fire	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	n/a
Ambulance	Not known	£0	£0	£0	£0	Not known	n/a
Sports facilities*	£850,642	£595,449	£617,728	£850,642	Not known	£2,914,461	CIL, S106
Children's play facilities*	£280,000	£200,000	£200,000	£280,000	Not known	£960,000	CIL, S106
Youth facilities*	£230,000	£460,000	£460,000	Not known	Not known	£1,150,000	CIL, S106
Community centres	£1,201,200	£840,840	£872,300	£1,201,200	Not known	£4,115,540	CIL, S106
Allotments*	£92,820	£64,974	£67,405	£92,820	Not known	£318,019	CIL, S106
Green infrastructure	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	CIL, S106
Libraries	£453,600	£317,520	£329,400	£453,600	£0	£1,554,120	CIL, S106
Flooding and coastal management	Not apportioned	Not apportioned	Not apportioned	Not apportioned	Not apportioned	£34,018,119	CIL, S106
Waste*	£203,700	£142,590	£2,897,925	£203,700	£0	£3,447,915	CIL, S106
Total	£33,593,567	£15,114,790	£12,714,955	£9,747,425	£0	£105,188,856	

* Excludes cost of land

Table 12.2: Infrastructure responsibilities and priorities

Item	Responsibility	Need	Timing
Electricity	UK Power Networks	Critical	Provision at Adastral Park needed to support this development when it comes forward, along with wider growth
Gas	National Grid	Critical	Provision at Adastral Park and Framlingham needed to support this development when it comes forward, along with wider growth
Used water	Anglian Water	Critical	WRC upgrades needed to support growth with needs at Adastral Park the most critical for this site to come forward in the short term
Education - EY&C	Suffolk County Council	Critical	
Education - primary	Suffolk County Council	Critical	New school needed at Adastral Park in line with growth and solutions needed at Framlingham and Saxmungham to expand provision
Education - secondary	Suffolk County Council	Critical	As and when sites come forward
Flooding and coastal management	Environment Agency; local partnerships; Developers	Critical	To be determined
Ambulance	East of England Ambulance Service	Essential	New facility at Martlesham/Kesgrave as growth comes forward in Eastern Ipswich Plan Area
Police	Suffolk Constabulary	Essential	Provision at Adastral Park needed to support this development when it comes forward, along with wider growth
Health	NHS England	Essential	As and when sites come forward
Potable water	Anglian Water/Essex & Suffolk Water	Essential	As and when sites come forward
Transport	Suffolk County Council; Public transport providers; Developers	Essential	As and when sites come forward
Waste	Suffolk County Council	Essential	As and when sites come forward
Sports facilities	Suffolk Coastal District Council; Developers	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Children's play facilities	Suffolk Coastal District Council; Developers	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Youth facilities	Suffolk Coastal District Council; Developers	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Community centres	Suffolk Coastal District Council; Developers; Parish Councils	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Allotments	Suffolk Coastal District Council; Developers; Parish Councils	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Green infrastructure	Suffolk Coastal District Council; Developers	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Libraries	Suffolk County Council	Desirable	As and when sites come forward
Fire	Suffolk Fire Service	No needs	N/a

Appendix A Scenarios tested

Location	SCENARIO 1 (dwellings)				SCENARIO 2 (dwellings)			
	Residual new allocations, 2013-27	Years 1-5	Years 6-10	Years 11-14	Residual new allocations, 2013-27	Years 1-5	Years 6-10	Years 11-14
Eastern Ipswich (Aadal Park)	2,010	700	700	610	As Scenario 1			
Felixstowe, Walton & the Trimleys	1,470	500	500	470	As Scenario 1			
Market Towns								
<i>Aldeburgh</i>	10	5	5	0	75	30	30	15
<i>Framlingham</i>	380	130	130	120	500	200	200	100
<i>Leiston</i>	370	130	130	110	500	200	200	100
<i>Saxmundham</i>	190	70	70	50	350	125	125	100
<i>Woodbridge</i>	40	20	20	0	100	40	40	20
Key Service Centres								
<i>Alderton</i>	50	20	20	10	As Scenario 1			
<i>Blythburgh</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Bramfield</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Darsham</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Dennington</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Earl Soham</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Eyke</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Grundisburgh</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Hollesley</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Knodishall</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Martlesham (village)</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Melton (village)</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Orford</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Otley</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Peasenhall (with part of Sibton)</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Rendlesham</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Snape</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Trimley St Martin</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Trimley St Mary</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Westleton</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Wickham Market</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Witnesham</i>	50	20	20	10				
<i>Yoxford</i>	50	20	20	10				
Local Service Centres								
<i>Aldringham</i>	25	10	10	5	As Scenario 1			
<i>Badingham</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Bawdsey</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Bucklesham</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Benhall</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Blaxhall</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Brandeston</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Bredfield</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Bruisyard</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Butley</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Campsea Ashe</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Charsfield</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Chillesford</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Dunwich</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Easton</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Hacheston</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Hasketon</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Kelsale</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Kirton</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Little Bealings</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Little Glemham</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Marlesford</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Middleton</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Nacton</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Parham</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Rendham</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Rushmere St. Andrew (village)</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Shottisham</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Stratford St Andrew</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Sutton Heath</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Theberton</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Thorpeness</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Tunstall</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Ufford</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Walberswick</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Waldringfield</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Wenhaston</i>	25	10	10	5				
<i>Westerfield</i>	25	10	10	5				

**Appendix B
needs**

Suffolk Constabulary – breakdown of

STAFFING COSTS

The following table shows the current staffing levels for SCDC, the area of the proposed Eastern Ipswich Plan Area development.

Staff Type	Current Staffing Level	Increased staffing level (based on growth of 4,800 population)
SNT Officers	25	1
SNT PCSOs	34	1
Response Officers	50	2
Other Officers pro-rated (incl. CID and other specialist teams)	115	4
Total officers		8
Police staff for SCDC pro-rated	165	6
Total staff		6

Officers and Staff Set-up Costs

Additional Officers	Approx. set-up cost per officer	Pro rata requirement for 8 officers
Recruitment	£1,060	£8,480
Training	£4,400	£35,200
Uniform & Personal equipment	£940	£7,520
Standard equipment (ICT and furniture)	£1,642	£13,136
Total costs	£8,042	£64,336

Additional central support services	Approx. set up cost per member of staff	Pro rata requirement for 6 staff
Recruitment	£1,060	£6,360
Standard equipment (ICT and furniture)	£1,642	£9,852
Total costs	£2,702	£16,212

TOTAL		£80,548
--------------	--	----------------

Source: SC Finance/HR and ICT

The costs shown above are reflective of the costs as at the time of this information being submitted (April 2014). These are however subject to change and will be recalculated at the point of planning permission being submitted.

PREMISES COSTS

ADASTRAL SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAM AND PUBLIC ACCESS POINT						
PRESENT LOCATION:		None			DATE: 19.03.2014	
1. Please enter figures in the boxes indicated with a bold blue zero where appropriate. The floor space required will then be calculated for you.						
PROPOSED LOCATION:		BT Adastral Park			COMPLETED BY:	CR
Staff Type	Current People Numbers	Estimated Daily Occupancy	Desks	Notes on assessment and type of room proposed	SQ M Each Desk	Total SQM
CPC REQUIREMENTS						
Inspector	1	1	1	In open plan office	5	5.00
Specials	4	0	1	In open plan office	5	5.00
SNT Sergeant	2	1	1	In open plan office	5	5.00
SNT Constable	14	6	4	In open plan office	5	20.00
PCSO	5	2	1	In open plan office	5	5.00
Station Clerks	1	1	1	In Public Enquiry Office	5	5.00
Admin Clerk	1	1	1	In open plan office	5	5.00
Future additional staff numbers (Hot Desk visitors)	1	1	1		5	5
REQUIREMENT	29	13	11			55.00
Other Space Type	Space Required	Number Required	SQ M PER ITEM	TOTAL SQ M	SITE REQUIREMENTS	
PEO Reception		1	15.00	15.00	Staff CP	5
Meeting/Interview Rooms	PEO	1	13.00	13.00	Parking	4
ICT - Server/Comms Room	5 SQ M per cabinet	1	5.00	5.00	Staff Bike Parking	5
Rest Room/Kitchen	Number of seating in kitchen area	1	20.00	20.00	Ops Bike Parking	5
Toilets and Showers	Daily capacity number for male and female	2	15.00	30.00		
Disabled Toilet + shower (wet room)	1 toilet	1	5.00	5.00		
Lockers & Equipment	No of all staff requiring lockers and equipment hangars	30	0.50	15.00	Salt Bin Areas	2
Cleaners Cupboard		1	5.00	5.00	Waste Bin Areas	1
Internal Store Cupboard		1	5.00	5.00		
External Store		1	10.00	10.00		
Plant room/Boiler Room		1	5.00	5.00		
Drying Room		1	5.00	5.00		
PSE Stores (Main, Temp & Drugs)		1	5.00	5.00		
Circulation space- stairs/corridors 20% of total space			40.00	40.00		
					MISC	Any other special requirements
TOTAL OTHER SPACE REQUIREMENT				178.00		
TOTAL COMBINED SPACE REQUIREMEI					233.00 SQ M	
					2508.01 SQ FT	

The above is based on an all-inclusive build cost of £2,500 per square metre, which equates to a total build cost of **£582,500**.

Although a specific building design has not been completed at this early stage of planning it is suggested that this additional accommodation would be developed within the existing SC estate at Force Headquarters Martlesham.

This would afford the appropriate access to the current and emerging community, and also negate the acquisition and so cost of land purchase.

COST OF VEHICLES

The current vehicle fleet ratio is 2.4 officers to 1 vehicle, as previously mentioned there is no spare capacity within the existing fleet to absorb the additional needs of posts that will be required to police the additional activity resulting from development in the Eastern Ipswich Plan Area.

Vehicle costs have been capitalised on 5-year lifetime average costs for a low/medium size equipped vehicle (excluding fuel).

On the basis of an additional 8 officers in the territorial policing and protective services, it is calculated that there will be a requirement for an additional 3 vehicles.

Additional vehicles and bicycles	Cost per Vehicle	Total cost for planned growth
3 vehicles(incl.livery and emergency equipment)	£28,161	£84,483
Total cost		£84,483

The costs shown above are reflective of the costs as at the time the information was provided (April 2014). These are however subject to change and will be recalculated at the point of planning permission being submitted.