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Executive Summary

1. This document presents the Integrated Development Programme (IDP) for the Haven Gateway Sub-Region. It provides a single delivery plan for capital-led investment which will allow for appropriately phased development in the period to 2021 and, indicatively, beyond. It is drafted with a view to the medium-long term, and our strong belief is that its delivery must be sustained despite the current “credit crunch” and economic downturn. If this can be achieved, then the IDP will contribute materially to realising the aspirations and targets for the Haven Gateway, as set out in both the new Regional Economic Strategy and Regional Spatial Strategy.

Context for growth in the Haven Gateway

2. The Haven Gateway is identified in the East of England Plan as one of four areas in the region for which the “coherence and particular nature of the issues and responses justifies sub-area treatment”. As well as the Key Centres for Development and Change of Ipswich and Colchester, the sub-region is defined in relation to the internationally-significant Haven Ports (principally Felixstowe, Harwich and Ipswich), its market and coastal towns, and its high quality rural hinterland. The East of England Plan explains that the Haven Gateway “has substantial potential to develop further as a major focus for economic development and growth”.

[Map of Haven Gateway Sub Region]
3. Between 2001 and 2021, provision is made for the delivery of 65,100 net additional homes across the six local authority districts which are wholly or partially within the Haven Gateway. Policy H2 from the East of England Plan states that region-wide, 35% of homes coming forward through planning permissions granted after the publication of RSS (May 2008) should be affordable. Additionally, the sub-region has committed to making provision for delivering some 50,000 net additional jobs. By the end of the plan period of the East of England Plan (2021), it is anticipated that the resident population of the Haven Gateway sub-region (all districts) will have grown from 700,000 to 800,000 people – an increment of almost 15%.

4. It is partly because of its willingness to sign up to growth on this scale – and partly because of its substantial underlying economic potential – that the Haven Gateway is identified within the new Regional Economic Strategy as one of the East of England’s principal “Engines of Growth”.

5. Within this context, the Vision that local partners have developed for the Haven Gateway is to deliver

A high quality environment for its residents, workers and visitors by capitalising on its location as a key gateway, realising its potential for significant sustainable growth, addressing its needs for economic regeneration, creating an additional focus for growth of hi-tech, knowledge-based employment and protecting and enhancing its high quality, attractive and natural assets.

Progress to Date

6. During the early part of the current decade, the sub-region outperformed other sub-regions in terms of housing completions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luton (inc. Dunstable, Houghton Regis, Leighton Buzzard and Linslade)</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>-184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough (UA only)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>-188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend (inc. whole districts of Castle Point and Rochford)</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway (inc. whole districts of Colchester, Ipswich, Babergh, Mid Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal and Tendring)</td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>20,566</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>+74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Norwich (inc. whole districts of Broadland and South Norfolk) 37,500 1,875 9,304 1,551 2,014 -139

Total 169,000 8,450 45,000 7,501 8,857 -407

7. However over the last year – as the effects of the credit crunch have started to bite – progress in the Haven Gateway (as elsewhere) has slowed. With regard to the delivery of affordable housing units, the sub-region is well behind the indicative target.

8. In employment growth terms, the picture is complex. The target of 50,000 net additional jobs to be created by 2021 has always been recognised as challenging. Although the derivation of accurate and consistent jobs numbers is fraught, the evidence suggests that during the early years of the plan period (2001-2007), the Suffolk part of the Haven Gateway area was somewhat ahead of the target (established for monitoring purposes) whilst the Essex portion was behind.

9. Data with regard to jobs numbers, however, provide only one perspective on economic performance, particularly if this is understood within the wider context provided by the new Regional Economic Strategy. The message from other indicators – particularly those that provide some sense of future prospects – is less sanguine. Business start-up rates – both as a proportion of stock and per head of resident working age population – are lower in the Haven Gateway than across the East of England as a whole. Although there are variations within the Haven Gateway, the proportion of both knowledge intensive businesses and employees is below the regional average. Crucially, qualification levels amongst the resident working age population at level 4 (degree level) and above are also some way adrift. Addressing these economic challenges must be the priority going forward.

10. All of this presents some stark messages, particularly in the context of a macro-economic climate that is becoming increasingly difficult. For the UK as a whole, IMF (October 2008) anticipates a decline in GDP in 2009, with growth resuming in 2010. Sustaining growth in this context presents real challenges. However, our horizons are to 2021 and beyond, and it is in this longer term context that the IDP has been developed.

Realising the Vision

11. In order to realise our Vision – and to achieve the housing and employment growth targets set out in the East of England Plan over the period to 2021 and to contribute materially to realising the ambitions set out in the new RES – it will be necessary to harness the Haven Gateway’s assets in a consistent, ambitious and sustainable way. A number of important weaknesses and constraints must also be addressed.

12. As we have already seen, overall, the Haven Gateway is, at best, mid ranking in terms of the strength of its economy: per capita GVA is lower than elsewhere in the region, as are the
skills of its resident population, rates of entrepreneurship and composite measures of overall competitiveness. Rates of housing completion are currently quite weak, while affordable housing has been delivered at rates which are some way adrift from the regional average.

13. However the Haven Gateway has important assets that need to be used effectively and well: Adastral Park is home to one of the UK’s largest concentrations of research excellence; Ipswich and Colchester are medium-sized cities with a clear sense of purpose; and within the sub-region, there is growing provision of further and higher education (which is, finally, addressing a significant historic deficit). The Haven Gateway also benefits from outstanding global connectivity: the Haven Ports form one of the UK’s most important international gateways, connecting the East of England to the global economy, and the importance of rail links to London should not be underestimated. Additionally – with Dedham Vale and the Stour Estuary, and some world class cultural assets – the Haven Gateway provides a “quality of place” that is genuinely outstanding.

14. In the light of challenges and opportunities of this nature – and in seeking to effect the sustained transition to which the area has pledged – there will be a need for substantial investment in the Haven Gateway; the vast majority of this will derive from the private sector. However in seeking to deliver the ambitious Vision, the public sector also has a key role to play; it must address key market failures (including in relation to investor confidence), respond to key challenges with regard to social equity, and respond to (and mitigate) the possible environmental impacts of growth. It must also create the conditions in which – over the medium term – rapid population and economic growth can take place effectively, sustainably and well, while conserving the “quality of place” that defines the Haven Gateway sub-region.

Priorities for capital investment

15. By working together to prepare this Integrated Development Programme, partners within the Haven Gateway have identified – and will continue to identify – what we believe to be the critical investments that will be required to unlock, facilitate, generate and sustain growth which is consistent both with the delivery of the overall Vision and the attainment of targets which are acknowledged to be challenging.

16. Specifically, partners have identified a series of Investment Packages. By way of introduction, these are listed below (in no particular order):

**Thematic Packages**

- Transport
- Green infrastructure
- Tourism and culture
- Housing
- Skills.
Spatial Packages

- IP-One – with a spatial focus on central Ipswich
- IPA-East – a spatial focus on the eastern part of the Ipswich Policy Area, which includes Adastral Park (Innovation-Martlesham)
- North Colchester
- East Colchester
- Colchester Town Centre
- Haven Gateway Coastal Towns.

Long Term Investment Package

- Maximising our potential for further sustainable growth.

17. The first five Packages are Thematic. These are not locationally specific and their impacts should benefit the whole of the sub-region. All of the Thematic Packages require further work. Critically, the Haven Gateway Transport Board has agreed to progress the transport package, recognising that the core themes within the Package have strong resonance with the priorities identified in the Regional Economic Strategy and the arguments marshalled by the Eddington Study. The Green Infrastructure Package draws heavily on the Haven Gateway’s Green Infrastructure Strategy. The Culture and Tourism Package also has a draft strategy which draws together various strategic ambitions from across the Gateway. Both have dedicated working groups that will ensure a joined up and consistent focus is maintained going forward.

18. The next six packages are Spatial. They relate to coherent geographical areas with significant economic and housing growth potential. The development of all six Spatial Packages has been led by the relevant local planning authority(ies). Five of the six have been advanced as costed and prioritised delivery plans which are fully aligned with, and informed by, Local Development Frameworks in terms both of the scale of ambition and the timescale for its delivery. The sixth – Haven Gateway Coastal Towns – is robust in its ambition, but it requires further work due primarily to later completion of the relevant LDFs.

19. The final Package is longer term in nature and is intended to position the Haven Gateway to take forward future growth in the most sustainable way possible. It principally consists of studies at this stage and hence relates to developments that will take place primarily in the latter part of the planning period; hence as yet, some of the details remain sketchy.

---

1 The Eddington Transport Study: The case for action – Sir Rod Eddington’s advice to government, December 2006
How the packages will help to realise opportunities and address constraints to sustainable growth within the Haven Gateway

All of the Packages have been developed following the identification of – and in response to – clearly evidenced opportunities for and constraints to sustainable economic and/or housing growth. In summary terms, Table 2 below distils thirteen key challenges and opportunities that have been identified and evidenced in relation to the Haven Gateway’s growth ambitions, and the implications that follow; it then flags how the challenges and opportunities are being addressed/captured through priority interventions within the different Packages. In highly summarised form, Table 2 therefore provides a programme-level logic chain for the Haven Gateway IDP as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Oppportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. GVA growth across the whole of the Haven Gateway is projected to be lower than the regional average and there is a concern that – left to its own devices – economic growth will focus on low wage/low skill activities. | There is a clear need to nurture higher value-added activities with a strong knowledge component, building on the knowledge-based assets of Haven Gateway. | Four spatial packages have a strong focus on the scope and potential of the knowledge economy, and have identified priority interventions in response:  
- IP-One – with a focus on UCS  
- IPA-E – based around Adastral Park (InnovationMartlesham)  
- East Colchester – with strong links to the University of Essex and its proposed Research Park  
- Colchester Town Centre – with a focus on the creative industries.  
The Skills thematic package acknowledges the major new investments being made at Colchester Institute and Suffolk New College that seek to support the growth of local knowledge based businesses.  
The Long Term Package also includes proposals aimed at improving targeted economic development support to ensure the most advantageous take up of employment development opportunities being created through the spatial packages. |
| b. Skills levels across the Haven Gateway are relatively poor and in some areas, they are seriously weak. | A wide-ranging response is needed and a capital investment plan can only be part of the answer. Extending the provision of HE/FE is one key dimension. | Interventions concerned directly with the skills of local people are identified in several of the spatial packages:  
- IP-One – including the Phase II and III expansion of UCS, the Knowledge Innovation Hub and Suffolk New College  
- IPA –East and increased working between BT and the HE sector  
- East Colchester – Development of University of Essex.  
Additionally, a Thematic Package focusing on skills has been identified with key priorities in relation to increasing the proportion of the population with level 4 skills and above and reducing the proportion with no qualifications. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Opportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| c. Currently, the area performs poorly on metrics of enterprise / entrepreneurship. In this context, there may still be a shortfall in relation to the supply of premises for business start-ups. | The Haven Gateway needs actively to foster an environment of entrepreneurship. Provision for homeworking may be one part of this but there is also a need for more business incubator facilities. | Investments aimed at encouraging higher rates of business start-up and survival are embedded in several of the spatial packages:  
- IPA-E – including the development of InnovationMartlesham (Suffolk Innovation Park)  
- IP-One – where new mixed use developments offer the opportunity for significant numbers of units for smaller businesses  
- East Colchester – including plans for a Research Park linked to the University of Essex and mixed use development in the wider area  
- Colchester Town Centre – including emerging plans for the provision of business space linked to the creative and cultural sector  
- North Colchester – with plans for new business space at Cuckoo Farm and business incubator units at Colchester Business Park. |
| d. Particularly in and around Colchester, employment land – although plentiful in supply – is of a poor quality and it is not conducive to added value economic growth. | There is a need to identify and safeguard high quality sites, while recognising the growing importance of provision outside of the B Use Classes. | Several of the Spatial Investment Packages respond to this imperative including, most directly:  
- IPA-East – with the potential for strategic employment provision  
- North Colchester – with significant employment provision in a strategic location  
- Haven Gateway Coastal Towns Package includes provision for employment generation in the towns. Additionally, the longer term package looks at the master planning of key sites, an employment land study in Suffolk, economic development support to ensure the sub-region capitalises on its opportunities for employment growth and achieving the release of major employment development sites at Sproughton and Brantham. |
| e. Within the Haven Gateway, there are some strong knowledge-based assets which need to be harnessed effectively, especially in the creative industries, in ICT, and in environmental technologies. | In order to achieve sustainable economic growth as part of the wider growth agenda, it will be imperative to provide the physical infrastructure consistent with the needs of priority sectors and clusters. | Several of the Spatial Packages have a strong sectoral focus. For example:  
- IPA-East – is built around the needs of the ICT cluster  
- East Colchester – is premised around knowledge-based activity, including that relating to ICT  
- Colchester Town Centre and IP-One – both have a focus around the creative and cultural sector. Once again economic development support as proposed in the Long Term Package may be needed to harness these opportunities. |
| f. The urban functions (retail, services, etc.) of the larger urban areas are relatively weak and – at least in Ipswich and Clacton-on-Sea – this links to the built form/urban realm. Issues relating to the economic vibrancy of town centres need to be addressed. | There is a need to recognise the importance of vibrant town centres in the context of sustainable growth and from the perspective of provision for both housing and jobs growth targets. | The importance of achieving town centre renaissance (including interventions linked to the public realm) is at the heart of a number of the Spatial Investment Packages including, especially:  
- Colchester Town Centre and IP-One – the Packages relating to the town centres of Colchester and Ipswich respectively  
- at a smaller scale, similar imperatives are defined in relation to the Haven Gateway Coastal Towns Package and the Longer Term Package that encompasses market towns such as Sudbury and Stowmarket. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Opportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. Several coastal towns are in need of regeneration: there are pockets of severe deprivation in these communities, including in relation to labour market participation.</td>
<td>A particular response is needed in relation to these settlements, recognising that coastal towns face a number of shared regeneration issues although some are also set for growth.</td>
<td>Within the IDP, there is a Spatial Package focusing on Coastal towns – an emerging package which is addressing the need for renaissance and revival in the sub-region’s smaller urban centres and rural areas. In part this is being addressed through the Partnership’s Economic Participation Interventions. These interventions will be underpinned by planned action within the Tourism and Culture Package that includes measures to address obstacles to the growth of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Although the development process is a long one, the prospect of significant port expansion at Felixstowe and Harwich needs to be recognised, and potential economic opportunities need to be identified in response.</td>
<td>The full potential of ports development – and the risks linked to it – needs to be factored into long term thinking about investment priorities.</td>
<td>Within the IDP, there is a need to further develop the growth potential linked to port development at Felixstowe and Harwich. The DryPorts initiative (Long Term Package) led by the Haven Gateway is already starting to identify the issues involved (e.g. the Felixstowe Port Logistics Study) demonstrating that there is not enough land available) and this will enable appropriate action to be orchestrated and deliverred. The Gateway function of the Ports is also recognised in terms of tourism and alongside the regeneration of the coastal towns, these Packages will need to be developed over the months ahead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| i. The sub-region’s housing growth target remains a challenging one: although delivery was better in 2007, the whole sub-region is now facing the impact of the credit crunch. | It may be necessary to intervene to ensure that key sites are released onto the market at the required times to ensure the required flow of new homes. | Within the IDP, several Packages include interventions linked to bringing forward significant sites for housing development. For example:  
- IP-One – where a large number of smaller housing sites can all be released by major flood defence works  
- IPA-E – includes a major housing site that the completion of master planning work together with transport and utility investment will help to release  
- North Colchester – where the early delivery of the A12 junction will be crucial to unlock several major housing sites. |
| j. The provision of new affordable housing in the Haven Gateway since 2001 has been less than a third of that sought by the RSS for the period 2008-2021 so the delivery challenge is acute, particularly if the backlog of provision is to be addressed. | It is important that progress is made in the delivery of housing per se. Additionally, mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing need to be used more effectively, consistently and well. | Across all the Packages which include a significant element of housing delivery (i.e. all six Spatial Packages), there is a commitment to deliver a high proportion of affordable housing, but whilst not surprising in the early years of delivery, affordability is very much behind trajectory. Partly because of this, a Thematic Package focused on Housing has been identified which aims to develop measures to assist the delivery of the target of up to 1,100 affordable units annually. |
| k. The provision of new physical infrastructure is currently failing to keep pace with the growth in housing and population. This is probably most acute in the case of transport investment, both at a sub-regional level (A14, A120, F2N) and at the local, inter-urban, level. | Additional investment is essential and the timing of it needs to be phased appropriately. In parallel, there is an imperative to effect a modal shift – away from car use towards public transport, walking and cycling. | The IDP makes a reasoned case for targeted infrastructure investment, both within the Spatial Investment Packages and in a separate thematic package focusing on Transport interventions. The key interventions here are:  
- Felixstowe to Nuneaton railway line gauge improvements and upgrades to the A120, A12 and A14 Trunk Roads, to ensure efficient strategic road and rail networks in the sub region by maximising the movement of freight by rail and tackling capacity and congestion at key locations including the Ports.  
- Transport packages for Urban Colchester and Ipswich (Ipswich fit for the 21st Century) to ensure that places facing high levels of growth function better in transport terms. |

---

2 Felixstowe Port Logistics Study, Final Report, Royal Haskoning October 2008
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Oppportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l. Utility provision (energy and water resources) will become increasingly stretched and, at the same time, the risk of coastal flooding will threaten parts of the area, including some of our towns.</td>
<td>The infrastructure implications linked to these utilities and flood risk need to be addressed in planning for sustainable growth.</td>
<td>Utilities provision (including for example electricity supply within IPA-East and the Water Cycle and Renewables Study currently being addressed through the Long Term Package) are critical constraints to growth and the results and implications of the studies proposed will inform future iterations of the IDP. Within the IDP, several Packages include interventions linked to addressing flood risk e.g. IP-One, Coastal Towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. The need to safeguard and create green lungs and corridors (both within towns and between them) will also become more important as the area continues to grow.</td>
<td>As above, Green Infrastructure needs to be designed into the Haven Gateway’s future growth.</td>
<td>Included within the IDP is a Thematic Package with a focus on Green Infrastructure. This includes a range of projects, the most significant of which are those that will provide access to areas of Natural Green Space within high growth urban areas (e.g. Ipswich “River for All” and Belstead Brook Park), as well as the strategic provision of such space around and between urban areas e.g. Suffolk Sandlings (3,500 ha) and South Colchester Green Wheel and North and East Ipswich Green Arc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Within each of the Packages, partners have identified priority interventions; some require public sector investment, and some do not. These interventions are variable in character – from electricity supply, to public realm improvements, to the provision of business incubator space, and to transport investments. However they all have a clear and evidenced relationship to the delivery of the overall ambition for growth. Moreover they all have a specified – and usually catalytic – role in relation to the progress of the Package of which they are a part. It is on this basis that they are in the process of being scored in line with the methodology set out in the IDP Toolkit and that a level of initial prioritisation has already been undertaken by local partners.

**Funding and outputs**

22. Delivering the Packages outlined above will require substantial investment. A full funding profile will be developed in due course. Funding will be sought from a variety of sources and much of the proposed development will be privately funded. Indicatively, the call on funding from EEDA and CLG sources over the next three years is £103.88 million.

23. It should be noted that this public sector investment amounts to around 15% of estimated total project costs but that funding from other sources – including local authorities, Environment Agency, Highways Agency, etc. – will also be required. Indeed, substantial government funding for major strategic transport projects of over £2 billion over the next 20 years will be vital to the success and growth of the Sub-Region and this is investment upon which the achievement of the growth targets in this IDP is predicated.
Table 3: Delivering the Haven Gateway IDP: Short term call on funding from EEDA/CLG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Packages</th>
<th>Funding sought from EEDA/CLG, 2008/09-2010/11 (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Packages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP-One</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA-East</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester North</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester East</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Town Centre</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Towns</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Long Term Package                 | 6.7                                               |
| Total                             | 103.88                                            |

From the Spatial Packages, it is possible to estimate some of the outputs that are likely to be achieved, focusing especially on housing and jobs. From Table 4, it is apparent that interventions linked to the six Spatial Packages within the Haven Gateway IDP will deliver around a third of the area’s overall targets in relation to both jobs and dwellings. Hence advancing the Packages is important in terms of the overall contribution of the Haven Gateway to the regional outcomes set out in RSS. With a focus on high value economic growth, and a commitment to engaging more of the Haven Gateway’s population in high value economic activity, both the Spatial and Thematic Packages will also contribute materially to realising the high level regional ambitions set out in the new RES.

Table 4: Estimated contribution of the IDP Spatial Packages to key targets from RSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package</th>
<th>Estimated new dwellings</th>
<th>New jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP-One</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA - Ipswich East</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Colchester</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Colchester</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Town Centre</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Towns</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Package</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the IDP forward

Within the Haven Gateway, partners believe that the Packages that have been identified are the right ones in terms of managing – and prioritising – the investments required to deliver substantial growth sustainably and well over the period to 2021/31. Notwithstanding the credit crunch and economic downturn, progress now needs to be made with regard to their implementation.
26. The preparation of the IDP has already helped inform our thinking in terms of our Programme of Development submission to Government for Growth Point Funding (where the Partnership identified the need for £58m of public sector investment (2008-11) and to date has secured £17.457m). Clearly the extent of the programme that the Haven Gateway Partnership can deliver will be directly related to the scale of the funding available over the next two years and beyond. Work will continue on prioritisation and programme planning to ensure that resources that are awarded are used to best effect.

27. However the IDP process has been an ambitious one – in concept, scope and timescale. For the first time, it has brought together the disciplines and timescales linked to spatial planning and those associated with key funding cycles. Hence the exercise itself has been quite challenging particularly in the context of the LDFs being at different stages of development (and therefore varying levels of certainty). Several of the Packages need further work and elaboration, particularly with regard to interventions focused in later stages of the planning period. In some cases, detailed work has not been possible over recent months owing to the timing of LDF processes. In others, detailed technical work remains to be done within an agreed policy framework. However across the Gateway, there is a commitment to advancing the actions set out in this document and using the IDP de facto as a ‘live’ project management tool.

28. Partners within the Haven Gateway are committed to taking the IDP process further in subsequent iterations. This will mean, inter alia, a broadening of its scope (by involving a wider range of delivery bodies) and striving to ensure that a wider range of stakeholders are aware of its role, purpose and importance. Similarly, the RSS review is an opportunity to coordinate better policy and investment planning at a sub-regional level and look with greater certainty beyond 2021.

29. While the interventions identified in this IDP for Haven Gateway are not all fully developed, partners are convinced that those which have been specified in detail are the right ones. Given the scale of both opportunity and challenge that the Haven Gateway represents, it is partners’ belief that – given its rigour – the IDP ought to be of serious interest to a wide range of funding bodies and, equally, it ought to influence in a material way, the contents of the East of England’s submission to government in response to the Regional Funding Allocations (due to be finalised early in 2009), future Growth Point Funding, the Community Infrastructure Fund, the Regional Infrastructure Fund, and mainstream funding and priorities from Government sponsored agencies.
1: Introduction

1.1 This document sets out the Haven Gateway’s Integrated Development Programme (IDP).

1.2 In the context of ambitious targets for both economic/employment and housing growth – to which partners across the Haven Gateway are fully committed – the IDP aims to provide an over-arching delivery plan for capital-led investment which will allow for appropriately phased development in the period to 2021 and, indicatively, beyond. The ambitions for Haven Gateway are nested within those defined regionally and set out in the newly-published Regional Economic Strategy and the East of England Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy).

1.3 The IDP pinpoints key investment priorities which have been identified following an analysis of key opportunities and constraints, and, in outline, the market failures that justify intervention linked to both. In early iterations, the focus has been on some of the economic challenges, although clear reference is also made to physical and infrastructural issues and constraints. Hence the Investment Packages that are identified – and within them, the projects that are proposed as priorities for funding – are not unstructured “wish-lists”; instead, they are well evidenced investment priorities that should contribute in an unambiguous manner to enhancing the area’s economic performance, accommodating growth in its physical manifestations and, through both processes, providing a basis for prosperous, inclusive and sustainable communities in line with the targets and ambitions set out in the RES and RSS.

1.4 The credit crunch and severe economic downturn – which really started to bite in the latter part of 2008 – do not change the fundamental ambitions for Haven Gateway over the long term. However they do cast the identified investment priorities in a new light. Although the IDP is focused on the long term delivery of ambitions linked to two strategies which were only finalised in 2008, the downturn changes some of the short term imperatives and it also presents some opportunities which need to be seized. Specifically, given that housing growth is now likely to slow over the short to medium term, there may an opportunity to deliver some of the key infrastructure which will help to facilitate development when confidence in the housing market returns. But it should also be recognised that many key infrastructure projects which were due to be delivered by the private sector will now not move forward unless public sector assistance is provided as a fall in land values has significantly affected project viability and delivery from subsequent s106 agreements. Hence the imperative for short term action – in line with the long term ambitions of the IDP – has grown in the context of far more challenging economic conditions. The IDP provides an evidenced basis from which a variety of public sector funders should be able to respond.

1.5 The IDP that follows is divided into two main sections, each of which is subdivided into a number of chapters. The first section (Part A, chapters 1-6) presents the evidence – the scale of the challenge, the constraints/opportunities linked to its delivery, and – in outline – the critical interventions that have been identified in response. The second section (Parts B-E, chapters 7-end) provides more detailed information about each of the packages within the IDP.

1.6 The IDP has been developed by partners in the Haven Gateway over a period of a year. The intention is that it will continue to evolve as a “live document”.

PART A

EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS
2: Context, vision and growth trajectories

Background to the Area

2.1 The sub-region is one of the key International Gateways to the UK and therefore its growth and infrastructure of are of national significance to the well-being of the UK economy. As well as the regional cities of Ipswich and Colchester, the sub-region is defined in relation to the internationally-significant Haven Ports (principally Felixstowe, Harwich and Ipswich), its market and coastal towns and its high quality rural hinterland. Substantial economic and housing growth is planned over the next two decades.

2.2 In 2001, the population of the six districts that are wholly or partially within the Haven Gateway was close to 700,000. By 2006, this figure had increased to nearly 740,000, suggesting an annual growth rate across the Gateway of 1.1%. The comparative figure for the East of England was 0.8%. Hence in terms of its resident population, the Haven Gateway is
growing quickly. Within this overall picture, there are some variations: Colchester appears to be growing fastest (1.8% pa) and Ipswich most slowly (0.5% pa) (see Table 2-1). The relatively low Ipswich rate may reflect the fact that, alongside falling household size, much of the new housing development coming forward in the Ipswich area lies outside the current administrative boundary of the Borough.

Table 2-1: Population estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Annual growth rate 2001-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Region</td>
<td>5,400,500</td>
<td>5,606,600</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>83,500</td>
<td>86,700</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>170,800</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>120,400</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>115,200</td>
<td>122,200</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>138,800</td>
<td>144,600</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway districts</td>
<td>697,700</td>
<td>736,700</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mid Year Population Estimates

2.3 Over the period 2001-2007, the housing stock of the six districts increased by 20,580 to 327,600, growth of 6.7% or 1.1% per annum. Equivalent percentage increases for the East of England were 5.6% and 0.9% respectively. Hence in total the Haven Gateway districts grew slightly more quickly than the region as a whole. Again there were variations across the sub-region (see Table 2-2).

Table 2-2: Housing stock: local authority areas: 2001 and 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Region total</td>
<td>2,331,000</td>
<td>2,461,540</td>
<td>130,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>37,620</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>64,560</td>
<td>70,450</td>
<td>5,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>51,830</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>36,970</td>
<td>39,660</td>
<td>2,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>52,670</td>
<td>56,610</td>
<td>3,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>64,900</td>
<td>67,560</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Districts total</td>
<td>306,930</td>
<td>327,600</td>
<td>20,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Regional Annual Monitoring Report 2007, EERA

2.4 In order to understand more precisely the particular opportunities for and constraints to growth, it is necessary to unpack the district-level information and understand the “real places” which are driving the data. Based on ONS’ “bricks and mortar” definition of place and using data from the 2001 Census, six settlements in the Haven Gateway together account for over 50% of the resident population. Those same six settlements provided 50.9% and 51.5% of the total housing stock in 2001 and 2007 respectively, and over that same period,
the proportion of the total stock located at Colchester and Ipswich increased. The opportunities for and constraints to growth need to be understood in the context of this settlement geography (Tables 2-3 and 2-4).

Table 2-3: Population of Urban Areas within the Haven Gateway 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Area</th>
<th>Usual Resident Population</th>
<th>% of Haven Gateway population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Urban Area</td>
<td>141,658</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>104,390</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clacton-on-Sea</td>
<td>54,048</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe</td>
<td>29,349</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>20,130</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Key Statistics for Urban Areas in England and Wales (ONS) – Table KS01

Table 2-4: Housing stock of Urban Areas within the Haven Gateway 2001 and 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Area</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>% of HG stock 2001 and 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Policy Area</td>
<td>67,810</td>
<td>73,680</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>39,350</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clacton-on-Sea</td>
<td>26,690</td>
<td>27,690</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe and Trimleys</td>
<td>13,440</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich and Dovercourt</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>9,510</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway 6 Districts total</td>
<td>306,930</td>
<td>327,600</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: District Council Mid Year Housing Stock Estimates

2.5 Finally – in terms of the Haven Gateway’s economic geography – it is instructive to consider economic flows between places, proxied through travel to work patterns. Table 2-5 provides an indication of flows of workers to and from the three largest urban areas within the Haven Gateway. It also provides data for the London Boroughs.

Table 2-5: Flows of workers between the larger urban areas in the Haven Gateway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>ONS-defined Urban Area</th>
<th>Clacton-on-Sea / Little Clacton</th>
<th>Colchester</th>
<th>Ipswich Urban Area</th>
<th>London Boroughs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clacton-on-Sea / Little Clacton</td>
<td>12,764</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>34,593</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>3,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipswich Urban Area</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>50,915</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Boroughs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3,129,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL AREAS</td>
<td>17,471</td>
<td>58,668</td>
<td>77,872</td>
<td>3,885,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 Census
These data suggest that:

- the Ipswich Urban Area constitutes the largest urban economy within the Haven Gateway (based on the metric of the number of people identifying their principal place of work within it): there are almost 20,000 more jobs in Ipswich Urban Area than in Colchester

- among the three Haven Gateway towns, the flow of workers is greatest (in absolute terms) from Clacton-on-Sea/Little Clacton to Colchester

- the degree of labour market overlap between Colchester and Ipswich Urban Area appears to be really quite modest: for example, of the 78,000 people with workplaces in Ipswich Urban Area, just over 1,000 had homes in Colchester

- both Colchester and Ipswich Urban Area provide more workers for the London economy than they do for each other

- relatively, London commuting is a much stronger feature of Colchester and Clacton-on-Sea/Little Clacton than it is of Ipswich Urban Area.

What we can conclude, then, is that (i) Ipswich is the largest urban economy and housing market within the Haven Gateway; that (ii) Colchester and Ipswich are, in functional economic terms, quite separate from each other; but that (iii) increasingly, links with London are a feature of economic flows within and across the Haven Gateway that merits some consideration.

Other aspects of the Haven Gateway’s character

The Haven Gateway sub-region has a significant coastline and this determines much of its character. Nationally, there has been renewed interest in the economic problems of the country’s coastal towns. The House of Commons’ Communities and Local Government Committee published a report on coastal towns in March 2007 which stated that “Government has neglected the needs of coastal towns for too long. A greater understanding and appreciation is needed of the challenges faced in coastal towns.” Evidence presented to the Committee suggested that there were big variations in economic and social conditions across coastal areas, but that many faced a range of shared issues including peripheral locations which are exacerbated by weak transport links; the impact on the economy of changing tourism trends; high levels of seasonal employment; a relatively large number of old and young people; a large number of private rented houses, and houses in poor condition, both associated with the legacy of traditional seaside tourism and guesthouses; a relatively high proportion of low income households; and relatively low levels of educational attainment, lower life expectancy and higher rates of homelessness acceptances.

These findings were largely been reinforced by the publication of a report commissioned by EEDA. This identified the Haven Gateway as one of four “coastal zones” in the East of England. The report argued that a significant increase in economic performance would be

---

2 House of Commons Committee for Communities and Local Government, Report on Coastal Towns, 6 March 2007
3 Coastal Initiative Socio-Economic Research, Final report August 2008, Globe Regeneration Consultants
needed if the four coastal zones were to achieve parity with the rest of the region. However it also recognised the significant environmental challenges that many coastal areas face and in the Haven Gateway, the issues relating to flood risk were specifically identified. The report stressed the importance of Shoreline Management Plans and – consistent with Defra’s draft Marine Bill – argued for Integrated Coastal Zone Management approaches, based on close working at a local level between the Environment Agency and local authorities.

**Environmental assets**

2.10 The sub-region has environmental assets of national importance, including two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Dedham Vale and Suffolk Coasts and Heaths); ecologically rich estuaries and countryside; and rural settlements which are rich and varied in character. Conservation and enhancement of these assets must go hand in hand with growth and development.

**Vision for the Haven Gateway**

2.11 The Vision for the Haven Gateway – set out by the Haven Gateway Partnership – is:

“To deliver a high quality environment for its residents, workers and visitors by capitalising on its location as a key gateway, realising its potential for significant sustainable growth, addressing its needs for economic regeneration, creating an additional focus for growth of hi-tech, knowledge-based employment and protecting and enhancing its high quality, attractive and natural assets”.

2.12 The Haven Gateway Partnership was established in 2001 and comprises leading private sector companies – including BT, Hutchison and ABP Ports, together with district and County Council representation from Colchester, Tendring, Babergh, Suffolk Coastal, Ipswich and Suffolk and Essex.

2.13 The Partnership has already identified its priorities and ambitions for the sub-region including:

- delivery of the 49,700 jobs and 50,840 new homes required by the East of England Plan by 2021
- new container terminal facilities at Harwich and Felixstowe
- an international visual arts centre – First Site – at Colchester and dance centre Dance East - at Ipswich
- the redevelopment of the Ipswich waterfront including the provision of a new University Campus for Suffolk
- maintenance of the Gateway’s high environmental values and quality of life through a Green Infrastructure Strategy
- the regeneration of Jaywick, Harwich, Clacton, Felixstowe and other coastal towns
- maximising the role of the sub-region as an International Gateway to the UK
• projects to enhance the sub-region’s role as an area of creativity and innovation.

2.14 The partnership provides a framework through which partners can work together to promote economic opportunities and secure the future prosperity of this major gateway to the UK. The Partnership’s appointment of a Chief Executive in September 2007 signalled a step-change in ambition of the Partnership to deliver its ambitions.

Growth Trajectories

Policy backdrop and targets for economic/employment and housing growth


2.16 Subsequently, a revised version of the East of England Plan (encompassing “Further Proposed Changes” from the Secretary of State) was prepared before the final revision was published by government in May 2008. This identified the Haven Gateway as one of four “Sub-Areas” within the East of England and it recognises that within the Haven Gateway there are two of the region’s 21 Key Centres for Development and Change (Colchester and Ipswich). Key policies relating to economic and housing growth from the East of England Plan are presented below.

| Table 2-6: Key Policies relating to the Haven Gateway from the East of England Plan |
|---|---|
| **Policy HG1: Strategy for the Sub-Region** | The sub-regional strategy aims to achieve transformational development and change throughout Haven Gateway which will:

  * develop the diverse economy of the sub-region, including provision for the needs of an expanding tourism sector in both urban and rural areas, support for the establishment and expansion of ICT clusters and recognition of the potential and need for employment growth in the smaller towns
  * support existing and proposed academic, scientific and research institutions
  * regenerate the sub-region to address unemployment, deprivation and social issues
  * provide for major housing growth at the Key Centres of Colchester and Ipswich, with the aim of securing throughout the sub-region the earliest possible move to the rates of delivery required to achieve the provision in policy H1 by 2021; and
  * provide for 20,000 net additional dwellings in the Ipswich Policy Area, including at least 15,400 within Ipswich, and around 4,600 on the fringes of Ipswich in Babergh, Mid Suffolk and Suffolk Coastal, the precise distribution determined through a partnership approach involving joint or coordinated LDDs. |

\(^4\) This figure relates to the ward-based definition of Haven Gateway (Policy HG3). The figure included in the final East of England Plan for the six districts that are wholly or partially within Haven Gateway was 65,100 (Policy H1)
Policy HG2: Employment-generating development

LDDs will provide an enabling context for not less than 50,000 additional jobs in Haven Gateway distributed as in Policy E1 ‘Job Growth 2001-2021’.

The local authorities, supported by regional and local partners, will seek to facilitate this increases in jobs by promoting a competitive sub-regional business environment through:

- supporting the maintenance and appropriate expansion of the ports, maritime and related activities, recognising the role they play in making the sub-region a major economic growth point and recently approved proposals for new container handling capacity at Bathside Bay and Felixstowe South
- promoting the urban areas of Colchester and Ipswich as major centres of employment
- providing appropriate sites, premises and infrastructure to attract a diverse range of employment to the strategic employment locations of Ipswich, Colchester, Harwich, Felixstowe and Clacton
- regeneration initiatives in East Colchester and St Botolph’s, Ipswich Waterfront and Village, Felixstowe (including measures to address its falling status as a resort), Harwich and smaller scale projects elsewhere, with a focus on employment diversification and other social aims as well as physical renewal.

Policy HG3: Transport infrastructure

Key priorities for transport in the sub-region should focus on the urban centres of Colchester and Ipswich and on the strategic infrastructure and services to and from the Haven Ports.

Source: East of England Plan

Economic/employment growth

2.17 In its comments on the Haven Gateway following the Examination in Public of the draft revision to RSS, the Panel described the job growth target as “challenging”. However it concluded that:

> Given the potential arising from port development and the buoyancy of the two main urban areas of Ipswich and Colchester, we share the view of EEDA and others that the figures are achievable, but will depend on delivery of the necessary interventions, including key infrastructure (EiP Panel Report, page 41).

2.18 Policy E1 in the final East of England Plan sets an indicative target of 50,000 net additional jobs to be provided in the whole of the five districts represented in Haven Gateway (Mid Suffolk is excluded) during the Plan period. Of these, 20,000 are to be provided in Colchester and Tendring in Essex, while the remainder are proposed for Ipswich Borough and Babergh and Suffolk Coastal districts in Suffolk). The draft version of the Plan published in December 2004 provided a district-level breakdown, the detail of which is included in Table 2-7 (see below). A map of Strategic Employment Sites is provided at Figure 2-2.
Housing growth

2.19 The final version of the East of England Plan includes the targets set out in Table 2-7 below. At a “whole district” level, the total figure for net additional dwellings is 65,100 over the period 2001-2021, somewhat higher than the corresponding figure included in the 2004 draft.

Table 2-7: Housing Growth in the Haven Gateway 2001-2021 and beyond – net additional dwellings (average annual rates in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>1,340 (270)</td>
<td>4,260 (280)</td>
<td>(280)</td>
<td>600 in IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>4,630 (930)</td>
<td>12,470 (830)</td>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>17,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>2,880 (580)</td>
<td>12,520 (830)</td>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>15,400 in IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>1,900 (380)</td>
<td>6,400 (430)</td>
<td>(430)</td>
<td>800 in IPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Districts and Housing Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>(280)</td>
<td>600 in IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>(510)</td>
<td>3,200 in IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>(430)</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>49,680</td>
<td>(3,310)</td>
<td>(3,310)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft Plan included all of Ipswich Borough and parts of three adjoining Suffolk Districts in the Haven Gateway Sub Region. The EiP Panel concluded that the sub region should generally comprise whole Districts, and gave no guidance on the scale of housing provision below District level, other than for the Ipswich Policy Area (IPA). The Government has endorsed that view in its proposed changes.

The Government also proposed the extrapolation of the 2006-2021 building rate beyond 2021 in the proposed changes.

2.20 The Plan no longer specifies a precise level or distribution of growth for the whole of the Suffolk part of the Haven Gateway Sub-Region, although it does give such guidance for the greater Ipswich area (referred to as the Ipswich Policy Area in the EEP). It will be for District Councils in Suffolk to determine the way in which the remaining provision within their Districts should be made, and the role of the Haven Gateway in delivering that provision, in the preparation of their Local Development Frameworks. However the intention of the East of England Plan is that development should continue to be concentrated at the larger towns of Ipswich, Colchester, Felixstowe, Harwich and Clacton. The principal locations for major housing growth are shown in Figure 2-3 below.

**Figure 2-3: Strategic Housing Growth in the Haven Gateway**

Source: Haven Gateway Programme of Development – A Framework for Growth, October 2007
The scale of the challenge

Jobs growth

2.21 Throughout the EiP in 2005/06, the consensus was that the Haven Gateway’s jobs growth target was “challenging” and in the context of the current credit crunch and economic downturn, the scale of the challenge has increased. As the backdrop to the IDP, it is important to “dimension” this statement, and to consider how it relates to the area’s economic ambitions more generally.

2.22 Published alongside the consultation draft of the RES in August 2007 – before the credit crunch and economic downturn started to bite – was some joint modelling work which had been commissioned by EEDA and completed by Oxford Economics/Arup\(^5\). This included a set of “Unrestricted Baseline Forecasts” which were assumed to be “policy neutral”. Table 2-8 below is an extract from the Oxford Economics/Arup base projection for employment. It relates to districts within the Haven Gateway. Also included within the Table are district-level jobs growth targets that were set out in the earlier draft version of RSS (Dec 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>+2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>+3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>290.3</td>
<td>302.4</td>
<td>330.7</td>
<td>350.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oxford Economics/Arup – Annex B (unrestricted baseline forecasts); Draft Revision to the East of England Plan, Dec 2004

* Data for 2001 were not published as part of the Oxford Economics/Arup report. Figures for 2001 have been generated crudely – by calculating the average annual growth rate in employment over the period 1991-2006 and then applying it to derive a figure for 2001

2.23 The data within Table 2-8 need to be treated with a good deal of caution, not least because – from the various RSS documents and iterations – it is unclear whether the jobs growth figure relates to the totality of Suffolk Coastal and Babergh, or just those parts which are within “Haven Gateway” on the narrower spatial definition. Nevertheless, taking the data at face value, we can make the following observations:

- if the drivers of past employment growth can, reasonably, be extrapolated forward, then there does not appear to be a major jobs growth “problem” in the Essex portion of Haven Gateway: across Colchester and Tendring, the projected increment is 23,500 as compared to a target from the Proposed Changes to RSS of 20,000\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) East of England: Joint Modelling for the RES and RSS Oxford Economics and Arups for EEDA, August 2007

\(^6\) Note that the later iterations of RSS do not include a district-level breakdown of jobs growth targets. Instead targets are presented at a more aggregate level which distinguishes only between the Suffolk and Essex elements of the Haven Gateway
in the northern part of Haven Gateway (Suffolk Coastal, Ipswich, Babergh), projected jobs growth (on the policy neutral projection) is 16,800 over the period 2001-21. This compares to a target from RSS of 30,000. The gap – compared to the “projected achieved” figure for 2021 – is in the order of 10%.

2.24 Additionally, it is worth noting the degree of consistency between the findings from the Oxford Economics/Arup modelling work and that completed in 2005 as part of the Haven Gateway Employment Land Study. The second study compared three different sets of employment projections relating to the period 2001-2021. Looking across the three, the study worked towards a “consensus view” that across the Haven Gateway (excluding Mid Suffolk), 37,400 net additional jobs were likely to be created. Given the errors and uncertainties linked to all projections, this is certainly in the same ball-park as that deriving from Oxford Economics/Arup and reported in Table 2-8. However, at district level, there are some differences, and these are noteworthy:

- the Oxford Economics/Arup projections are much more bullish with regard to the prospects of that part of Haven Gateway that is within Essex, particularly Colchester Borough
- whereas the “consensus view” reported by DTZ in 2005 was that employment in Ipswich would grow by 10,600 jobs over the period, the more recent data produced by Oxford Economics/Arup are much more cautious, suggesting an increment of 4,800 jobs. Given that the district-level target for employment growth in Ipswich (from draft RSS) was 18,000 net additional jobs, the extent of the challenge is clear. The figures for Suffolk Coastal have also been revised downwards, although less dramatically so.

GVA growth

2.25 The Oxford Economics/Arup study also included a base projection relating to GVA. Additionally, by dividing the GVA projections by those prepared for total employment, it is possible to derive an estimate of GVA per job – the best indicator we have relating to productivity performance. Data for 2001 and 2021, and the derived annual growth rates for both GVA and GVA per job, are presented in Table 2-9 below.

Table 2-9: “Unrestricted Baseline Forecasts” for GVA (£million) and GVA per job (£’000) in the Haven Gateway and the East of England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>3518</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>2648</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>2979</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway</td>
<td>6086</td>
<td>13007</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>60462</td>
<td>143901</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oxford Economics/Arup – Annex B (unrestricted baseline forecasts)

7 Employment Land Study – Final Report to the Haven Gateway Partnership, DTZ Pieda, December 2005
Table 2-9 needs to be treated with as much caution as Table 2-8. However, taking its contents at face value would suggest that:

- Overall, the economy of the Haven Gateway area is projected to grow noticeably more slowly than the East of England as a whole in the period 2001-2021. This is true of every district within Haven Gateway with the exception of Tendring.

- In 2001, GVA per job across the Haven Gateway was 80% of the average for the East of England. Only Suffolk Coastal had GVA per job figures that were higher than the regional average (presumably, in part, because of Adastral Park). In Ipswich (the weakest district on this measure), GVA per job was 72% of the regional average.

- By 2021, GVA per job is projected to decline across the Haven Gateway to 72% of the regional average. For both Babergh and Ipswich, the corresponding figure is about 62%. Suffolk Coastal – which at the start of the period had GVA per job above the regional average – is projected to decline to less than 90% of the mean across the East of England by 2021.

**Housing growth and housing trajectory**

Figure 2-4 below is a composite housing trajectory for the whole of the six Haven Gateway districts for the period 2001-21. It shows projected completions and compares these to the annualised allocation from the East of England Plan (i.e. 3,255 net additional dwellings per annum). It shows that during the early years, completions are projected to exceed the target. It also suggests they are likely to fall behind on an annual basis in later years, but that, taking the period as a whole, the EEP requirements will be met (the orange “manage” line on Figure 2-4, which takes into account both past and future completions).
Two notes of caution should be registered here:

- Firstly, at the time of preparing the composite trajectory in Figure 2-4, a number of Districts have still not reached the position of agreeing a site-specific trajectory covering the whole of the EEP period. Pending completion of that work as part of LDF preparation, it is assumed that sites will be allocated and will come forward at a rate which will deliver either the EEP rate or the necessary residual rate for the remainder of the period up to 2021.

- Secondly, the sub-region was one of only two sub-regions in the East of England – the other being Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft which is not of the same scale – which is ahead of its trajectory. However, only Colchester of the six Districts delivered an annual rate of housing growth during the period 2001-2006 in excess of the EEP requirement for the whole plan period. Mid Suffolk and, more significantly, Ipswich fell well short of those rates. However, there has been significant delivery increase in the years 06/07 and 07/08 particularly in Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal – which has meant that the levels of completions in the sub-region are significantly higher than Cambridge and close to even the London commuter belt. There must however be considerable uncertainty as to whether accelerated rates can continue to be achieved, particularly bearing in mind the downturn in the housing market beginning in the latter part of 2007 and the current credit crunch.

In any event, with the exception of Babergh and Mid Suffolk, the expectation is that additional land is likely to be required in all districts over and above the capacity of already identified sites to deliver the scale of housing growth required by the East of England Plan. Moreover, the forthcoming review of the EEP will be looking to provide for higher rates of housing growth over the extended period up to 2031.

Twelve sites with the benefit of full or outline planning permission are expected to deliver over 500 dwellings each between 2001-2021, and nearly 12,500 in total. Some of the sites were already under construction in 2001, and nine of the twelve are located in Ipswich or Colchester.

Although these sites will provide a significant increment of development, their total contribution will be only around a fifth of the total housing requirement within the Haven Gateway over the East of England Plan period to 2021.

A larger number of smaller sites with planning permission or still to be allocated in development plans will have an important role to play, while "windfall development" will also make a contribution. The levelling out of projected housing completions in Figure 2-4 beyond 2011 reflects assumptions by District and Borough Councils, rather than a certainty, that sufficient development will come forward to meet the requirements of the East of England Plan.

In seeking to deliver that growth, maximising the use of brownfield land and prioritising the development of such land over greenfield sites in meeting future housing needs are key objectives of the Haven Gateway Partners. Through its Framework for Growth, the
Partnership has committed to manage housing growth and associated development with a view to promoting sustainable, well serviced, mixed communities and high quality places.

**Affordable housing**

2.34 A further issue is the requirement for and supply of affordable housing, which could have a significant bearing on the achievement of economic and employment growth targets. The East of England Plan’s aspirational target is that 35% of all planning permissions granted in the region after adoption of the Plan should be for affordable housing.

2.35 The East of England Affordable Housing Study 2003 identified a significant backlog of unmet housing need and high levels of newly arising need across the Haven Gateway Sub-Region. It also noted rural areas facing intense affordable housing need, reflecting pressure on local markets from commuters, second homes and tourism; and “hotspots” where house price / income differentials are amongst the highest in the Region.

2.36 Between 2001 and 2007, just over 18,300 affordable dwellings were built in the East of England, about 14% of overall completions during that period. No local authority achieved the rate of 35% specified in the East of England Plan. Table 2-8 indicates that the best performance of the 6 Haven Gateway authorities was in Babergh at 22% of completions, with an average of 11% achieved across the authorities as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Completions</th>
<th>Affordable</th>
<th>% Affordable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Region total</td>
<td>130,540</td>
<td>18,360</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Districts total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Regional Annual Monitoring Report 2007, EERA*

2.37 Achievement of the necessary increase in the scale and rate of affordable housing delivery will require commitment and action on the part of not only the sub-regional partners but other key players including EERA and the Housing Corporation (now Homes and Communities Agency).
Figure 2-5: Major housing sites in the Haven Gateway

### Conclusions

2.38 From both the economic projections and the housing trajectory, the implication is that the successful delivery of planned growth should not simply be assumed. The credit crunch and economic down-turn of the last few months have reinforced this view.

2.39 With regard to housing, additional sites need to be brought forward and, additionally, interventions may be needed to seek to ensure that schemes that have been approved can deliver to the timescales that are envisaged. The issue is not simply one of numbers. All new development should as far as possible meet sustainability objectives, and the sub-regional need for more affordable housing should also be addressed.

2.40 On the economic/employment side, the data in Tables 2-8 and 2-9 are important but they also need to be treated with a good degree of care: they are simply the product of a model which extrapolates past performance forwards and hence they should be treated as a guide to the challenges linked to the scale of growth, not the definitive answer. It is also important to remember that the projections were generated before the credit crunch and economic downturn really started to bite. Nevertheless, if it is the case that the past does not look very different from the future (with regard, for example, to the supply of employment land, the complement of existing major businesses, etc.), then the data presented above suggest that jobs creation – certainly to the levels set out in RSS – is likely to be more of a challenge in the north of the Haven Gateway sub-area (particularly the wider urban area of Ipswich) than the south: for the area in and around Ipswich, there appears to be a fairly (and increasingly) significant challenge in terms of job numbers.

2.41 However, across the Gateway as a whole, there also appears to be a major issue with regard to the quality of jobs and economic performance in terms of GVA per job. This is not, of course, a target from RSS. However it is a major concern for the new RES. Overall, Haven Gateway has started the (RSS) plan period with GVA per job at around 80% of the regional
average; in the period to 2021, this figure is projected to decline to around 72%. Addressing the GVA gap arguably, therefore, constitutes the principal, high level, economic challenge and the investments included within the IDP have been prioritised in response.
3: The economic performance of the Haven Gateway

3.1 From the viewpoint of Treasury, there are two main determinants of strong economic performance: high and stable levels of employment, and progressive increases in productivity. This argument is also acknowledged by EEDA: raising the employment rate of the over-16 population and increasing the annual growth rate in GVA per employee and GVA per capita are regional outcome targets set out in the new Regional Economic Strategy.

3.2 In the paragraphs below, we comment on these two factors in turn and the headline performance of the Haven Gateway in relation to both. In theory at least, this analysis ought to un-earth the problems/challenges that are driving the projections and – in turn – ought to be providing the focus for investments included within the IDP. Again though, it should be noted that the data reported here were generated pre-credit crunch and economic downturn and they need to be understood in this context.

Employment

3.3 With regard to employment levels, two key metrics need to be considered: economic activity rates and employment rates. These data are presented in Table 3-1 – for Haven Gateway and its constituent districts, and for the East of England. They suggest that 80% of the Haven Gateway’s working age population is economically active and over 75% is in employment; these figures are close to – although slightly lower than – the regional average. Although it is important to acknowledge the confidence intervals linked to the data, the evidence suggests that at district level, Ipswich performs best on both measures and Tendring (by some margin) worst.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Economic activity rate – working age</th>
<th>Employment rate - working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>denominator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>2,701,300</td>
<td>3,346,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>41,200</td>
<td>50,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>78,200</td>
<td>98,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>60,400</td>
<td>71,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>77,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: APS, 2006

8 Defined as the proportion of people either in employment or actively seeking employment
9 Defined as the proportion of people in employment
3.4 CLG issued new Indices of Deprivation in December, 2007. One of the domains within ID relates to employment deprivation. This is conceptualised as “involuntary exclusion of the working age population from the labour market” and it provides an important, and finer-grained, perspective on labour market participation and exclusion. On the associated indicators, Local Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in England are ranked from 1 (most deprived) to 32,482 (least deprived). Table 3-2 below shows the distribution of LSOAs within the Haven Gateway (defined on a district basis) across the four quartiles of English LSOAs. It suggests that 30% of LSOAs in Tendring and 24% of LSOAs in Ipswich are within the most deprived quartile nationally on the employment domain. In Mid Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal and Babergh, the proportion of LSOAs in this most deprived group – on the employment domain – is less than 2%. While all six districts have some local areas which are in the most deprived quartile nationally, the spatial distribution of employment deprivation across the Haven Gateway is therefore quite distinctive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Employment Score</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Colchester</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Tendring</th>
<th>HG LADs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8,120 (most deprived quartile)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,121-16,241</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,242-24,361</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;24,361 (least deprived quartile)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of LSOAs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Communities and Local Government, Indices of Deprivation, 2007

Drivers of Productivity

3.5 Since 2000 or thereabouts, HM Treasury and DTI/BERR have emphasised consistently the importance of five productivity drivers as the key to economic performance, while the market failures linked to those drivers have provided an important rationale for public interventions of varying forms. Of the five drivers, one – competition – relates essentially to regulatory issues and can therefore be disregarded in a comparative regional/local context. However the other four – skills, investment, entrepreneurship and innovation – merit some consideration (insofar as locally available data allow), for economic performance is driven by them.

Skills

3.6 Table 3-3 presents summary data relating to qualifications across the working age population (WAP). Overall, 23% of the Haven Gateway’s resident WAP is qualified to NVQ Level 4 (degree level) or above. This is about two percentage points lower than the average for the region. Within the Haven Gateway, there is some variation: Ipswich and Tendring perform much less strongly than the other districts. Table 3-2 also shows the proportion of the WAP with no qualifications. For the East of England, the average figure is 14% while in the Haven Gateway it is 18%. On this measure, the weakest district is Tendring (24.5%) while the strongest – and the only one that performs better than the regional average – is Babergh
(13.6%). Although it is important to acknowledge the confidence levels linked to survey-based data, these findings suggest that there is a clear “skills problem”, particularly in Ipswich and Tendring.

Table 3-3: Qualification levels in the Working Age Population, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% with NVQ4+ - working age</th>
<th>% with no qualifications - working age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>denominator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>834,800</td>
<td>3,344,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>50,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td>98,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>70,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>77,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: APS, 2006

**Enterprise and entrepreneurship**

3.7 In 2006, there were over 420,000 people aged 20-64 living within the districts included (in whole or in part) within the Haven Gateway and approaching 2,000 new businesses were registered for VAT. Combining these data suggests about 45 business starts per 10,000 adults aged 20-64 – a ratio that compares quite unfavourably with the regional average. Digging further into Table 3-4, we can observe that the number of registrations as a proportion of stock is generally quite low, particularly in the more rural areas; in essence this reflects the high incidence of micro businesses and it is typical of rural areas in general. The more concerning statistic, however, is the number of registrations per 10,000 people aged 20-64; this is lower than the regional average in all districts and in Ipswich, the figure is over 12 percentage points below the mean for the East of England. The implication, then, is that Haven Gateway fares relatively poorly in terms of enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Table 3-4: Business start-up indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Colchester</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Tendring</th>
<th>Haven Gateway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Registrations</td>
<td>17,490</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Registrations</td>
<td>14,020</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stock</td>
<td>196,455</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>24,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident population</td>
<td>3,309,400</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>105,800</td>
<td>71,200</td>
<td>53,700</td>
<td>67,700</td>
<td>75,700</td>
<td>423,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aged 20-64 (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrations as % of</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Investment

There are very few data that provide a proxy for investment at either sub-national or sub-regional scales. Based on ABI, ONS produces data relating to net capital expenditure at a district level. This is calculated by aggregating data at the level of business units (i.e. essentially firms) relating to the value of new building work, acquisitions (less disposals of land and existing buildings), vehicles and plant and machinery. Although ONS warns that the data are unreliable (because of the weak correlation between investment and local employment), it is the best/only dataset that is available.

Table 3-5: Net capital expenditure in the Haven Gateway and East of England, 1999-2005 (£'000 at current prices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Average annual growth rate in net capital expenditure, 1999-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>80,800</td>
<td>94,100</td>
<td>96,300</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>179,600</td>
<td>224,200</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>125,200</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>87,400</td>
<td>93,600</td>
<td>86,100</td>
<td>80,900</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>298,800</td>
<td>175,500</td>
<td>223,900</td>
<td>269,700</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>172,400</td>
<td>173,300</td>
<td>160,100</td>
<td>351,400</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>80,300</td>
<td>61,300</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway</td>
<td>896,600</td>
<td>827,700</td>
<td>779,400</td>
<td>988,300</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>6,846,600</td>
<td>6,627,200</td>
<td>6,706,000</td>
<td>6,812,000</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HG as % of EoE**

- Babergh: 13%
- Ipswich: 12%
- Mid Suffolk: 12%
- Suffolk Coastal: 15%

Source: ABI/ONS – note, however, that the regional capital expenditure figures do not meet the ONS quality standards and, consequently, do not have National Statistics status

Whilst noting these health-warnings, we can make three potentially important observations from the Table above. First, overall, the rate of net capital expenditure in the Haven Gateway appears to have exceeded the average across the East of England over recent years. Second, there are substantial variations within the Haven Gateway. Over the period, Ipswich appears to have seen a declining rate of net capital expenditure. Conversely, the picture for Colchester appears strongly positive – although a detailed reading of the data suggests that this has been driven by data for one year (2005). Third, the volume of net capital expenditure...
is very variable at district level: taking the average over the years for which we have data, the highest figures are recorded in Suffolk Coastal and Colchester while the lowest are in Tendring, and the latter is less than 30% of the former. This spatial distribution ought, in principle, to provide an indication of future competitive potential. By inference, the high figures for Suffolk Coastal may be an indication of port-related investment in Felixstowe and business investment in – or close to – Adastral Park. In Colchester Borough, the investments are likely to be in – or close to – the town of Colchester.

3.10 Table 3-6 below presents the same data, but on a per business unit basis. The messages are broadly similar: although there is year-on-year variation, in general, Suffolk Coastal appears to be performing strongly on this metric, Tendring is performing weakly, but overall, businesses in the Haven Gateway appear to be investing at a rate which is similar to (and perhaps slightly in excess of) the regional average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABI/ONS – note, however, that the regional capital expenditure figures do not meet the ONS quality standards and, consequently, do not have National Statistics status

### Innovation

3.11 There are few available data relating to innovation at sub-regional levels. The proportion of knowledge-based businesses in a local economy is – generally – regarded as a reasonable proxy. Table 3-7 below provides data relating to knowledge intensive businesses (KIBs) measured in terms of the number of data units (a proxy for the number of businesses) and the number of employees. The data suggest that overall, the incidence of knowledge intensive businesses/employment is lower in the Haven Gateway than across the region. However at a district level, Suffolk Coastal performs strongly while the incidence of knowledge intensive activity in Mid Suffolk and Tendring is quite weak.
Table 3-7: Incidence of knowledge intensive\textsuperscript{10} data units (i.e. proxy for businesses) and employees, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KIB Data Units</th>
<th>KIB Employees</th>
<th>Total Data Units</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>% Data Units KIBs</th>
<th>% Employees KIBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>3915</td>
<td>29680</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>6933</td>
<td>70510</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>4740</td>
<td>67316</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>4215</td>
<td>30935</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>5,421</td>
<td>5297</td>
<td>44934</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>4490</td>
<td>35033</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>23,041</td>
<td>29,590</td>
<td>278408</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>30,520</td>
<td>225,034</td>
<td>234086</td>
<td>2330778</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABI

3.12 As part of the UK Competitiveness Index, Robert Huggins and Associates have compiled comparative data relating to changes in the incidence of knowledge-based businesses, and – although the definition of knowledge-based businesses is different – this provides an additional perspective. An extract from this dataset – relating to districts wholly or partially within the Haven Gateway – is presented below.

Table 3-8: Incidence of knowledge-based businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Colchester</th>
<th>Tendring</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Knowledge-Based Business 1997</td>
<td>% of Total Business</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Knowledge-Based Business 1997</td>
<td>Rank (out of 408 LADs)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Knowledge-Based Business 2003</td>
<td>% of Total Business</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Knowledge-Based Business 2003</td>
<td>Rank (out of 408 LADs)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Knowledge-Based Business CAGR</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Knowledge-Based Business Rise in Rank (+/−)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Huggins and Associates, 2005

3.13 From Table 3-8, we can observe that:

- In the main, districts within the Haven Gateway are mid-ranking in terms of the incidence of knowledge-based businesses when compared to Local Authority Districts elsewhere in the UK.
- Between 1997 and 2003, the incidence of knowledge-based businesses grew relatively quickly (albeit from different starting points) in Suffolk Coastal, Babergh

\textsuperscript{10} These are defined on the basis of an OECD definition which – in terms of sectors – includes Pharmaceuticals manufacture; Office machinery and computers manufacture; Aerospace; Precision instruments; Electrical engineering; Telecommunications; Financial intermediation; Insurance and pension funding; Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation; Computer and related activities; R&D; Other business activities; Motion picture and video activities; and Radio and television activities
and Mid Suffolk. It grew very slowly in Ipswich and Tendring and, in both cases, the consequence was a declining rank relative to UK comparators.

- By the end of the period, the districts with the highest incidence of knowledge-based businesses in the Haven Gateway was in Colchester and Suffolk Coastal.

Conclusions

3.14 Overall, the review of indicators linked to the drivers of productivity suggests that within the Haven Gateway, performance is – generally – some way adrift from regional averages and mid-ranking in terms of national benchmarks. The UK Competitiveness Index provides a composite measure of performance and it suggests that (a) with the exception of Tendring, Haven Gateway districts are mid range, and that (b) for four of the six districts – including both Ipswich and Colchester Boroughs – relative performance has declined over recent years (Table 3-9).

Table 3-9: Overall performance on the UK Competitiveness Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Colchester</th>
<th>Tendring</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Competitiveness</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Rank (out of</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Competitiveness</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Rank (out of</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Competitiveness</td>
<td>Change in</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Score (-/-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Competitiveness</td>
<td>Rise in Rank</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>(+/-)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Huggins and Associates, 2005

3.15 As the Haven Gateway gears up to deliver above-trend housing and employment/economic growth, there is clearly much to be done – particularly in the context of the recent economic down-turn and credit crunch. In particular, the analysis of productivity drivers suggests major issues relating to skills (especially in Ipswich); enterprise and entrepreneurship; and innovation.

3.16 Additionally, however, it is important not to lose sight of the issues relating to economic participation which were raised at the beginning of this Chapter; in a real sense – and as identified by both Treasury and EEDA – this is just as important in terms of effecting sustained economic growth as driving up productivity performance. Three of the six districts within the Haven Gateway have an economic activity rate below the regional average and in Tendring the differential is substantial. Additionally, particularly for Tendring and Ipswich, there appear to be sizeable pockets of severe employment deprivation at finer-grained spatial scale. Alongside measures to improve skills, enterprise and entrepreneurship, and innovation, the need effect enhanced labour market participation – particularly within more deprived parts of the sub-region – must also be a priority.
4: Opportunities for – and constraints to – growth in the Haven Gateway

4.1 In this Chapter, we review the opportunities for – and constraints to – economic/employment and housing growth in the Haven Gateway. The narrative in this Chapter needs to be read alongside that in Chapters 2 and 3 as the evidence base underpinning the IDP: the Investment Packages and priority interventions (described in later Chapters) have been identified in response. We take three different “cuts” at these issues:

- We examine – first of all – the existing sectoral distribution of economic activity and recent trends within it (Although this might appear to sit uneasily in an analysis of opportunities for and constraints to growth, the reason for including it here is the fundamental recognition that it is businesses that create wealth and increased wealth creation that is required to drive sustainable economic growth).

- We then turn to consider the economic geography of the sub-region, focusing on the character and function of the five main urban economies within the Gateway. Within this context, we attempt to identify opportunities and constraints to economic/employment and housing growth insofar as these are located within the relevant functional urban areas.

- Third, we turn to consider opportunities and constraints that really do need to be considered at a bigger spatial scale. As identified in the Framework for Growth 2007, three are especially important: transport infrastructure, flood risk, and utilities, including water supply.

4.2 At the end of the chapter, we distil the principal constraints to – and opportunities for – economic/employment and housing growth which have been used as the basis for identifying priority investments required to effect the area’s growth ambitions.

Sectoral dimensions

4.3 At a high level – and on a whole district basis – Figure 4-1 shows the comparative size of different sectors (indicated by the size of the circles). It also shows which sectors have grown and declined in terms of employment in recent years: employment in manufacturing has declined absolutely, but all other sectors have grown. Finally it provides location quotients (in relation to England); outstanding on this measure is the strong concentration of employment in transport and communications which is wholly consistent with the area’s gateway function.
Table 4-1 below provides further detail on the sectoral distribution of employees in employment across the Haven Gateway\(^{11}\), but on a much more disaggregated basis. For those sectors which are strongly represented in the area relative to the region (i.e. a location quotient in excess of 1.0), it shows the absolute number of employees in employment; the growth rate in employee jobs over the period 2003-05; and the location quotient (relative to the region).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total no. of employees 2005</th>
<th>HG CAGR 2003-05</th>
<th>2005 LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61 : Water transport</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 : Electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 : Fishing, operation of fish hatcheries and fish farms; service activities incidental to fishing</td>
<td>[small number]</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 : Manufacture basic metals</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 : Supporting and auxiliary transport activities; activities of travel agencies</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 : Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 : Post and telecommunications</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 : Other mining and quarry</td>
<td>[small number]</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 : Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 : Health and social work</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 : Recreational, cultural and sporting activities</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : Publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 : Agriculture, hunting and related service activities</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 : Land transport; transport via pipelines</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 : Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 : Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 : Sale, maintenance and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; retail sale of automotive fuel</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 : Manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel</td>
<td>[small number]</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Defined on a ward basis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total no. of employees</th>
<th>HG CAGR 2003-05</th>
<th>2005 LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93 : Other service activities</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 : Retail trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles; repair of personal and household goods</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 : Education</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABI

4.5 Particularly at a disaggregated level, ABI is known to contain sampling and other errors, and hence care is needed in interpretation. However from the Table, we can observe that:

- The sectors which are most strongly represented in the Haven Gateway (in relative terms) are strongly port-related – notably water transport and supporting/auxiliary activities. While the former has seen a decline in employment locally, the latter has grown and it now accounts for approaching 10,000 jobs.
- Within the Haven Gateway, there is a high concentration of employment in post and telecommunications and some aspects of financial services; the former accounts for over 7,000 jobs and it is likely that many of these are located on or near Adastral Park, to the north east of Ipswich.
- Health and social work, and education both employ large numbers of people within the Haven Gateway and both have seen rapid absolute growth in recent years.
- For two sectors with a reasonable employment base and a level of local specialisation, there was substantial job loss over the period: insurance and pension funding, and the generation of power.

4.6 Although predating the credit crunch and economic downturn, these observations relating to the Haven Gateway’s sectoral make-up provide the backdrop for the discussion of the opportunities for – and constraints to – growth in particular places which is set out below.

II: Spatial dimensions

(a) Ipswich Urban Area

4.7 From the analysis presented in preceding chapters, the implication is that the Ipswich Policy area – which is the largest urban area within the Haven Gateway – will struggle to deliver the quantum of jobs growth required by the East of England Plan and, additionally, the quality of employment growth appears somewhat suspect. Hence the economic “problems” that may need to be addressed through interventions can – at a headline level – be summarised as follows:

- First, within the Ipswich area, above-trend rates of job creation are needed if economic growth is going to keep pace with planned housing and population growth.
- Second, there is a need to invest to ensure that quality jobs are created. This has all sorts of implications. It probably means that particular attention needs to be paid to skills levels within the resident workforce (in part addressed through investment at both UCS and Suffolk New College). Additionally it means that – as far as possible –
steps ought to be taken to promote more knowledge-based activities, whether within existing sectors or new ones.

- Third – and relating to both points above – there is a need to create a more enterprising local economy. Currently rates of new business formation are low within the Ipswich area compared both to the East of England and elsewhere in the Haven Gateway.

- Fourth, given the high economic activity and employment rates that characterise Ipswich relative to both the region and the wider Haven Gateway, there may be relatively little scope to increase effective labour supply from amongst the existing population. However this observation sits uncomfortably with the findings of the Indices of Deprivation (2007) and ought to be kept under review.

4.8 In response to these headline challenges, the paragraphs below examine some of the opportunities for – and constraints to – growth within the Ipswich Urban Area. All of these have been identified (more or less explicitly) in RSS as Policies for the Haven Gateway (see Chapter 2).

**Opportunities and constraints linked to… Ipswich town centre**

4.9 Relative to the size of the urban population, there is evidence to suggest that Ipswich town centre is not “punching its weight” in economic terms. On Experian’s retail centre ranking (2004), Ipswich is ranked as the 37th best performing centre – ahead of Cambridge (49) but some way behind Norwich (9), the region’s leading retail centre.

4.10 Within this context, an Area Action Plan for Ipswich was produced, focusing on ensuring the urban renaissance of the IP-One area (covering the town centre, the Waterfront area, Ipswich Village, and Suffolk College). Although the link to economic outcomes was not made in a quantified sense, the AAP highlighted some of the problems that needed to be overcome in central Ipswich, including:

- the need for improved connectivity within the town centre
- constrained accessibility within the town centre
- long-term erosion of the town’s legibility, urban form and structure
- the requirement to deliver a sustainable retail offer
- the potential for over-development of certain land uses
- historic buildings requiring economic re-use
- the disconnection of the town centre from the waterfront

4.11 In part, any underperformance of Ipswich town centre may be exacerbated by the final problem identified in the AAP: the severance between it and the emerging education quarter and the Waterfront (the problem of severance is likely to be more important in terms of future...
growth than it has been with regard to past performance). This set of issues was the subject of a study which argued that there were essentially two scenarios with regard to the future of Ipswich town centre: developing it as a town within a busy ring-road, or, addressing the barrier between the town and the Waterfront such that Ipswich might become a “town on the Waterfront”. Given that the Waterfront is, in principle, no more than 8 minutes’ walk from the town centre, the study identified many economic benefits linked with the second scenario – notably increased “footfall” on the Waterfront which could help to sustain restaurants, cultural amenities, etc., and potentially, the scope to effect appropriate forms of economic development in the area between the city-centre proper and the Waterfront.

4.12 As the list of AAP-defined problems also demonstrates, there are also major issues relating to traffic. Central Ipswich is the destination for almost half of all the journeys to work within the greater Ipswich area. Many of these journeys are relatively short, but they are made by car, leading to congested roads in and around the town centre and on radial routes leading to it. One third of journeys to work are within a comfortable walking distance and two thirds within cycling distance. Looking ahead, the likely concentration of new development around the central area provides both a challenge and an opportunity to change commuting patterns and reduce peak hour car travel. There is a need to improve the connectivity between, and accessibility of, key sites in the town centre, Ipswich Village, the education quarter and Waterfront so that people can get around more easily on foot, by bicycle and by public transport.

4.13 In responding to development opportunities and constraints in relation to Ipswich town centre, there is a need, in addition, to recognise the issues relating to flood risk.

Opportunities and constraints linked to… the ICT Cluster and development to the north east of Ipswich

4.14 Located mainly in, or close to, Ipswich is one of the Haven Gateway’s principal sectoral specialisms: ICT and related activities. A study of the potential of the Ipswich to Cambridge Hi Tech Corridor examined these specialisms in reasonable detail. Although now dated, the study’s findings still have resonance.

4.15 Core to the ICT sector within the Haven Gateway is Adastral Park – a 45 hectare site which is wholly owned by BT and located to the north east of Ipswich. As well as being the owner of Adastral Park, BT’s research and development unit is the major occupant and well over 3,000 people are employed on the site by it. BT has invested some £60m in the site over recent years and – at least in part – the purpose of this was to attract inward investors. And there were some successes during the early part of the current decade (e.g. Fujitsu). In addition, BT established Brightstar – an incubator and corporate venturing partnership with exclusive rights to create new start-up businesses on the back of BT’s intellectual property portfolio. Another key feature of the development at Adastral Park surrounded the visible presence of Higher (HE) and Further (FE) Education Institutions: UCL carries out engineering research and delivers postgraduate courses on Adastral Park; Suffolk College has

---

14 Taken from a Suffolk County Council Cabinet Report on the proposed Ipswich Transport Strategy, June 2007
15 Investing in the Growth of Haven Gateway – Final Report to HGP Peter Townroe, March 2004
16 Cambridge to Ipswich Hi Tech Corridor Report to SDA by SQW, December 2003
a research centre (called Create) which is developing on-line learning aimed at widening participation; the University of Essex runs a unit (called Chimera); and CMI (Cambridge-Massachusetts Institute) also has an outpost on the site.

4.16 The question of how the resources ensconced within Adastral Park might be used to effect sustainable economic growth in the Ipswich area – and address some of the challenges identified above – has long exercised both local partners and EEDA. Notwithstanding the down-turn following the dot.com boom during the early years of the current decade, the ICT cluster in the East of England is seen as vital to both the regional economy and that of Haven Gateway, and Adastral Park is central to that cluster.

4.17 Through a series of studies, EEDA concluded that there was a clear need and opportunity to establish a 30-acre science based Business Park linked to BT Adastral Park at Martlesham that would have the potential both to create over 1100 high value jobs and provide future stability in the sector. Specific objectives identified in relation to what was originally conceived as Suffolk Innovation Park (SIP) were to: accelerate commercialisation of research, inward licensing and innovation; support new business formation in the sector; support existing businesses to expand and grow; help attract businesses and inward investment to the area; diversify the sector away from reliance on BT; help retain talented researchers locally and within the region; create a complementary Innovation Park and Enterprise Hub that aligns to the University Campus Suffolk project; and foster collaboration and commercialisation, with research and university institutions. It was also felt that it would increase the skills base for ICT businesses and institutions.

4.18 Over recent months, the proposal for Suffolk Innovation Park has been reconfigured and the new proposition is that “InnovationMartlesham” will be embedded within the Adastral Park site. Recently opened and having attracted 10 new businesses in the last six months, this ought to be helpful, both in realising a key opportunity within the Ipswich area and addressing some of the weaknesses of the area’s economy. InnovationMartlesham is located close to key areas of planned housing growth in that part of the Ipswich Policy Area (IPA) that is within Suffolk Coastal District. In theory at least, there ought therefore to be scope for delivering high quality economic and housing growth in a manner which is fully aligned. In the longer term, this growth is likely to require transport measures to address capacity issues on the A12 Ipswich eastern bypass and radial routes both within and outside the town. There are also concerns about the adequacy of electricity supply to the eastern fringe of Ipswich.

4.19 One of the objectives of InnovationMartlesham and Adastral Park more generally is to benefit the main urban area of Ipswich, some seven kilometres away, and the wider Haven Gateway. There have been various attempts to encourage the ICT cluster to spread. One example has been IP-City – a networking venture which, in its early years, comprised over 300 businesses and other organisations with the overall purpose of establishing the area as a leading high tech economy. Recently, attempts have been made to re-launch IP-City with a stronger focus on the geography of the Haven Gateway. Additionally, funded in part by EEDA and IBC, IP-City Centre has been created close to the Waterfront and the intention is that it should provide

17 Taken from a Suffolk County Council report to cabinet, May 2006
18 Haven Gateway Programme of Development – A Framework for Growth, October 2007
high quality office and conferencing accommodation that may be appropriate to the needs of some ICT businesses. Rates of the take-up at the new Centre appear to be on-target.

**Opportunities and constraints linked to… University Campus Suffolk (UCS)**

4.20 For many years, one the principal weaknesses identified in relation to the economy of Ipswich was the lack of a higher education presence in the town; this shortcoming featured prominently in a number of strategies and plans drafted in the 1990s, and presumably also their antecedents\(^ {19}\). It was prompted by – and consistent with – the area’s weak performance with regard to higher level skills (evidenced above).

4.21 However, catalysed in part by the government’s target that 50% of 18-30 year olds should have some experience of HE, significant progress has been made over recent years, culminating in the enrolment of the first students in University Campus Suffolk in September 2007. Centred on Ipswich Waterfront, but with nodes being developed across Suffolk, including potentially Felixstowe, UCS is a joint venture between the Universities of East Anglia and Essex. The two HEIs will, at least initially, accredit UCS degrees in parallel. Suffolk College is also closely involved in the development and has relocated to an adjacent site. The aim is to provide an integrated package of HE and FE which is still comparatively unusual in the UK context. This should facilitate the development of clear progression pathways from FE to HE, thereby increasing the number of local people able to enter HE. The intention is that around 3,500 students should be based on the Waterfront campus. This will increase in later phases of development to 6,200 (by 2013/14).

4.22 Having established UCS campus, the question for Ipswich – and for the IDP – is how this resource and facility should be used to best effect in economic development terms. It is estimated that, with a university campus in the county, the Suffolk economy will benefit from an extra £50 million each year\(^ {20}\). As UCS becomes established – and as part of the wider Waterfront regeneration – active steps will need to be taken to ensure that links with the local economy are actively nurtured and harnessed. This includes links to InnovationMartlesham and Adastral Park, but also needs to be considered more generally.

**Opportunities and constraints linked to… financial services**

4.23 Traditionally, Ipswich has had a reasonably strong financial services sector which is sometimes considered as part of a London-Ipswich-Norwich financial corridor, reflecting, \textit{inter alia}, links from the two East of England centres into the City of London. In 2004, about 8,000 employees worked in Ipswich Borough’s finance and business sector, with a further 4,800 employees in the sector in Suffolk Coastal; at this time, the number of jobs in finance and business was over-represented in both Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal when compared to the regional average, with LQs of 1.4 and 1.3 respectively. Given the need for more, higher quality, jobs, the potential linked to financial services ought to be considered – not just in Ipswich, but in Colchester too. However this will need to be done in a manner that is informed by recent developments linked to the credit crunch and the economic down-turn.

\(^{19}\) An Area-Based Evaluation of EEDA’s Impacts – Ipswich, Report to EEDA by SQW Consulting, 2006

\(^{20}\) http://www.ucs.ac.uk/news/facts.asp
(b) Colchester

4.24 Colchester is England’s first Roman city and hence it has a distinctive role in terms of heritage and tourism. The Borough’s Economic Prosperity Strategy describes it as “an old historic town, but increasingly a young city in the making”21. Within this context, aspirations within the (Borough-wide) Colchester 2020 Local Strategic Partnership’s vision make reference to Colchester as “a centre of excellence for innovation, culture and learning” and “a preferred destination for visitors, for business location, and for investment”.

4.25 In terms of its resident population, the urban area of Colchester is smaller than that of Ipswich. At the time of the last census, around 58,000 people identified their place of work as being within the ONS-defined urban area of Colchester, and of these, about 13,000 commuted to work there from outside the urban area. At the same time, Colchester was also a source of workers for employers elsewhere; in particular, data from the 2001 Census suggest that about 3,400 residents of the Colchester urban area commuted to work in a London Borough. Colchester is relatively well connected to London with a train journey time of about 55 minutes. Hence it is likely that the incidence of London commuting has increased since the last Census, suggesting greater interconnectivity, certainly in terms of labour markets.

4.26 Borough-wide, recent research for Colchester Borough Council provides evidence relating to the structure of the local economy. At a broad level, public administration, education and health is strongly represented (in terms of employment, and relative to regional benchmarks) and it has grown quickly over recent years, as – to a lesser extent – has distribution, hotels and restaurants. Analysis of more disaggregated data provides a finer-grained assessment. It suggests that education and “other business activities” have seen the greatest absolute growth while insurance and pension funding has experienced a decline of almost 2,000 jobs in the period 1998-2005. Overall though – over the period – total employment has grown, from just under 66,000 to over 70,000 jobs22.

4.27 Looking ahead, the data presented earlier suggest that the principal challenges for Colchester may be summed up as follows:

- On the face of it, Colchester does not face a huge challenge in terms of jobs numbers as projected employment growth is in excess of the target set out in RSS.

- However, looking ahead, there are certainly issues relating to the quality of employment growth and projected performance on a GVA per job basis is concerning.

- In terms of its skills base, the incidence of higher level skills within the working age population is close to the average for the East of England. However, Colchester has a high incidence of people of working age with no qualifications; this is four percentage points higher than the average for the region.

- Business start-up rates are similar to the average for the Haven Gateway, but notably lower than the average for the region.

---

22 Colchester Employment Study – Appendix E Socio-Economic Assessment, Lambert Smith Hampton, for Colchester Borough Council, February 2007
While the incidence of knowledge-based activity is good in a Haven Gateway context, it is lower than the regional average and there is some suggestion that relative performance may be slipping. Given the latent potential that exists within the Borough (see below), this may currently be something of a missed opportunity.

One further point is worthy of note as a key constraint within Colchester surrounds the supply of employment land. There is evidence to suggest that although apparently plentiful, the available sites are generally of a poor quality; indeed it is estimated that whilst Colchester (Borough) has 98ha of available employment land, only 2ha is of “good quality”\(^{23}\). High quality economic activity generally requires employment land of a similarly high quality and hence there must be further concerns with regard to the quality of projected economic growth. There is also currently a significant under-provision of incubation space for new and grow-on firms.

Colchester’s Core Strategy to 2021 seeks to address these issues by directing industry and warehousing uses primarily to new high quality well-located Strategic Employment Zones in North Colchester (Cuckoo Farm) and Stanway (Stane Park) in addition to the knowledge-based industry programmed for the University Research Park. Further office development will be directed to sustainable and accessible mixed use areas in the Town Centre, Urban Gateways and Town Centre fringe. The regeneration of key sites in these locations, such as St Botolph’s and North Station, will help deliver new employment and retail floorspace and reduce the pressure for out-of-centre development at less sustainable locations.

Within this overall context, the paragraphs that follow identify particular opportunities and constraints of relevance to Colchester’s potential for sustained economic/employment and housing growth.

### Opportunities and constraints linked to… Colchester Town Centre

Colchester town centre – and the economy within it – is quite distinctive. The structure of its retail sector is different from elsewhere; it is estimated that within Colchester there are 200 independent traders and 100 multiples, whereas in Ipswich (and Chelmsford), these figures are reversed\(^{24}\). Possibly in part because of this make-up, businesses within the town centre recently voted against the establishment of a Business Improvement District, the aim of which had been to improve the safety and cleanliness of Colchester and promote the town, both around the borough and outside the county.

As well as retail, Colchester Borough’s tourism sector – worth an estimated £189.6m to the local economy – is focused on the town centre. However traffic and capacity issues in the town centre are considered to be constraining its growth and this problem is likely to be exaggerated in the context of the 2012 Olympics\(^ {25}\).

In response, the Core Strategy identifies two key areas for regeneration and development in the Town Centre and its environs, St Botolph’s and North Station. A masterplan for the St. Botolph’s area of the town centre has been completed. This includes proposals for new retail

\(^{23}\) Employment Land Study – Final Report to the Haven Gateway Partnership, DTZ Pieda, December 2005

\(^{24}\) Colchester’s Economic Prosperity Strategy 2007-2010, Colchester Borough Council, June 2007

development and a cultural quarter; as a result, retail floorspace ought to increase by 500,000 sq ft. In the Cultural Quarter, the new visual arts and cultural facility is on-site and due to open in 2009 with a new hotel and creative business centre due for completion in 2012. Further development is proposed in St Botolphs including a new Magistrates Court, a new Bus Station, improvements to the Town Rail Station, new homes, new prime retail development (approx 500,000 sq ft) and improvements to the public realm in St Botolphs including enhancements to the Priory, the creation of additional outside event space and improved links between St Botolphs and the rest of the town through the Cycle Town Initiative. In addition, the Historic Town Centre Improvements project will address issues of congestion in the town centre core, in particular in the High Street, whilst also seeking to improve the economic and social performance of the town.

4.34 In addition, the Core Strategy identifies the area around the train station at North Station and the nearby business area at the Cowdray Centre as a new area requiring regeneration due to its prominence as a gateway to the town, the current poor quality of its public realm, congestion problems, and potential for providing sustainably located new housing, offices (about 40,000m² of gross floor space), retail premises, along with regeneration of the North Station (main line) rail station, a North Transit Corridor and improvements to the crucial A133 central corridor.

Opportunities and constraints linked to... Colchester's knowledge-based assets

4.35 The University of Essex – based at Wivenhoe Park, to the south east of Colchester town centre – is one of the region’s leading research-based universities. Data from HESA suggest that the University received over £8m of research funding in 2004/05 – the third highest figure among HEIs in the region. On various league tables, the university’s ranking is consistently within the upper quartile of UK institutions: the Times league table of Universities ranked the University of Essex as 30th (of 109 institutions); the Guardian ranked it as 31st (of 130 institutions) and the Sunday Times ranked it as 33rd (of 119 institutions). The University has 19 departments spanning the Humanities, Social Sciences and Science and Engineering, and it has particular expertise in robotics and socio-economic data. There are currently around 8,800 students; 25% of these within the Graduate School. The University’s website suggests that it contributes more than £60 million annually to the local economy and is the largest single employer in the Colchester area (excluding the Health Service and the Military). It employs around 1,750 people of which some 700 are engaged in research and teaching.

4.36 The University of Essex is seeking to establish a Research Park on a 16 hectare site at Wivenhoe Park, although implementation of these plans has been delayed due to the current economic climate. The Park will provide up to 56,000 sq m of high specification accommodation led by a first phase of approximately 6,000 m² which will consist of a high profile building to showcase the University’s international reputation in certain key sectors.

---

and an office village. It is anticipated that the development of the Research Park will create employment opportunities and substantial economic benefits in East Colchester, including the creation of 2,500 new jobs, many of which should be of high value, leading to the retention of more graduates locally.

**Opportunities and constraints linked to… Colchester Garrison**

4.37 Colchester has been a garrison town for hundreds of years. The presence of the Army was consolidated during the mid to late 19th century with the construction of several barracks around the central open space known as Abbey Field. A new self-contained garrison on land to the south is now completed. A large, predominately brownfield, site, occupied by the existing garrison, has therefore been made available for redevelopment for mixed use urban village, including 2,600 new houses and development is underway. The masterplan for the site responds to numerous objectives, including to:

- provide a wide variety of house types, sizes and tenures related to housing needs, including social housing, in accordance with Council and Government policy
- encourage appropriate businesses to locate within the Garrison area to provide work close to homes and to improve employment opportunities.

4.38 Within the written statement supporting the masterplan, little reference is made to the potential economic development roles and functions of a redeveloped Colchester garrison. One comment is made:

> It is likely that employment generated will be in business and services, with some retail work, but this will be on a small scale with no major industrial or commercial employer. Due to the proximity of the town centre and rail connections, the northern area may attract people wishing to run their own business from home. (Colchester Garrison Masterplan – Supporting Written Statement, para 5.07).

4.39 The redevelopment of the Garrison was, when launched, the largest PFI in the UK at £1.5 billion. It has secured the presence of the Army in Colchester for the next 35 years, safeguarding 5,000 jobs. Clearly this is an investment of major national significance let alone of sub regional importance in economic terms. In terms of effecting future economic growth that is both sustainable and aligned with the area’s aspirations for higher quality employment – and in recognition of the garrison site’s proximity to Wivenhoe Park – it will be important that the opportunities it provides are used to good effect.

**Opportunities and constraints linked to… developments in North Colchester**

4.40 North Colchester is identified as an area for major employment growth over the next decade. In July 2003, six planning applications were approved relating to the Cuckoo Farm and Severalls Hospital sites. In total they include proposals for 1,500 new residential units, an employment zone expected to create 3,500 new jobs, the relocation of roadside services currently on the north side of the A12 together with the recently completed 10,000 seater

---

Community Stadium and a 1000 space Park and Ride facility. Development is subject to a new junction on the A12 and other major infrastructure works\textsuperscript{32}. Due to the credit crunch reducing private sector capacity to deliver, approval for CIF funding to deliver the junction improvements has recently been sought and obtained (subject to a detailed business case). This should mean that the junction is complete by 2011, so facilitating development even within the challenging economic conditions although match funding will still be required to provide the additional infrastructure including the bus transit corridor. Early delivery of the junction will also bring forward the opening of the Park and Ride facility which will have a positive impact on congestion in the town. Post 2016, the Core Strategy promotes the release of a Greenfield site in this part of town to accommodate a further 2200 home sustainable community.

Opportunities and constraints linked to… Stanway Growth Area

4.41 A further 800 new Greenfield homes are planned on the south-western fringe of Colchester. This area is also identified as a Strategic Employment Site (approx 16ha) which will have excellent access onto the A12. This new development will be supported by a south-west distributor road.

\textbf{(c) Clacton-on-Sea / Little Clacton (and Jaywick)}

4.42 At the time of the last Census, just over 54,000 people lived in the ONS-defined urban area of Clacton-on-Sea/Little Clacton and approaching 17,500 people worked there. More than 2,000 residents of the urban area travelled to work in Colchester (urban area) and a further 1,000 out-commuted to work in a London Borough. Overall, there were more out-commuters from the urban area of Clacton-on-Sea/Little Clacton than there were in-commuters to it. Hence although Clacton-on-Sea/Little Clacton was relatively self contained, the labour market balance was a negative one.

4.43 Clacton is best known as a holiday resort, with sandy beaches, amusements, the pier (including an aquarium, rides and shops as well as regular fireworks nights) and a range of watersports. Tourism is important to the local economy although changing holiday trends have led to a decline in long stay holidays and an increase in short breaks and day visits.

4.44 The analysis of economic data in Chapters 2 and 3 suggested – insofar as Tendring can be regarded as a proxy for Clacton-on-Sea – that:

- within the area, there are serious issues with regard to both activity and employment rates suggesting problems relating to labour market exclusion and consequential deprivation
- there are major weaknesses in terms of local skills: almost a quarter of the working age population has no qualifications which is almost ten percentage points higher than the regional average
- levels of business investment are the lowest in the Haven Gateway by some margin, as is the incidence of knowledge-based businesses.

\textsuperscript{32} Review of the Forecasts: Foundations for the Greater Essex Framework, Shared Intelligence, July 2007
Within this overall context, Tendring District Council has concluded that Clacton town centre is not realising its full economic potential. There are issues relating to the urban realm and, in addition, Clacton’s retail offer is considered to be relatively poor. The Local Plan states that the town’s retail element, whilst in relatively good health, is coming under increasing threat from Colchester’s retail offer and the District-Wide Retail Study for Tendring (updated in 2003) identifies a need for non-food bulky goods floorspace in Clacton in the period to 2011.

In response, a Town Centre Strategy for Clacton was commissioned and adopted by Tendring District Council. This concluded that:

“...the town centre strategy and any related management initiatives would bring about positive economic and environmental benefits which would enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre overall. The associated economic growth could be extensive and should not be underestimated. Essentially, we consider that Clacton, as the largest urban centre in the district, has significant economic development potential. This potential could act as a catalyst for the economic regeneration of a substantial part of the wider district” (Source: Clacton Town Centre Strategy, Drivers Jonas 2003).

BDP was subsequently commissioned by the Tendring District Council to put forward specific proposals for Clacton Town Centre which would both enhance the visitor experience and encourage new investment. The consultants considered a range of development opportunities in and around the town centre and along the seafront which build upon the recent improvements to the public realm in the heart of the shopping area. A strategic framework of interventions has been created to deliver the above objectives. These are set out in the Clacton Neighbourhood Plan and Clacton Town Centre Vision Documents.

There are two related projects being pursued in Jaywick. A Master Plan is being progressed looking at appropriate development options to tackle the poor condition of the housing stock and the inadequate road infrastructure. Work on a prospectus to Ministers regarding the future of Jaywick has identified a possible need for investment of between £45 and £75 million to achieve its regeneration. This level of funding will be far beyond the level ever likely to be available to the Haven Gateway through Growth Point funding and whilst full partnership backing and modest financial support will be made by the Haven Gateway Partnership, the major capital funds for this exceptional regeneration project will need to come direct from Government. In the meantime, the Safer and Strong Communities Project has been looking at ways to achieve more “joined up” public services provision through an Interaction Board which includes community representatives.

In this context, it is important to recall some of the challenges facing Tendring district as a whole. Largely because of the performance of Clacton/Jaywick, Tendring ranks as one of the worst performing districts nation-wide on the UK Competitiveness Index. Its performance is particularly suspect with regard to the incidence of higher level skills. Linked to this, there is a perceived lack of adult training and development facilities in the town. However, one of Colchester Institute’s two campuses is in Clacton (with two sites), and significant expenditure

is being undertaken over the next three years on the rebuild/extension of the Institute, Essex’s largest college.

**(d) Felixstowe and Harwich, and the Haven Ports**

4.50 After Ipswich, Colchester and Clacton-on-Sea, Felixstowe (with a resident population of 29,000 people) and Harwich (just over 20,000 people) are the next biggest urban areas in the Haven Gateway. In both cases, their local economies are dominated by port-related activities.

4.51 Together, the Haven Ports (Felixstowe, Harwich and the (much smaller) Port of Ipswich) handle over 40% of UK deep-sea container traffic and a substantial volume of cruise, ferry and ro-ro freight business. With some 17,000 commercial vessel movements per annum, including some of the largest container ships, almost 15,000 people are employed directly in the various ports logistics and shipping sectors in Suffolk and North Essex.

4.52 Situated on the northern bank of the Orwell Estuary, the **Port of Felixstowe** is the largest container port in the UK. In November 2004, a 270-metre extension to the Port of Felixstowe’s Trinity Terminal was formally opened, and Hutchison Ports (HPUK) has subsequently sought to reconfigure the southern end of the Port of Felixstowe. A Public Inquiry into the Felixstowe South proposals took place towards the end of 2004, and the project was given formal approval by Government in February 2006. Construction of the first phase of the development commenced in Summer 2008 with the quay expected to be operational in 2010. Once completed, Felixstowe will be able to provide over four kilometres of deep-water container facilities, and total capacity at the Port will increase by 1.5 million TEUs, to 5.2 million TEUs per annum.

4.53 It is estimated that the Felixstowe South Reconfiguration will help to create an additional 621 jobs by the time it is fully operational. Some 860 additional jobs will also be generated through associated activities, such as freight forwarding and haulage, and multiplier effects elsewhere in the area. Measures to address the transport impacts of port-related development will be funded by the port through s106 agreements, including junction improvements on the A14 Trunk Road. However it is anticipated that committed housing land in Felixstowe and the Trimley villages will be insufficient to meet housing need generated by employment increases at the port. Additionally, concerns have been expressed about the dependence of Felixstowe town on one industry, particularly given the demise of its leisure sector; a long term strategy for the growth of the town has been developed (by David Lock Associates) in response.

4.54 On the southern bank, **Harwich International Port** is a major multi-purpose port handling cargo and vessels as well as passenger travel. It is set for significant expansion through a proposal for a container port at Bathside Bay which has had provisional approval from the Secretary of State; potentially, this will make Harwich the second largest container port in the UK. In the course of the Public Inquiry relating to Bathside Bay, the promoter, Hutchison Ports (HPUK), advanced the arguments below with regard to the likely economic impacts associated with the investment:

---

34 Harwich Haven Authority – see http://www.hha.co.uk/default.asp?section=about%20us&page=chiefexecheadlines
35 “Twenty-foot Equivalent Unit” (i.e. a unit of capacity)
Quite apart from a beneficial effect on the national economy by bringing benefits and avoiding disbenefits, Bathside Bay Container Terminal has a very positive role to play in the local and regional economies. The New Terminal’s importance to the local and regional economy is underlined by its location in Harwich, which is identified in RPG 9 (Policy RE7) as a Priority Area for Economic Regeneration. When operating, the New Terminal would create in the region of 770 jobs directly, around 500 net additional jobs in associated activities and a further 430 jobs by reason of multiplier effects. This will reduce unemployment in Tendring, and in particular in its most deprived areas, because there is a match between the skill profiles required and those who are to be employed. In addition, HPUK will provide further training. As a result there can be expected to be a significant increase in employment in Tendring, which currently suffers from unemployment above the regional average as well as a seasonally dependent economy (Source: Bathside Bay Container Terminal: Statement of Case on behalf of Hutchison Ports and others, 2004).

4.55 In seeking to capture the maximum economic impacts from the planned investments, provision is being made for port-related development on business parks in Harwich.

4.56 In economic terms, the expansion of the ports at Felixstowe and Harwich constitutes a major economic driver for the two towns but also for the whole of the Haven Gateway; indeed, Bathside Bay and Felixstowe South are two of only three large schemes approved by Government over recent years (the third was London Gateway (Shellhaven)). There are, undoubtedly, costs and challenges, not least those linked to the pressure on the area’s transport infrastructure and environmental issues and concerns. However steps ought to be taken to ensure that the maximum economic benefit deriving from investment in the two ports is captured. As set out in a recent report of the House of Commons Transport Committee, this must have implications in relation to national road and rail infrastructure priorities; specifically (and illustratively), the comment was made that notwithstanding the approval of the Bathside Bay proposal, development is unlikely to proceed until road improvements have been agreed. In this context, a comment from DfT’s Interim Report on its Ports Policy Review is pertinent to the Haven Gateway:

*The availability of sufficient port capacity is a potentially significant constraint on future economic growth. Equally, congestion on port access routes and the wider inter-urban network, already a problem in the South East of England, could act as an additional constraint. It is therefore the Government’s intention to address these issues together as part of an examination of our high-priority international links in line with the recommendations of the Eddington Study (Ports Policy Review – Interim Report, Department for Transport, 2007).*

4.57 However, transport is not the only consideration. Realising the full economic potential linked to ports expansion – in qualitative as well as quantitative terms – requires investment in local skills; the development and application of leading-edge logistics technologies; and the development of the ports-related cluster more generally. In this context, the opportunities to develop meaningful links with the knowledge-based and ICT-related activities in both

---

36 The Ports Industry in England and Wales, House of Commons (61) – Transport Committee, 2006-07
37 The cluster is described in Haven Gateway Partnership’s Ports Policy Review Consultation Response, September 2006
Ipswich and Colchester ought to be actively pursued. Continuing port developments at Parkeston Quay and the Bathside Bay development – although it is not likely to start until around 2013 – should generate a significant demand for additional off site storage and warehousing as close to the port as possible. This will assist in opening up local sites for employment development which were included in the Tendring District Local Plan 2007.

III: Wider infrastructural issues

Transport

4.58 As stated in the context of different urban economies within the Haven Gateway, there are a number of locally important constraints to growth linked to the transport infrastructure. In part these will be addressed through modal shifts and through demand management measures. In both Ipswich and Colchester, improvements to transport in the urban centres are priorities identified in the East of England Plan.

4.59 However, there are also three key transportation issues that affect prospects for sustained economic growth across the Haven Gateway as a whole. All three are significant constraints to the area’s growth and they should be recognised as such regionally and nationally:

- **Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail freight gauge enhancement and capacity increase** – This is required to increase the volume of freight transported to and from the Haven Ports by rail. Gauge enhancements to the Felixstowe-Peterborough section of the Felixstowe-Nuneaton rail corridor are planned and funded, but there is more to be done.

- **A120 improvements** – These are needed to improve access to Colchester from the west (notably Braintree and Stansted) and on to Harwich. The approval of development at Bathside Bay is conditional on improvements to the A120 Harwich-Hare Green.

- A14 and A12 capacity Improvements including, potentially:
  - Copdock Interchange
  - Cuckoo Farm junction and A133 Improvements
  - Orwell Bridge and Operation Stack
  - A12 North of Wickham Market
  - Colchester Historic Town Centre Improvements and Ipswich Town Centre Improvements – Ipswich Fit for the 21st Century

- A133 Improvements and Rapid Transit

- Colchester Park and Ride.
Flood Risk

4.60 The coastal location of the sub-region requires long term investment in adequate sea and flood defences. Importantly, some regeneration and development opportunities will not be able to proceed unless appropriate defences are created. Areas at particular risk – in relation to long term development plans – include Ipswich town centre and parts of Felixstowe. The Environment Agency has confirmed significant funding to deliver the Ipswich Flood Defence Strategy and it is prioritised within the Growth Point Fund priorities for 2008-11.

4.61 Moreover, many of the sub-region’s Coasts are dominated by Flood risk issues, creating major constraints to growth and the regeneration of coastal towns including Harwich and Jaywick. Suffolk Coastal, as part of its regeneration of Felixstowe, is currently benefiting from significant Environment Agency funding to increase flood protection.

Utility Provision

4.62 It is anticipated that planned growth will require a clear response in terms of the provision of utilities, especially water resources. An earlier study on Housing and Infrastructure (completed by RTP) noted that “the Environment Agency have commented that water resources in the area are fully committed and increased demand will have to be met by greater efficiency of use, although within this context, further water supply can be found. The measures they envisage include demand management through metering, building in efficiency into new dwellings through measures such as low flow taps and reducing leakage in the distribution system”.

4.63 A water cycle study was commissioned using 2007-8 Growth Point Funding. It provides a detailed analysis of the water cycle issues affecting the sub-region and has established a GIS tool to enable planning authorities to respond effectively and accurately to water cycle opportunities and constraints. Moreover, this has contributed to the utilities planning frameworks in their bids to regulators for additional funding to support the high levels of growth.

4.64 The provision of energy supply and future of Sizewell (C&D) are crucial growth issues facing this economy. The proximity of the Port of Felixstowe and BT InnovationMartlesham as well as significant housing growth places significant pressure on electricity provision on this peninsular.

4.65 The Nuclear Power Stations at Sizewell are a major economic driver for the area. They comprise Sizewell A, owned by Magnox South and Sizewell B, owned by British Energy. The nuclear power stations are some of the largest employers in Suffolk and the Haven Gateway, employing over 1280 people between them.

4.66 Sizewell A employs 418 permanent staff, 12 agency staff and 125 contractors. After ending 40 years of electrical generation on 31st December 2006, work began to decommission the power station. The existing workforce is currently being used to ‘self-perform’ deplanting activities, retaining valuable skills and employment within the area. During the station’s operational lifetime its twin Magnox reactors produced over 110 TWh of electricity. A typical day’s generation saw the station supply more than 10 million kWh of electricity.
Sizewell B employs 525 permanent British Energy staff from the local area and imports specific skilled workers from several different countries for the refuelling outage, which occurs every 18 months. It also employs over 200 full time staff from contract partners. It has a net electrical output of 1188MW, is capable of producing energy for over 1.5 million homes and supplies 3% of the UK’s entire electricity needs. Sizewell B is the UK’s newest nuclear power station and is the only one that uses a pressurised water reactor (PWR). Sizewell B injects some £30 million per annum into the local economy from salaries and local services.

The Government’s positive stance on nuclear energy suggests that there could be a third Sizewell ‘C’ station proposed for the site in the future. If this is the case, careful planning is needed regarding the provision of employment, skills and associated infrastructure. Any potential growth will need to be managed in order to promote sustainable and prosperous communities and ensure that the wealth generated is retained within the sub-region. Improvements to the A12 will be vital to enhance the economic viability of the site and to provide access to employment and training. Rail improvements will also be required for this purpose. Relevant skills provision will need to be in place in order that staff can be employed locally. It will also be important to retain employment land availability for the development of any associated industries and to encourage more local procurement for both goods and services.

Summary of specific challenges/opportunities and economic criteria for prioritisation

Even before the current down-turn, GVA growth across the whole of the Haven Gateway was projected to be lower than the regional average. There is a concern that – left to its own devices – economic growth will focus on low wage/low skill activities.

Skills levels across the Haven Gateway are relatively poor and in some areas, they are seriously weak; steps need to be taken to improve them.

Currently, the area performs relatively poorly on metrics of enterprise and entrepreneurship. In this context, there may still be a shortfall in relation to the supply premises for business start-ups (although existing initiatives are addressing this, to a limited extent).

Particularly in and around Colchester, employment land – although plentiful in supply – is of a poor quality and it is not conducive to added value economic growth.
• Within the Haven Gateway, there are some strong knowledge-based assets. These need to be harnessed effectively, especially in the creative industries, in ICT, and in environmental technologies.

• The urban functions (retail, services, etc.) of the larger urban areas are relatively weak and this links to the built form/urban realm. As the population grows, the issues relating to the economic vibrancy of town centres will need to be further addressed.

• Additionally, a number of coastal towns are in need of regeneration: there are pockets of severe deprivation in these communities, including in relation to labour market participation.

• Although the development process is a long one, the prospect of significant port expansion at Felixstowe and Harwich needs to be recognised, and potential economic opportunities need to be identified in response.

• The sub-region’s housing growth target remains a challenging one, despite performance to 2007. This is not helped by the downturn in the housing market and public funding will increasingly have to be used if these levels are to be retained to ensure that key sites are released onto the market at the required times to ensure the required flow of new homes. Additional land will need to be allocated for new housing – and further public sector intervention may be required – if progress is to be sustained.

• The provision of new affordable housing in the Haven Gateway area since 2001 has been less than a third of that sought by the RSS for the period 2008-2021 so this challenge is only going to become more acute, particularly in what are likely to be challenging economic times.

• In the drive to deliver these high levels of new housing, very careful attention will need to be given to the quality of this new stock, both in terms of its layout and design and its energy efficiency and generation.

• The provision of new physical infrastructure has until recently failed to keep pace with the growth in housing and population. This is probably most acute in the case of transport investment, both at a sub-regional level (A14, A120, F2N) and at the local, inter-urban, level.

• It is predicted that water resources will become increasingly stretched whilst, at the same time, the risk of coastal flooding will threaten parts of the area, including some of our towns.

• Energy supply, particularly on the Felixstowe peninsular, is a constraint to the both the port and the growth of Ipswich although the development of Sizewell and renewable energy offer real opportunities. The provision of the necessary electricity supply infrastructure may constrain growth unless improved planning and funding arrangements are put in place.
• The need to safeguard and create green lungs and corridors (both within towns and between them) will also become more important as the area continues to grow.

4.70 The credit crunch and severe economic downturn – which really started to bite in the latter part of 2008 – cast these challenges and opportunities with regard to growth in the Haven Gateway in a new light. Although the IDP is focused on the long term delivery of ambitions linked to the RES and East of England Plan – both of which were finalised in 2008 – the downturn does change some of the short term imperatives and it also presents some opportunities which need to be seized. Specifically, given that housing growth is now likely to slow over the short to medium term, there may be an opportunity to deliver some of the key infrastructure which will help to facilitate development when confidence in the housing market returns. But it should also be recognised that many key infrastructure projects which were due to be delivered by the private sector will now not move forward unless public sector assistance is provided as a fall in land values has significantly affected project viability and delivery from subsequent s106 agreements. Hence the imperative for short term action – in line with the long term ambitions of the IDP – has grown in the context of far more challenging economic conditions. The IDP itself should provide an evidenced basis from which a variety of public sector funders are able to respond.
5: Risks and uncertainties

Major uncertainties

5.1 Capital projects have within them major uncertainties and risks and these are traditionally addressed and monitored at increasing levels of detail as projects reach the point of delivery. At this stage the Investment Packages identify some of the key risks for their constituent projects but work on developing individual project templates in accordance with the IDP toolkit will enable a detailed risk register to be established (as part of the Haven Gateway’s programme management role – see below). Over and above project-specific risks, some of the wider principal issues include:

- **LDF Processes** – the Haven Gateway works with a number of district councils (i.e. local planning authorities) all of which have their own timetables for their local development frameworks. This has made the preparation of the IDP challenging, and means that each of the proposed developments has a different status and therefore different level of risk. As the region moves towards an integrated regional economic and spatial strategy – for which the IDP is, in some important respects, acting as a pathfinder – the greater co-ordination and possible joining-up of local development frameworks would be a real opportunity to reduce uncertainty. The RSS refresh will provide an opportunity to do this.

- **Private sector investment** – the delivery of growth in any sub-region is predicated on the private sector. In the Haven Gateway, this means, for example, generating the commercial confidence in sub-region to invest (in the ports for example), delivering the key sites at InnovationMartlesham, etc. Moreover, infrastructure and utilities provision is largely delivered by the private sector. Increasingly, these decisions are made on an international basis and therefore the sharing of priorities and vision of the sub-region to create climate of confidence and opportunity is of increasing importance. This has become all the more important in the context of the recent economic down-turn and credit crunch.

- **Programme management** – the delivery of the Integrated Development Programme requires a Programme Management approach. The Haven Gateway Partnership is well placed to do this. Through its enhanced Executive function and new growth point funding (2008-11), it has put in place a dedicated resource to oversee the delivery of this programme. Funding for this is identified within the Programme of Development.

- **Flood Risk** – increasingly development is being impacted by flood risk – both fluvial and coastal.

Major Investments which are outside the remit of the IDP

5.2 The Haven Gateway’s role as an International Gateway is of national importance and cannot be overstated. The expansion of its gateway, its sea ports, Stansted airport and the transport
corridors both into and within the area, particularly where they contribute to significant modal-shift, are of fundamental importance to future economic and housing growth. These investments tend to be the subject of national decision making rather than regional or indeed local and therefore the partnership’s major role is primarily one of influence. Critical wider investments include:

- **Felixstowe to Nuneaton railway** – an identified TENS priority. Through extensive lobbying, the Government has recently announced some £80 million funding to deliver gauge enhancement to F2N between Peterborough and Nuneaton which, when aligned to Hutchison ports investment between Felixstowe and Peterborough, will provide crucial investment in this line. However, in order to deliver the trans modal shift and increased capacity (so freeing up both passenger and freight lines), including CrossRail into and out of London, a capacity enhancement scheme is required. Recently turned down for multi-annual TIF finding (due to the project being insufficiently developed), the project has been identified as a priority by the East of England Regional Planning Panel and its scoping and development by Network Rail is a priority (with up to 30% match funding available from the EU).

- **A12/A120** – identified as a Trans European priority route (and therefore eligible to up to 20% match funding from the EU), the A12 and A120 are key constraints in the sub-region, and contribute directly to the perception of inaccessibility to the Gateway ports. Moreover, the dualling of the A120, from Hares Green to Harwich is likely to be a key constraint on the delivery of Bathside Bay.

- **A12/A14** - Both the A12 and A14 are the principal arterial routes to and from the Gateway and they meet at the Copdock interchange outside Ipswich – a key constraint. As trunk roads, the Partnership can only influence investment although further modelling of the A14 is an identified priority.

- **Sizewell C (and D)** – in the coming months, the Government will be clarifying its recommendations on future nuclear energy provision which will have significant implications on the sub-region both through potential de-commissioning and further provision.

- **Climate change** – of all the regions, the East of England is likely to be most affected by climate change and many of our key sites are impacted by flood risk – both coastal and fluvial – and the water cycle. Closer working between the Environment Agency, DEFRA, EEDA and the Haven Gateway Partnership to deliver common objectives to manage the impact of climate change, potential flood risk and future development is essential.
6: Investment Packages and priority interventions within them: Summary

6.1 The Packages that together comprise the Haven Gateway IDP are listed below (in no particular order):

**Thematic Packages**
- Transport
- Green infrastructure
- Tourism and Culture
- Housing
- Skills.

**Spatial Packages**
- IP-One – with a spatial focus on central Ipswich
- IPA-East – a spatial focus on the eastern part of the Ipswich Policy Area, which includes Adastral Park (InnovationMartlesham)
- North Colchester
- East Colchester
- Colchester Town Centre
- Haven Gateway Coastal Towns.

**Long Term Investment Package**
- Maximising our potential for further sustainable growth.

6.2 These Packages have been developed following the identification of – and in response to – clearly evidenced opportunities for and constraints to sustainable housing and/or economic growth. In summary terms, the table below distils the thirteen key challenges and opportunities that have been identified and evidenced in relation to the Haven Gateway’s growth ambitions, and the implications that follow; it then flags how the challenges and opportunities are being addressed/captured though priority interventions within the Packages. In highly summarised form, the table therefore provides a programme-level logic chain for the Haven Gateway IDP as a whole.
### Table 6-1: Summary logic chain for the Haven Gateway IDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Opportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a.                    | GVA growth across the whole of the Haven Gateway is projected to be lower than the regional average and there is a concern that – left to its own devices – economic growth will focus on low wage/low skill activities. | Four spatial packages have a strong focus on the scope and potential of the knowledge economy, and have identified priority interventions in response:  
  • IP-One – with a focus on UCS  
  • IPA-E – based around Adastral Park (InnovationMartlesham)  
  • East Colchester – with strong links to the University of Essex and its proposed Research Park  
  • Colchester Town Centre – with a focus on the creative industries.  
  The Skills thematic package acknowledges the major new investments being made at Colchester Institute and Suffolk New College that seek to support the growth of local knowledge based businesses.  
  The Long Term Package also includes proposals aimed at improving targeted economic development support to ensure the most advantageous take up of employment development opportunities being created through the spatial packages. |
| b.                    | Skills levels across the Haven Gateway are relatively poor and in some areas, they are seriously weak. | Interventions concerned directly with the skills of local people are identified in several of the spatial packages:  
  • IP-One – including the Phase II and III expansion of UCS, the Knowledge Innovation Hub and Suffolk New College  
  • IPA –East and increased working between BT and the HE sector  
  • East Colchester – Development of University of Essex.  
  Additionally, a Thematic Package focusing on skills has been identified with key priorities in relation to increasing the proportion of the population with level 4 skills and above and reducing the proportion with no qualifications. |
| c.                    | Currently, the area performs poorly on metrics of enterprise / entrepreneurship. In this context, there may still be a shortfall in relation to the supply of premises for business start-ups. | Investments aimed at encouraging higher rates of business start-up and survival are embedded in several of the spatial packages:  
  • IPA-E – including the development of InnovationMartlesham (Suffolk Innovation Park)  
  • IP-One – where new mixed use developments offer the opportunity for significant numbers of units for smaller businesses  
  • East Colchester – including plans for a Research Park linked to the University of Essex and mixed use development in the wider area  
  • Colchester Town Centre – including emerging plans for the provision of business space linked to the creative and cultural sector  
  • North Colchester – with plans for new business space at Cuckoo Farm and business incubator units at Colchester Business Park. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Opportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Particularly in and around Colchester, employment land – although plentiful in supply – is of a poor quality and it is not conducive to added value economic growth.</td>
<td>There is a need to identify and safeguard high quality sites, while recognising the growing importance of provision outside of the B Use Classes.</td>
<td>Several of the Spatial Investment Packages respond to this imperative including, most directly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• IPA-East – with the potential for strategic employment provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• North Colchester – with significant employment provision in a strategic location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Haven Gateway Coastal Towns Package includes provision for employment generation in the towns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additionally, the longer term package looks at the master planning of key sites, an employment land study in Suffolk, economic development support to ensure the sub-region capitalises on its opportunities for employment growth and achieving the release of major employment development sites at Sproughton and Brantham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Within the Haven Gateway, there are some strong knowledge-based assets which need to be harnessed effectively, especially in the creative industries, in ICT, and in environmental technologies.</td>
<td>In order to achieve sustainable economic growth as part of the wider growth agenda, it will be imperative to provide the physical infrastructure consistent with the needs of priority sectors and clusters.</td>
<td>Several of the Spatial Packages have a strong sectoral focus. For example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• IPA-East – is built around the needs of the ICT cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• East Colchester – is premised around knowledge-based activity, including that relating to ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Colchester Town Centre and IP-One – both have a focus around the creative and cultural sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once again economic development support as proposed in the Long Term Package may be needed to harness these opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The urban functions (retail, services, etc.) of the larger urban areas are relatively weak and – at least in Ipswich and Clacton-on-Sea – this links to the built form/urban realm. Issues relating to the economic vibrancy of town centres need to be addressed.</td>
<td>There is a need to recognise the importance of vibrant town centres in the context of sustainable growth and from the perspective of provision for both housing and jobs growth targets.</td>
<td>The importance of achieving town centre renaissance (including interventions linked to the public realm) is at the heart of a number of the Spatial Investment Packages including, especially:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Colchester Town Centre and IP-One – the Packages relating to the town centres of Colchester and Ipswich respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• at a smaller scale, similar imperatives are defined in relation to the Haven Gateway Coastal Towns Package and the Longer Term Package that encompasses market towns such as Sudbury and Stowmarket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Several coastal towns are in need of regeneration: there are pockets of severe deprivation in these communities, including in relation to labour market participation.</td>
<td>A particular response is needed in relation to these settlements, recognising that coastal towns face a number of shared regeneration issues although some are also set for growth.</td>
<td>Within the IDP, there is a Spatial Package focusing on Coastal towns – an emerging package which is addressing the need for renaissance and revival in the sub-region’s smaller urban centres and rural areas. In part this is being addressed through the Partnership’s Economic Participation Interventions. These interventions will be underpinned by planned action within the Tourism and Culture Package that includes measures to address obstacles to the growth of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Although the development process is a long one, the prospect of significant port expansion at Felixstowe and Harwich needs to be recognised, and potential economic opportunities need to be identified in response.</td>
<td>The full potential of ports development – and the risks linked to it – needs to be factored into long term thinking about investment priorities.</td>
<td>Within the IDP, there is a need to further develop the growth potential linked to port development at Felixstowe and Harwich. The DryPorts initiative (Long Term Package) led by the Haven Gateway is already starting to identify the issues involved (e.g. the Felixstowe Port Logistics Study demonstrating that there is not enough land available) and this will enable appropriate action to be orchestrated and delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Gateway function of the Ports is also recognised in terms of tourism and alongside the regeneration of the coastal towns, these Packages will need to be developed over the months ahead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 Felixstowe Port Logistics Study, Final Report, Royal Haskoning October 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Opportunity</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>How the Haven Gateway IDP responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. The provision of new affordable housing in the Haven Gateway since 2001 has been less than a third of that sought by the RSS for the period 2008-2021 so the delivery challenge is acute, particularly if the backlog of provision is to be addressed.</td>
<td>It is important that progress is made in the delivery of housing per se. Additionally, mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing need to be used more effectively, consistently and well.</td>
<td>Across all the Packages which include a significant element of housing delivery (i.e. all six Spatial Packages), there is a commitment to deliver a high proportion of affordable housing, but whilst not surprising in the early years of delivery, affordability is very much behind trajectory. Partly because of this, a Thematic Package focused on Housing has been identified which aims to develop measures to assist the delivery of the target of up to 1,100 affordable units annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The provision of new physical infrastructure is currently failing to keep pace with the growth in housing and population. This is probably most acute in the case of transport investment, both at a sub-regional level (A14, A120, F2N) and at the local, inter-urban, level.</td>
<td>Additional investment is essential and the timing of it needs to be phased appropriately. In parallel, there is an imperative to effect a modal shift – away from car use towards public transport, walking and cycling.</td>
<td>The IDP makes a reasoned case for targeted infrastructure investment, both within the Spatial Investment Packages and in a separate thematic package focusing on Transport interventions. The key interventions here are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Utility provision (energy and water resources) will become increasingly stretched and, at the same time, the risk of coastal flooding will threaten parts of the area, including some of our towns.</td>
<td>The infrastructure implications linked to these utilities and flood risk need to be addressed in planning for sustainable growth.</td>
<td>Utilities provision (including for example electricity supply within IPA-East and the Water Cycle and Renewables Study currently being addressed through the Long Term Package) are critical constraints to growth and the results and implications of the studies proposed will inform future iterations of the IDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. The need to safeguard and create green lungs and corridors (both within towns and between them) will also become more important as the area continues to grow.</td>
<td>As above, Green Infrastructure needs to be designed into the Haven Gateway’s future growth.</td>
<td>Included within the IDP is a Thematic Package with a focus on Green Infrastructure. This includes a range of projects, the most significant of which are those that will provide access to areas of Natural Green Space within high growth urban areas (e.g. Ipswich “River for All” and Belstead Brook Park), as well as the strategic provision of such space around and between urban areas e.g. Suffolk Sandlings (3,500 ha) and South Colchester Green Wheel and North and East Ipswich Green Arc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed description of each of the Packages is provided in the chapters that follow.
PART B

THEMATIC PACKAGES
7: Transport

Introduction

7.1 A number of transport measures are integrated within the individual Spatial Investment Packages. However, in recognition of the sub-region’s key role as an International Gateway, we are also advocating a specific Thematic Package with a transport focus.

7.2 In recent months, the Haven Gateway Transport Board has been reconfigured to generate a more coherent transport strategy for the sub-region, focusing on ensuring that Growth Point Funding and applications to the Community Infrastructure Fund reflect the immediate and greatest priorities. These have been agreed on the basis of:

- the impacts of specific proposals in seeking to secure economic and housing growth
- the deliverability of particular proposals.

7.3 With regard to the first imperative, the Board has been influenced and informed by the findings of the Eddington Transport Study\(^1\). This found that the performance of the UK’s transport networks will be a crucial enabler of sustained productivity growth and overall competitiveness. Two underlying arguments – both of great cogency in relation to the wider rationale for the Haven Gateway IDP – were cited:

- firstly, good transport systems support the productivity of urban areas, supporting deep and productive labour markets, and allowing businesses to reap the benefits of agglomeration
- secondly, transport corridors are the arteries of domestic and international trade, boosting the competitiveness of the UK economy.

7.4 On this basis, Eddington concluded that “strategic economic priorities for long term transport policy should be growing and congested urban areas and their catchments; the key inter-urban corridors; and key international gateways”. Transport priorities for the Haven Gateway have been defined in this context. All of these are important locally, but others are also of regional or national significance; the latter are flagged within this Thematic Package, but the expectation of partners is that they will and must also be advanced purposefully through regional and national processes.

7.5 In terms of national processes, the Government has recently published a response to the Eddington Report\(^2\). This repeatedly acknowledges the importance of International Gateways to the UK economy and specifically identifies the Haven Ports and the transport corridors linking them to London (the A12) and the Midlands (the A14) as being part of the country’s core strategic transport infrastructure. It also states that the Government is committed to supporting the improvement of surface access to airports and ports, and has a direct delivery

\(^1\) The Eddington Transport Study: The case for action – Sir Rod Eddington’s advice to government, December 2006
\(^2\) Delivering a Sustainable Transport System, Department for Transport, November 2008
role in part-funding schemes to improve the strategic national network. It notes that container traffic into this country has grown rapidly and is expected to continue to grow in both volume and importance.

7.6 Accordingly, it has launched a programme of funding for small high-value international gateway schemes to address long-term problems in congested areas. One of the four projects in this new programme relates to the A12 and is a large-scale package of traffic management measures to address reliability, congestion and safety issues on this vital freight route to and from the Haven Gateway Ports.

7.7 On the national road network, the Government has pledged to put in place a £6bn programme of major road improvements up to 2014, aimed at supporting economic and housing growth and improving safety. Details of the programme are expected to be announced in early 2009.

7.8 In terms of rail improvements to the Haven Ports, the first phase of work to increase the gauge of the rail link (so that it can handle 9’6’’ containers) and to increase rail freight capacity between Felixstowe and Peterborough has been completed, and the second phase (facilitating rail freight movement through to Nuneaton) is funded by Government and in Network Rail’s investment programme for 2009–14.

Description of the Package

7.9 The transport Theme Package within the IDP is concerned with capital investments in relation to transport at all scales – from the strategic (national) road and rail infrastructure (as set out above), through initiatives which are regional in their effect, to much more local schemes. It is recognised that a range of investment processes – including those which are strongly influenced by the private sector – will be required in implementation.

7.10 There are two principal objectives within this Thematic Package. The first is to ensure the reliability, efficient use and resilience of the strategic road and rail networks in the Haven Gateway, by maximising the movement of freight by rail, and tackling capacity and congestion issues at key locations including the Ports. This objective underscores the significant role of the sub-region as a premier international gateway, and its influence on the performance of the wider regional and national economy.

7.11 The second objective is more local in focus and its emphasis is on ensuring that places facing high levels of growth within the Haven Gateway Sub Region – particularly the major urban centres of Ipswich and Colchester – function better in transport terms. Hence the second objective is to ensure that, within the congested urban centres, greater use is made of sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport, and less use made of private vehicles for local trips.

7.12 A critical element that underpins the transport package is the need for transport modelling within the sub region. DCLG funding is being used to develop two models covering the wider urban areas around Colchester and Ipswich, that can interface with the Highways Agency’s more strategic regional transport model. There is a need to evaluate the impact of the proposed expansion in dwellings and employment and to seek to reach agreement with Government on the essential transport infrastructure necessary to support the proposed level
of expansion. Transport modelling facilities are essential to allow this evaluation to take place.

**Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS**

7.13 The Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) is embedded within the East of England Plan and it provides a framework for the delivery of transport investment and policy priorities to support the aims of the RSS. The overall aim of the RTS is to ensure that the East of England benefits from increased accessibility whilst minimising the impact on the environment and inhabitants of the region; to this end, four objectives and nine outcomes are identified. Within the new Regional Economic Strategy, transport improvements are identified as one of eight goals. Heavily informed by the arguments of the Eddington study (cited above), the stated intent is to maximise the economic benefits of the RTS framework by:

- fully exploiting the economic opportunities arising from the development of international gateways
- supporting productivity growth arising from agglomeration in the region’s growing cities and towns
- enhancing productivity through improved connectivity on the key inter-urban network.

7.14 As both an international gateway and home to two of the region’s fastest-growing urban areas, it is evident that the transport priorities of the Haven Gateway are aligned strongly with those set out in both the RES and the RSS. Delivering these priorities should generate positive impacts of both local and regional/national significance, and hence contribute to the objectives of the two key regional strategies.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (linking to logic chain(s))**

7.15 This Thematic Package is concerned with responding to all three of the economic priorities for strategic transport priorities identified by Eddington and reinforced by the RES. Specifically, it is concerned with:

- realising the economic and other opportunities linked to the potential of the Haven Ports, both at current capacity and – more importantly – in the context of clear expansion plans
- facilitating inter-urban connectivity, particularly between the functional urban areas of Colchester and Ipswich, thereby increasing the scope for pan-Haven Gateway agglomeration economies
- improving the effectiveness of connections and connectivity within the sub-region’s two principal urban areas of Colchester and Ipswich.

7.16 As set out in earlier chapters of the IDP, a good proportion of the additional 65,000 homes and 50,000 jobs will be located in or close to the urban areas of Ipswich and Colchester. The
transport priorities identified here aim to facilitate the growth process at these key locations and realise the agglomeration benefits that ought to ensue, along with the potential benefits of further investment in the Haven Gateway Ports. Some – e.g. the A133 Improvements – relate directly to specific Spatial Packages and ought to be seen as integral to them. Others – e.g. Copdock Interchange improvements – are concerned with the functioning of the sub-region as a whole and need to be understood more broadly in terms of their impacts.

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

7.17 Given the nature of the Thematic Package, it is appropriate to identify the most important investments in relation to each of the two objectives.

*Priority investments in relation to the first objective (to ensure the reliability, efficient use and resilience of the strategic road and rail networks in the Haven Gateway, by maximising the movement of freight by rail and tackling capacity and congestion issues at key locations including the Ports)*

**Felixstowe to Nuneaton Railway Line**

7.18 Improvements to the rail lines linking the port of Felixstowe to the west coast main line at Nuneaton are required to accommodate large containers and to improve capacity. Gauge and capacity enhancements between Felixstowe and Nuneaton should ensure that rail freight movements can be moved east-west from Felixstowe and Harwich to Nuneaton and the west coast main line and avoid the existing and congested route via the north London Line. In addition, it is considered that this may in turn free up train paths and facilitate additional passenger services into and out of London on the Great Eastern Line. It could also provide sufficient capacity to improve passenger services on the Ipswich - Peterborough route. Improvements to the Felixstowe to Nuneaton Railway Line are the partnership’s highest priority in seeking to ensure the continued national importance of the Haven ports, and to ensure that planned growth of the ports can be accommodated.

7.19 The draft Regional Freight Strategy for the East of England made the assumption that gauge enhancements to allow W10 intermodal trains will be delivered on two parts of this route:

- Felixstowe – Peterborough: funded by Hutchison Ports (UK) – now completed

7.20 Additionally, a series of individual capacity improvement schemes along the entire route from Haven Gateway to Nuneaton are being developed. Currently these are unfunded.

*Increased capacity on the A12, A14 and A120*

7.21 Within the Haven Gateway, there are three major road arteries which are critical in relation to movement within the sub-region:

---

• the A12 – which links Ipswich and Colchester (and continues NE to Lowestoft and SW to Chelmsford, London and the M25 Motorway) and was the focus of the recent A12 Commission of Inquiry

• the A14 – which links Felixstowe and Ipswich (and continues west to Cambridge and Huntingdon and on into the Midlands via the M6 and M1 Motorways)

• the A120 – which links Harwich (port) and Colchester (and continues west to Stansted Airport and the M11 Motorway).

7.22 Capacity issues have been identified on all three routes, many at link level (e.g. Orwell Bridge on the A14) or at junctions\(^4\). In this context, specific junction improvements and/or other investments have been identified as a priority:

• improvements to the Copdock Interchange (A12/A14) to tackle congestion and increase capacity

• accelerating delivery of a new A12 junction at Cuckoo Farm and the associated Northern Approaches roads to enable access to new developments north of Colchester (included in the North Colchester Spatial Package).

Other priorities linked to the strategic transport infrastructure

7.23 Two further priorities have been identified with regard to the Haven Gateway’s road network:

• **Operation Stack**: This is the management plan used by Suffolk Police when traffic heading to the Port of Felixstowe builds up on the A14. Initially, if the Port is closed, container vehicles are queued, or ‘stacked’, in the on-port holding areas. However, when these areas are full and traffic begins queuing on the A14, ‘Operation Stack’ is implemented to help manage this traffic. Hence Operation Stack is important in maintaining the reliability of the A14 and, on a short term basis, managing congestion. Investment to provide facilities for stacking affected lorries off-highway is essential to prevent increased congestion on the trunk and local roads.

• **A133 Improvements**: This is a long recognised scheme that is critical to North Colchester’s development plans (and hence it links closely with the North Colchester Spatial Package). It includes provision for bus priority measures, walking and cycling infrastructure improvements, capacity improvements at critical locations and introduction of traffic management measures in the congested A133 area\(^5\).

**Priority investments in relation to the second objective (to ensure that, within the congested urban centres, greater use is made of sustainable transport modes, such as walking, cycling and public transport and less use made of private vehicles for local trips)**

7.24 Commuting to and within the urban areas of Colchester and Ipswich makes a large contribution to peak hour congestion in the towns and also adds to the pressure on the A12

\(^4\) Haven Gateway Ipswich A14 Corridor Study, Atkins, Final Report, July 2007

\(^5\) Community Infrastructure Fund – Expression of Interest see http://consultation.colchester.gov.uk/doclib/EB_088_final_CIF_bid_A133_improvements.pdf
and A14. The partnership’s intention is to reduce the demands on the road network from car commuting, by achieving an increase in the proportion of local trips carried out by more sustainable modes of transport.

- **Park and Ride:** This is a priority in both Colchester (linked to the new Cuckoo Farm A12 Junction and the North Colchester Spatial Package) and Ipswich (linked to the IPA-East Package). It is a critical element of the sustainable transport package for the Haven Gateway and will relieve congestion on the town centre networks and key radial routes. By providing car parking on the outskirts of the town and priority routes to key destinations, Park and Ride will remove vehicles from the urban area and encourage sustainable travel patterns, improving air quality, road safety and quality of life for residents and visitors.

- **Colchester Town Centre / Colchester Urban Area Package:** This includes further transport improvements to Colchester as a KCDC. The main focus of these projects is to improve the sustainable transport network in the town, delivering improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure and bus priority measures, to enable and encourage growth to take place in a sustainable manner and to reduce congestion and its impacts on the network and environment.

- **Ipswich – Fit for the 21st Century:** This is a major scheme to transform the opportunities for sustainable travel in the key development areas of Ipswich. The scheme includes new bus stations, a state of the art traffic control system, real time bus information and wide scale improvements to make it easier to walk and cycle around Ipswich. It was submitted as a major scheme within Suffolk County Council’s LTP. The scheme was put forward as a priority for delivery by the region through the 2006 RFA process and has been included on DfT’s indicative list of schemes for delivery during the period 2009/10-2015/16. Suffolk County Council is working towards the submission of a Major Scheme Business Case early in 2009 with an anticipated start of works in 2010/11.

- **Demand Management Strategies:** Within the urban areas, the large growth in housing and employment will create additional travel demands on already congested urban networks. The provision of sufficient additional road capacity to accommodate these demands in their entirety is neither desirable nor deliverable in central areas. Local strategies are being developed to reduce the demand for car based journeys, particularly in peak periods. Elements in the toolkit include school and workplace travel plans, parking restraint and pricing, and the reallocation of road space to favour more sustainable forms of transport. Development control policies and standards for new developments will play an important part in reducing future traffic demand to acceptable levels.

- **Increased Uptake of Public Transport:** Measures will be taken to increase the use of public transport, alongside steps to reduce traffic demand. For travel within the urban areas, buses are the predominant mode of public transport. Schemes are being developed to improve the quality and reliability of the whole bus passenger

---

*Taken from Haven Gateway Ipswich A14 Corridor Study, Atkins, Final Report, July 2007*
experience. These schemes will deliver better waiting facilities, real time information, priority for buses in congested areas and, through quality bus partnerships, better vehicles.

Rail is an important public transport mode for longer distance commuting to London and Cambridge but also provides connections between the major settlements within the sub-region. There are also important rail links into the urban centres from their hinterlands. Improvements to capacity, frequency and quality of service on the Felixstowe to Ipswich and East Suffolk rail lines, as well as the main Liverpool Street to Norwich mainline, will make it possible to increase the use of rail within and beyond the sub-region. Improvements required include proposals for a loop on the East Suffolk line to support an increased frequency of service.

- **Cycling:** Within the settlements, cycling is an ideal mode of transport. In busy urban areas cycling is usually the quickest mode of travel for trips of up to about three miles. Regular cycling also brings substantial health benefits to individuals. The development of strong cycling cultures in the urban areas will play a big part in reducing the adverse effects of congestion and more easily facilitating the levels of proposed development.

  The “Ipswich – transport fit for the 21st century” scheme will deliver qualitative improvements to facilities for cycling, and for walking, in central Ipswich. The Ipswich transport strategy also has strong proposals to increase cycling levels throughout the town and the wider area.

  In the summer of 2008, Colchester secured Cycling Town status from Cycling England, one of 11 towns awarded this status in the country. Cycling England awarded Colchester £2.1m to deliver improvements to the cycling network in the town, provide cycle training to existing and new user groups, and undertake associated marketing. These improvements will assist in the delivery of sustainable growth in the town and reduce urban congestion. Match funding for these improvements is required.

- **Various walking/cycling projects (many defined within the Green Infrastructure Plan):** The Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies the provision of connected cycleways and walkways as a key component of its delivery framework. This improved connectivity can therefore be regarded as a major contribution to the transport strategy for the Haven Gateway. It also provides alternative and sustainable access to open space provision.

- **Enhancement of the Felixstowe to Harwich Foot Ferry:** Finally in terms of improved connectivity, the redevelopment of Felixstowe South provides a window of opportunity to secure the long term and broader use of the Harwich/Shotley to Felixstowe foot ferry, not only for leisure use but also to improve accessibility to the peninsulas, including in relation to employment opportunities.
Transport Modelling

Development of the Transport Thematic Package is underpinned by a need to upgrade the quality of transport modelling within the sub-region, and to this end, CLG Growth Point funding has been secured in 2008/09 and this work is ongoing. This modelling will not only support the evidence base for local LDFs but also provide a key evidence base to:

- support the preparation of Major Scheme Business Cases, including for the “Ipswich - Transport Fit for the 21st Century” scheme, Colchester Park and Ride, and Colchester A133 Improvements
- provide a sub-regional input into the development of the region’s advice linked to the Regional Funding Allocations (RFA)
- support key development work across Network Rail and the Highways Agency.

Timing and critical path

Measures to reduce congestion within the urban areas of Colchester and Ipswich, and to increase the use of sustainable transport modes, will be dependent on the implementation of the Essex and Suffolk Local Transport Plans and the availability of funding from developers, Department for Transport and DCLG.

The timing of improvements to the rail network will depend on the availability of funding to Network Rail from Government and from developers. Improvements to the trunk road network are also in part dependent on developer funding, but in the main on the availability of Government funding.

Short term funding in 2008/09 for modelling work is critical in the preparation of bids for Government funding for transport projects in the Colchester and Ipswich areas, in both the present and following years.

Scoring of Projects

At this stage in their development it has not been possible to score projects on a consistent basis but this will be addressed shortly. Some initial scoring is provided in Table 7-1. This is subject to review.

Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts

The Transport Thematic Package is potentially the largest in terms of the scale of the interventions and costs involved. In order to achieve the necessary improvements to the strategic road and rail network serving the sub-region, Government funding of over £2 billion will be needed over the next 20 years. The Haven Gateway Partnership is determined to keep lobbying for this investment but recognises that this is a longer term ambition. The costings currently identified within the Transport Package are therefore confined at this stage to the shorter term.
7.31 In terms of transport modelling work, the estimated cost is £1.9 million (£700,000 for the Suffolk element and £1.2 million for the work in Essex) with £1.3 million of this sought from CLG.

7.32 Work is underway to develop a clearer understanding of the costs, benefits and impacts of an indicative list of major transport schemes across the sub-region.

**Risks/risk mitigation**

7.33 The principal risks to schemes in this package are a lack of funding for their implementation or completion, which bids for CLG funding over the 2008-2010 period have sought to address, and potential cost overruns, where the risks can best be managed through tight contract specification. For those schemes involving restraint on travel demand, concerted public opposition is a potential risk to be addressed as far as possible through extensive and comprehensive public consultation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe to Nuneaton Railway Line</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased capacity: A12, A14 and A120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copdock Interchange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A133 Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Stacking and Lorry Park A14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col &amp; Tending Transport Model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Transport to support LDF growth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col North Station Masterplan and station Travel Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Col Rapid Transport Corridor and linked A133 improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Urban Transport Package</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Cycling Town</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suffolk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich – Fit for the 21st Century</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Strategic Network modelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesgrave/Martlesham Devlts Transport Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh and South Suffolk Transport Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmswell Relief Road and Bridge (Mid Suffolk)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowmarket Passenger Transport facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe/Shotley foot ferry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8: Green Infrastructure

Haven Gateway and Green Infrastructure

8.1 The Haven Gateway Framework for Growth (approved by the Haven Gateway Partnership Board in September 2007) states that ‘the natural environment makes an essential contribution to the quality of life in the Haven Gateway and is one of its principal assets, attracting tourists and workers as well as providing essential recreational opportunities’. Within the context of seeking to improve the Haven Gateway’s “Quality of Place”, Green Infrastructure is recognised as a key asset in relation to the area’s wider ambitions.

8.2 Green Infrastructure relates to the network of protected sites, nature reserves, greenspaces and greenway linkages within the Haven Gateway. The linkages include river corridors and flood plains, migration routes and features of the landscape, which are of importance as wildlife corridors. Green Infrastructure should provide for multi-functional uses (i.e. wildlife, recreational and cultural experiences), as well as delivering ecological services such as flood protection and microclimate control. It should also operate at all spatial scales from urban centres through to open countryside and has strong links with Tourism and Culture.

8.3 Advancing the early progress set out in the Framework for Growth, the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy (HaGGIS) was launched in June 2008. The Strategy, building on the work of the then-Countryside Agency’s ‘Access to the Countryside in and around Towns’ initiative, identifies gaps in provision and plans for multi-purpose uses, and fits a living green asset into the plans for economic regeneration and development. It provides an overarching strategy for the sub-region together with more detailed landscape frameworks for key settlements. The thinking is that this will drive the environmental regeneration of towns and the countryside and the connections between them, supporting the move towards more sustainable living. The strategy identifies a number of overarching principles for the sub-region, as follows:

- integrate green infrastructure provision and management into development proposals
- champion the role that green infrastructure assets play in delivering a high quality of life
- promote an integrated approach to green infrastructure provision and management that provides recreational opportunities for people whilst maintaining and enhancing the exceptional natural and historic environment within the Haven Gateway
- create green infrastructure that reflects the ethos and character of the Haven Gateway
- increase everyone’s understanding of, and ability to take action for, green infrastructure.
**Description of the Package**

8.4 The Green Infrastructure Thematic Package has been developed in response to the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy. The challenge for the Haven Gateway is to make the most of existing environmental assets, providing important opportunities for recreation, exercise and well-being as well as offering opportunities for economic growth, while understanding, managing and protecting sensitive sites.

8.5 The Green Infrastructure Strategy is a long term venture. It identified over 160 opportunities/project proposals. The Green Infrastructure Thematic Package seeks to advance this but it takes as its starting point schemes and projects which were prioritised to be the subject of bids for CLG funding support under the 2008-2011 New Growth Points Funding Round. Following discussion with stakeholders, this list of priorities was further revised. The package now includes a strengthening of Haven Gateway staff resources to support the immediate delivery of Green Infrastructure, drawn from an initial list of seven specific studies and projects to be delivered over the three year period 2008-11 and to develop plans for longer term projects beyond 2011. These schemes build on the sub-region’s existing natural assets and would help meet the future needs of both the current and incoming population. The immediate projects included in this Thematic Package are summarised in Table 8-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>LAD</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Proposer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich River Corridor “River for All”</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
<td>River corridor enhancement linked to extensive new housing areas.</td>
<td>Continuation of riverside cycleway, including widening for cycle use, access links, new bridges linking communities, warden post and other facilities and pocket parks. Improves links to existing greenspace for new residents and increases biodiversity value of local nature reserve and CWSs.</td>
<td>Greenways project / IBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich – Belstead Brook Park</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
<td>New volunteer centre to promote community action, training and capacity building, for future management of GI.</td>
<td>To improve access to, within and around the informal county park – particularly linking to new development and existing residential areas.</td>
<td>Greenways project / IBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins Farm Country Park Extension</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility study into the potential to develop the Hythe Lagoons as a new area of open space for East Colchester Regeneration Area.</td>
<td>To investigate the potential to develop the area surrounding the lagoons as Accessible Natural Green Space and open space to serve East Colchester</td>
<td>Colchester BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Naze, open space improvement</td>
<td>Tending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tending DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers Gipping and Rat enhancement scheme</td>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Suffolk DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harwich Linear Park</td>
<td>Tendring</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>An accessible, effectively managed linear park between the A120 and Parkeston.</td>
<td>The area has been identified as deficient in local and strategic accessible natural greenspace. The park area would be managed to become accessible to 22,000 households in a key employment and housing growth area.</td>
<td>Tendring DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Wilding of the Suffolk Sandlings</td>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>Initial planning study into innovative ways to break down physical barriers and create a “New Forest” type landscape that benefits wildlife and provides a strategically important recreational resource.</td>
<td>Important to increase the capacity of the Sandlings to provide a recreational resource for an increasing population. Links to the proposed increase of 20,000 dwellings in the Ipswich Policy Area.</td>
<td>Suffolk Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title</td>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Proposer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Centre at Abbotts Hall Farm</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>An education centre and interpretation of a 283ha coastal arable farm which is a showcase for sustainable coastal management.</td>
<td>Currently no interpretation of the site for schools and other visitors.</td>
<td>Essex Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Colchester Green Wheel Corridors</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project to improve, create and link sites in the south Colchester area and provide access to the wider countryside.</td>
<td>To support provision of 4000 new homes in the Colchester and Stanway areas.</td>
<td>Colchester BC and Essex Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and East Ipswich Green Arc</td>
<td>Ipswich, Mid Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>Potentially c100 incl. new &amp; improved existing sites</td>
<td>Project to improve, create and link sites in north and east Ipswich in order to create a green arc around the edge of the town and out towards the Suffolk Sandlings.</td>
<td>To help to provide access to green space for the 15,400 dwellings to be built in Ipswich Borough and the 4600 to be built in the Ipswich Fringe within adjoining districts between 2001 and 2021.</td>
<td>Ipswich BC, Mid Suffolk DC, Suffolk Coastal DC, Suffolk CC, Suffolk Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure Implementation Team</td>
<td>Colchester, Tendring, Babergh, Ipswich, Mid Suffolk, Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>An implementation team to work closely with LA planning staff to ensure that the Green Infrastructure Strategy is properly integrated into Local Development Frameworks and Regeneration Projects.</td>
<td>To ensure that projects prioritised for Growth Point funding are implemented on time and co-ordinated with other site delivery and regeneration projects in the Haven Gateway Sub Region.</td>
<td>Haven Gateway Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe Port Green Corridor</td>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Project to extend the existing Trimley Nature Reserve, develop visitor facilities and improve sustainable access from Ipswich.</td>
<td>To support the 20,000 additional homes to be provided between 2001 and 2021 in Ipswich and its fringes, including those required to support anticipated employment growth at Felixstowe Port.</td>
<td>Suffolk Coastal DC, Suffolk Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS**

8.6 The Haven Gateway Sub-Region has a unique and exceptional natural environment which needs to be managed carefully in the context of planned growth. The Regional Spatial Strategy notes that the sub-region has a series of international and national landscape and ecological designations. The Dedham Vale and large parts of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty run through the area, and all of the estuaries have national and international designations for nature conservation.

8.7 These areas are close to anticipated locations for growth and regeneration. However, as well as being a possible constraint on some development, the attractive environment plays a key role in defining the character of the sub-region and is one of the foundations for its economic success. There is a need to take into account the impact of these factors in relation to growth and regeneration, in accordance with other policies in the RSS on protecting and enhancing the environment.

8.8 Key elements of both the Haven Gateway and Regional Spatial Strategy visions are to deliver a high quality environment for residents, workers and visitors by, among other things, protecting and enhancing high quality, attractive natural assets. The Green Infrastructure package will make a major contribution towards the achievement of this objective by enhancing existing assets and providing a network of multi-functional accessible greenspace. The objective cannot be fully delivered without significant investment in Green Infrastructure.

8.9 Although provision of Green Infrastructure is not a central concern of the Regional Economic Strategy, such provision will nevertheless contribute to RES objectives by, for example, increasing the attractiveness of the Haven Gateway as a location in which to live, work and invest.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (linking to logic chain(s))**

8.10 The natural environment makes an essential contribution to the quality of life in the Haven Gateway and is one of its principal assets, attracting tourists and workers as well as providing essential recreational opportunities. There is a need to ensure that development contributes to an improved environment by requiring high standards of design, protecting and enhancing environmental assets, and providing green space and related infrastructure. HaGGIS identifies a number of themes around which to define principles through which greenspace should be provided and managed. These include:

- access (promotion, enhancement and creation of greenways, corridors and linkages)
- biodiversity (protection, enhancement, creation, mitigation and monitoring of biodiversity resources)
- landscape (safeguarding protected landscapes and landscape character types, promoting landscape distinctiveness and exploring landscape capacity)
• historic environment (understanding, protecting, managing and enhancing historic resources).

8.11 The implementation of the different elements will make a major contribution to the achievement of sustainable development in an area of significant planned growth in housing and employment, as envisaged in the Regional Spatial Strategy, and consistent with the Government’s vision for sustainable communities.

8.12 HaGGIS states that ‘there are likely to be many competing calls on Section 106 or roof tariff funds but Accessible Natural Greenspace at 500ha, 60ha and 20ha is much needed within the Haven Gateway Growth Point’. Proposals for new development should therefore take account of their contribution to and impact on Green Infrastructure.

**The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package**

8.13 Across the different substantive schemes, the two highest priorities are seen as the Ipswich River Corridor (“River for All”) and Belstead Brook Park projects.

8.14 Strengthening of Haven Gateway staff resources by the creation of a Green Infrastructure Implementation Team is also important, since this team would add value by driving forward specific schemes already identified in the package and others to be added as the package evolves. The team is key to implementation and co-ordination of the overarching package.

8.15 Other high priority projects are those which would enhance or facilitate the improvement of the strategic Green Infrastructure resource and are well related to major areas of existing population and proposed housing growth. These include the feasibility study into the re-wilding of the Suffolk Sandlings, and specific enhancements on the fringes of Ipswich and Colchester through the North and East Ipswich Green Arc and the South Colchester Green Wheel projects.

**Scoring of projects**

8.16 Across the projects identified above, the table below indicates the scores that have been given to them by local partners – against agreed criteria for IDPs as a whole. At this stage it has not been possible to determine numerical scores for the projects in this package, but as shown in the table, high and medium priority levels have been identified and these projects have been selected from a long list of over 160.
### Table 8-2: Scores for projects within the GI Thematic Package (under development)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich River Corridor “River for All”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich – Belstead Brook Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martins Farm Country Park Extension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Hythe Lagoons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Naze, open space improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers Gipping and Rat enhancement scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Harwich Linear Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Wilding of the Suffolk Sandlings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Centre at Abbots Hall Farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Colchester Green Wheel Corridors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and East Ipswich Green Arc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure Implementation Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe Port Green Corridor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Fit” should range from 3 (high) to 1 (low) in relation to the criterion. “Fit” should be multiplied by “weight” to achieve a “score”. The scores from each of the domains should then be summed in the final column.
**Timing and critical path**

8.17 HaGGIS covers the period to 2012. It suggests that the Schedule of Opportunities ‘should be incorporated into a more detailed phased action plan, to be updated every two years, that incorporates a strategy for governance, funding, promotion and further community and stakeholder engagement’. All projects currently identified in the Green Infrastructure Thematic Package are believed to be deliverable within the three years 2008-2011.

8.18 HaGGIS suggests the establishment of a steering group to oversee the implementation of the strategy, with lower-level area steering groups.

**Role of Steering Group**

- overseeing of the overall delivery of the strategy
- the setting of targets and outputs for the strategy and the monitoring of impacts of the priority projects
- coordination of project development and bidding to the Department of Community and Local Government
- dedicated staff to oversee delivery of the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy
- coordination of promotion and community engagement
- engagement is sought from the private sector
- buy-in at Haven Gateway Partnership Board level and with local authority members
- a broader network/forum developed to disseminate best practice and gather feedback among stakeholder groups and engage the community in project development, skills development and promotion.

**Area Steering Groups**

- coordinate stakeholders and their approaches, consolidate resources, coordinate efforts and facilitate cross partners working
- extend and refine the baseline resource analysis in the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure it is comprehensive and current for local plan and project need
- identify project clusters and strategic transformational projects amongst the local projects, and appraise these against the principles
- form bidding strategies to deliver the key project clusters and strategic projects
- ensure synergy with the Local Development Frameworks and open space strategies.
Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts

8.19 HaGGIS argues that, while ‘some of the vision projects are of a scale that makes them strategic or transformational projects in their own right’, others might more appropriately be grouped into thematic or locational project clusters, which then might ‘be able to lever in significant external funding … in a way more modest individual projects cannot hope to do’.

8.20 Estimated costs by project are listed below.

| Table 8-3: GI Thematic Package – Estimated Costs |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | CLG/EEDA funding sought (£m) | Other funding by year and source (£m) | Total scheme cost (£m) |
|                 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | 08/09 | 09/10 | 10/11 | Total |
| Ipswich River Corridor “River for All” | 0 | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.53 |
| Ipswich – Belstead Brook Park | 0 | 0.6 | 0.27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.945 |
| St Martins Farm Country Park Extension | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.165 |
| Colchester Hythe Lagoons | 0 | 0.23 |
| The Naze, open space improvement | 0 | 0.5 |
| Rivers Gipping and Rat enhancement scheme | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
| North Harwich Linear Park | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.45 |
| Re-Wilding of the Suffolk Sandlings | 0 | 0.025 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.085 |
| Education Centre at Abbotts Hall Farm | 0 | 0.14 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.44 |
| South Colchester Green Wheel Corridors | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 2.55 |
| North and East Ipswich Green Arc | 0.5 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Green Infrastructure Implementation Team | 0.088 | 0.088 | 0.088 | 0 | 0.0395 | 0.395 | 0.343 |
| Felixstowe Port Green Corridor | 0 | 0.5 | 0.65 | 0 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 1.6 |

Source: Haven Gateway Framework for Delivery

8.21 The total cost of the initial GI package over the period 2008-2011 is estimated at just over £12 million of which £9.5 million is sought from CLG/EEDA by way of grant. Outputs would include the setting up of the Green Infrastructure implementation team, a feasibility study for the Suffolk Sandlings project, and delivery of specific enhancements at and linked to the growth locations of Ipswich, Colchester and Harwich.

Risks/risk mitigation

8.22 The main risks to all of the schemes identified in the package are

- the lack of sufficient funding for implementation
- in the case of projects requiring partnership working, a failure to maintain or an inability to establish suitable new project management arrangements.
8.23 There are specific additional risk factors in relation to individual projects.

- In the case of the Colchester Green Wheel, it may not prove possible to acquire key sites needed to augment GI provision to the south of Colchester. In this instance, leasehold or management agreements may provide an alternative route.

- For the Abbots Hall Education Centre, the risk of breakdown of the existing management partnership has been addressed by establishing a Memorandum of Understanding for the whole site, regular partnership meetings, and the implementation of a Communications Strategy. (Similar measures are planned for the Harwich Linear Park).

- For the North and East Ipswich green Arc, the purchase of additional land may be protracted, but the Partnership will have the ability to focus on existing sites and linkages and enhanced community involvement.

Figure 8-1: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the Green Infrastructure package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Projects (further phases)</th>
<th>Feasibility Studies (further phases)</th>
<th>Green Infrastructure Implement Team</th>
<th>Priorities for short term public sector funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Capital projects (Phase 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Feasibility Studies (Phase 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Priorities for short term public sector funding
- Investments either with public funding secured or privately funded
- Possible calls on future public funding, but currently no details available ie dependent on studies, political decisions etc
9: Tourism and Culture

Description of the Package

9.1 The Tourism and Culture Thematic Package focuses on the economic development potential afforded by taking full advantage of the tourism and cultural opportunities in the sub-region. At this package level, it looks to draw together the range of Tourism and Culture related investments that will be delivered through the Spatial Packages and to supplement these with sub-regional activities that add further value to the “Quality of Place” of the Haven Gateway and its tourism and cultural offer.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

9.2 Tourism and culture cannot be seen in isolation from the wider economy. The Haven Gateway Partnership’s Framework for Growth identifies the role that tourism, culture and the cultural industries can play in promoting employment and sustainable economic growth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Economic Drivers</th>
<th>Likely Land-Use Sectors</th>
<th>Possible Spatial Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Colchester and Ipswich as major regional employment centres in the East of England</td>
<td>Business employment and services, ICT, high tech, knowledge based sectors, research institutions, creative industries</td>
<td>Town centres for retail, office, and other town centre uses defined by PPS6. Quality business parks and premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional retail centres with town centre uses</td>
<td>University and hospital campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key centres for the expansion of higher education and primary health care</td>
<td>Arts, cultural, sports and entertainment quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts, culture, sport, and entertainment facilities</td>
<td>Transport interchanges particularly passenger transport nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourism, hotels, catering and conference centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional transport nodes and distribution centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing for the needs of an expanding tourism and leisure industry sector in urban, rural, and coastal resort areas in a sustainable way</td>
<td>Heritage and cultural assets of Colchester, Ipswich, and smaller towns</td>
<td>Provision in urban, rural, and coastal resort areas in a sustainable way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional coastal resorts (Clacton, Frinton, Walton, Harwich, and Felixstowe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal and countryside settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Framework for Growth, 2007 Haven Gateway Partnership, Framework statement 8

9.3 The Cultural Strategy for the Haven Gateway (draft final report) was published in May 2007. Its overall ambition was to set out a culture-led economic development strategy for the Haven Gateway ‘to make the existing arts, culture, creativity and innovation work better for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the region’. It identifies a challenge for partners within the sub-region ‘to work together across political boundaries to harness that cultural offer to better benefit the economy as a whole’ by developing a shared vision and prioritising activity for focused investment. Similarly, the (draft) Tourism Development & Visitor Economy Strategy 2006-2010, produced by the Haven Gateway Partnership, identifies

1 Cultural Strategy for the Haven Gateway (draft final report), nmp, May 2007
tourism as a key priority for the sub-region. It states that tourism is worth over £786m to the sub-region per year; and ‘is an important part of the economic, social and environmental mix of the sub-region’.

9.4 The Cultural Strategy for the sub-region states that 7.6% of the sub-regional workforce is employed in the creative and cultural industries (particularly in publishing, architecture, performing arts, visual arts and software); and the Tourism Development & Visitor Economy Strategy\(^2\) that ‘some 20,000 jobs [are] supported in the sub-region through tourism’. However, calculating the contribution of tourism and the cultural sector to employment within the sub-region is not entirely straightforward: many businesses will serve tourists as well as local residents, and others will be part of the supply chain for businesses in the cultural sector.

Table 9-1 below shows, for key sectors, the absolute number of employees in employment; the growth rate in employee jobs over the period 2003-05; and the location quotient (relative to the region).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total no. of employees 2005</th>
<th>HG CAGR 2003-05</th>
<th>2005 LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63 : Supporting and auxiliary transport activities; activities of travel agencies</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 : Recreational, cultural and sporting activities</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 : Publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 : Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 : Other service activities</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ABI

9.5 The Regional Economic Strategy\(^3\) identifies key priorities, including Increased economic gain from the region’s distinctiveness and vitality. Specific elements include safeguarding, developing and promoting cultural strengths, as well as the natural and built environments; taking ‘a more integrated approach in developing culture as part of place-shaping’; and capitalising on the 2012 Games ‘to drive forward economic development and to realise positive benefits for the region’s cultural life, communities and tourism industry’. Implementation priorities include:

- improving the design quality and sustainability of places in the region
- developing a network of internationally important cultural centres of excellence and creative quarters in leading cities
- protecting and conserving the region’s key cultural and historic landscapes.

9.6 In addition, the new RES identifies the following as priorities for the Haven Gateway sub-region: ‘develop cultural infrastructure of national and regional significance, such as an International Centre of Excellence for Classical Music at Aldeburgh, firstsite:newsite visual arts facility in Colchester and DanceEast as part of the Cranfield Mill development in Ipswich’.

---
9.7 The Region’s Sustainable Tourism Strategy\(^4\) outlines core principles for the region, including improving competitiveness, quality and value for money; developing partnerships; and ensuring increased economic impact of tourism. An improved cultural offer is likely to assist in increasing tourism in the sub-region.

9.8 The spatial development packages identify a range of challenges and opportunities in relation to tourism and culture for particular areas of the sub-region, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Specific challenges/opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Urban Area</td>
<td>Challenges identified in the Area Action Plan which might hinder or assist in promoting tourism:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• constrained accessibility within the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the requirement to deliver a sustainable retail offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• historic buildings requiring economic re-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the disconnection of the town centre from the waterfront(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing the barrier between the town and the Waterfront such that Ipswich might become a “town on the Waterfront” could prove beneficial for encouraging tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>• England’s first Roman city; distinctive role in terms of heritage and tourism and opportunities for innovation and interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Strategic Partnership’s vision makes reference to Colchester as “a centre of excellence for innovation, culture and learning” and “a preferred destination for visitors, for business location, and for investment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• distinctive town centre retail economy - 200 independent traders and 100 multiples (in Ipswich and Chelmsford, these figures are reversed(^6))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• tourism sector – worth an estimated £189.6m to the local economy – is focused on the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• traffic and capacity issues in the town centre constraining growth - problem likely to be exaggerated in the context of the 2012 Olympics(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A120 improvements needed to improve access to Colchester from the west (notably Braintree and Stansted) and on to Harwich. Improved transport connections may help to encourage tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clacton-on-Sea / Little Clacton</td>
<td>• best known as a holiday resort, with sandy beaches, amusements, the pier (including an aquarium, rides and shops as well as regular fireworks nights) and a range of watersports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• tourism is important to the local economy although changing holiday trends have led to decline in long stay holidays and increase in short breaks and day visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• issues relating to the urban realm(^8) and retail offer considered to be relatively poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other coastal towns</td>
<td>• continuing issues around dependence on traditional seaside tourism and a need to diversify.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{NB}\) In the greater Ipswich area, the recent decision in favour of the “Snoasis” scheme will potentially now create another major attraction in the sub-region.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (linking to logic chain(s))**

9.9 The proposals in this package are primarily based upon the projects set out in the Spatial Packages. It is these that will deliver new hotel accommodation, improved shopping and

---

\(^6\) Colchester’s Economic Prosperity Strategy 2007-2010, Colchester Borough Council, June 2007  
\(^7\) Colchester’s Economic Prosperity Strategy 2007-2010, Colchester Borough Council, June 2007  
\(^8\) Review of the Forecasts: Foundations for the Greater Essex Framework, Shared Intelligence, July 2007
support services (eg cafes and restaurants), improved accessibility, improved visitor experience generally (eg though improved public realm and green spaces) as well as specific new visitor attractions. In this sense they cannot be separated from wider considerations of land use and economic development. However, they may contribute to and support the sub-region in overcoming existing barriers to the development of tourism and the cultural sector.

9.10 However, these investments alone are not enough, an overall focus on the development of the Tourism and Cultural Sector in the Haven Gateway is essential if maximum economic benefit is to be gained. For example, key barriers to tourism development in the sub-region\(^9\) include: lack of shared ambition; weakness in private/public sector linkage; and gaps in products and services.

9.11 In 2004, the HGP Tourism sub-group identified barriers to the future development of the Haven Gateway sub-region, including:

- lack of accommodation capacity, particularly in the hotel sector
- understanding the breadth and importance of the tourism sector
- complacency
- gaps in tourism service provision
- skills (Languages; IT; Customer Care).

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

9.12 The 2008 RES sets out strategic ambitions which will impact on tourism and the cultural sector, including:

- expand the international port function of Haven Gateway, including major growth of Felixstowe and Harwich
- carry out major reinvention of city and town centres, including Ipswich waterfront, East Colchester, Harwich and regeneration priorities such as Jaywick
- develop cultural infrastructure of national and regional significance, such as an International Centre of Excellence for Classical Music at Aldeburgh, Firstsite:newsite visual arts facility in Colchester and adjacent Cultural Quarter and DanceEast as part of the Cranfield Mills development in Ipswich.

9.13 The latter two ambitions are embodied and supported in the IDP Spatial Investment Packages relating to: the redevelopment of St. Botolph’s in Colchester for Firstsite:newsite, new retail, cultural and other mixed uses accompanied by a much improved public realm and setting for existing heritage assets such as St Botolph’s Priory (Colchester Town Centre Spatial Package); and the redevelopment of Ipswich Waterfront in a similar manner incorporating DanceEast (IP-One Spatial Package).

---

\(^9\) As identified in *Tourism Development & Visitor Economy Strategy 2006-2010 Haven Gateway Partnership 2006*
These investments, accompanied by proposed new hotels in the urban areas of Ipswich and Colchester (also facilitated by the respective Spatial Packages) and, most significantly, the Visitor Centre at Abbots Hall Farm outside Colchester (included within the Green Infrastructure element of this thematic investment package), would improve the current offer for tourists to the sub-region. They would also help to develop a visible centre for cultural activity within its largest towns. In impact terms these are clearly the most important investments within the thematic package.

These will be supplemented by some further investments that are not related to the IDP Spatial Packages. These are as follows:

• the interpretation and development of Colchester’s Roman Circus as a visitor attraction (estimated total project cost £3 million)
• the enhancement of Colchester Castle as one of the sub-region’s leading visitor attractions (estimated total project cost £3 million)
• the redevelopment of Ipswich Museum to transform it into a landmark building and world class museum (estimated total project cost £9 million)
• development of Christchurch Mansion, Ipswich, focussing on major improvements to visitor facilities and establishing it as the key focal point in the area to display the paintings and understand the life of John Constable (capital support anticipated to be in the region of £500,000 to £1 million)
• the staging of a major programme of sub-regional exhibitions and festivities to coincide with the London 2012 Olympics to gain a legacy of heightened cultural participation and develop the brand identity of the Haven Gateway as a cultural hot spot – planned activity includes a major exchange programme with Chinese cultural organisations and a block buster loan exhibition, to be held in Colchester Castle, featuring archaeological treasures from China.

In addition, recent work by the Haven Gateway Tourism and Culture Group has identified a number of sub-regional initiatives it hopes to be able to investigate further to enhance these and the Spatial Investment Packages including:

• working with the ferry companies and budget airline operators on initiatives to bring additional visitors over from Europe
• developing a support network for the creative industries cluster and identifying and addressing any barriers to growth
• reviewing the need to continue to develop attractions in the sub-region over the medium to long term
• developing natural links and programmes with European museums eg in the Netherlands and Denmark
• seeking to address ICT infrastructure issues that hinder the co-ordination of visitor services across the sub region.
9.17 It is envisaged that these measures could be developed into some form of Sub-Regional Tourism and Culture enabling programme

**Scoring of projects**

9.18 It has not been possible to score the projects within this package. However, partners have suggested that the top three priorities are:

- artistic and creative industry networking to develop local businesses and attract inward investment
- attraction development, where the key priorities are the Roman Circus and redevelopment of Colchester Castle
- collaborative view of marketing and audience development to gain a legacy from the 2012 Olympic Games.

**Timing and critical path**

9.19 As is implied above, the timing and critical path of the spatial investments are set out within the relevant Spatial Investment Packages. The remainder vary in their timing from medium to long term. Many require further development as projects before detailed delivery timescales can be assessed. To the extent that details exist, an initial programme is set out on the Gantt Chart overleaf.

**Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts**

9.20 The overall package cost for projects not already included elsewhere in Spatial Packages is £15 million over 2008-2011 (although none of this funding is sought from CLG or EEDA at this stage).

9.21 The outcome will be a revitalised cultural sector, with clear centres of activity; and a sub-region with an offer that is increasingly attractive to tourists.

**Risks/risk mitigation**

9.22 There are a number of risks associated with this package:

- stakeholder buy-in and joint working are important
- tourism and culture are wide thematic areas, and it may be difficult to effect change across them as a whole. It is important to join up interventions and prioritise areas for funding
- funding is limited
- tourism and culture are not top-tier priorities; while they may be supported by physical development, and contribute to economic regeneration, they compete with transport and education for funding and can be marginalised.
Figure 9-1: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the Tourism and Culture Thematic package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Colchester Town Centre Spatial Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cultural Quarter/Hotels, public space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Firstsite, Colchester Castle enhancements, Colchester Roman Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christchurch Mansion redevt, DanceEast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Blue** Priorities for short term public sector funding
- **Green** Investments either with public funding secured or privately funded
- **Red** Possible calls on future public funding, but currently no details available ie dependent on studies, political decisions etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit Weight  Score</td>
<td>Fit Weight  Score</td>
<td>Fit Weight  Score</td>
<td>Fit Weight  Score</td>
<td>Fit Weight  Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Roman Circus interpretation</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Castle enhancement</td>
<td>2 2 4 4</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Museum development</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Mansion development</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 China exhibition programme</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry and Airline company collaboration</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Industries network</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of further long term attractions</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing museum links with Europe</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing ICT infrastructure issues</td>
<td>2 0 4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10: Housing

Description of the Package

10.1 The Housing Thematic Package focuses on maximising the delivery of affordable housing through the potential available both via developer-led housing developments and also through local authority and Registered Social Landlord (RSL) interventions.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision and also to the RES/RSS

10.2 The RSS sets a target of 65,100 new homes to be delivered between 2001 and 2021. This equates to an annual completion rate of 3,255. By 2007, 20,566 new homes had been delivered, taking delivery ahead of target levels. However, the provision of affordable housing in the Haven Gateway since 2001 has been less than one third of that sought by the RSS for the period 2008-2021 so the delivery challenge is acute, particularly if the backlog of provision is to be addressed. Local Plans were often written before the RSS target of 35% was set. Often, they asked for a lower contribution which made the target unachievable from the start.

10.3 For historic reasons, housing issues within the Haven Gateway have been dealt with on a slightly different spatial basis through the Greater Haven Gateway sub-region. The Greater Haven Gateway sub-region (as defined by the Housing Corporation) is one of nine housing sub-regions in the East of England. It includes two additional local authority areas – Maldon and Braintree – that are not within the current Haven Gateway Partnership.

10.4 However, the fact remains that the sub-region, on either definition, is one of the UK’s fastest growing areas and it is one facing significant housing issues. For example, North East Essex and South East Suffolk are highlighted in the Eastern Region Affordable Housing Study (2003) as “pressured sub regions”, meaning those characterised by “high housing demand, high incomes, and high house prices”. The recent effects of the credit crunch and downturn in the housing market and wider economy are not likely to alter this underlying position.

10.5 High house prices in both urban and rural areas are a significant problem, fuelled by rising house prices following the general economic boom and migration from London. New challenges will be posed by the “credit crunch” and economic downturn. Income levels fluctuate across the sub-region with below average incomes in some areas exacerbating affordability problems. The sub-region is predominately a low wage economy with low value jobs resulting in a need for affordable housing.

10.6 To address these problems, the Greater Haven Gateway Housing Group has produced a Sub-Regional Housing Strategy1. The vision for this strategy is as follows:

“to ensure everyone can live in a decent home which meets their needs, at a price they can afford, and in locations that are sustainable”.

---

10.7 The strategy is currently being updated in the light of the results of studies such as Strategic Housing Market Assessments and will link directly to the new RES and RSS.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (liking to logic chains)**

10.8 Across the Greater Haven Gateway, recent Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) suggested that there is a need for 5014 affordable homes per annum. This reveals a substantial deficit in supply given that only 1,100 are likely to be available annually based upon average long term completion rates. Whilst delivery figures show that we have not been achieving this, the SHMAs give us a good evidence base on which to base our future LDF targets, a broader range of housing initiatives and our priorities for capital investment.

10.9 This package looks at ways in which the deficit can be managed and begin to be addressed.

**The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the package**

10.10 The Greater Haven Gateway Housing Group recognises the importance of overall housing delivery in helping us achieve our affordable housing targets. In the current market we are seeking a flexible approach to ensure continued delivery whilst acknowledging the need to focus on our longer term vision and goals. We are seeking to:

1) **Continue delivery in the current economic climate**

- The downturn in the current market is seeing Section 106 sites not delivering completions at rates previously experienced. We want to carry on delivering affordable housing and wherever possible use this to open up and stimulate private sector development. Along with work to bring forward urban sites, we will also seek to deliver homes through smaller rural sites. To enable us to achieve both efficiencies and confidence in delivery, we would seek to secure a Greater Haven Gateway rural housing programme which committed funding over a set time period to secure continued delivery.

- The Greater Haven Gateway Housing Group is seeking to work with the Housing Corporation (and the Homes and Communities Agency, its successor body) to model sample sites in the sub-region to identify where public funding could help unlock those sites to bring forward delivery of both market and affordable homes and to enable a robust view to be taken on how much subsidy would be required to deliver additional affordable homes.

- The Greater Haven Gateway Housing Group will work closely with planning colleagues, RSLs, land owners and developers to unlock sites on which development has stalled due to current market conditions, including opportunities on publicly owned land.
ii) Actively plan for the future

- We want to undertake action planning to achieve the Regional Spatial Strategy target of 35% of completions to be affordable homes. We will research the reasons for the current shortfall in delivery and ways in which we can increase percentage of affordable housing. We will also seek to secure an economic appraisal tool across the sub-region to enable us to better understand the potential of sites to deliver 35% affordable housing.

Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes and other potential impacts

10.11 In the current climate of both falling land prices and house prices along with uncertainty over cross-subsidy from shared-ownership, it is difficult to provide costed priority actions at this stage. However, our trajectories show that there is the potential to deliver 11,714 affordable homes and 32,582 market homes to 2021 (excluding Maldon for which figures are not currently available). Further planning and dialogue will be taking place with the Homes and Communities Agency to flesh out the details to achieve our desired outcome which is to achieve a more balanced housing market.
11: Skills

Description of the Package

11.1 The Skills Thematic Package is all about helping the Haven Gateway Sub Region to develop a knowledge based economy. In the short term, it focuses on addressing the skills deficit that exists in the Haven Gateway and ensuring that the Sub Region has the necessary skills to achieve sustainable economic and employment growth and to attain targets set for regional competitiveness.

Notable capital investments

11.2 For the purposes of the IDP, the major capital investments proposed are all contained in spatial packages and associated Haven Gateway programmes of activity. These include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed investment</th>
<th>Spatial Package or other investment programme</th>
<th>Requested/proposed investment</th>
<th>Expected benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Campus Suffolk, Phase 2</td>
<td>IDP: IP-One</td>
<td>£4m</td>
<td>Substantial boost to skills and training provision in area of major need – 2800 new students by 2013/14 and up to 300 direct and indirect new jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex Research Park</td>
<td>IDP: East Colchester</td>
<td>£2.5m</td>
<td>Increase in top level skills and research capability – potentially at least 2000 new jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanwich Learning Shop</td>
<td>Haven Gateway: IIC programme</td>
<td>£175k</td>
<td>Extra teaching space to stage new courses to engage local population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Sailing Trust boatyard, Brightlingsea</td>
<td>Haven Gateway: IIC programme</td>
<td>£245k</td>
<td>Creation of a training facility to promote apprenticeships in traditional maritime skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering for All, Colchester</td>
<td>Haven Gateway: IIC programme</td>
<td>£125k</td>
<td>Extends engineering facility doubling capacity for apprenticeships to address identified skill shortages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development for Migrant Communities</td>
<td>Haven Gateway: IIC programme</td>
<td>£18k</td>
<td>Offering additivity to regional offer to overcome mismatch between skills and jobs undertaken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.3 There are also multi million pound investments currently being made in redeveloping the fabric of Colchester Institute (£86 million) and also in Suffolk New College, Ipswich (over £60 million) which are highly significant to raising the level of skills in the sub-region.
Notable new initiatives

11.4 In addition to these capital investments, there are also a number of revenue (and potentially also capital) based activities in hand and plans to develop and expand activity over time on a partnership basis.

11.5 One major opportunity in this respect is to utilise existing flagship schemes (ie recent or planned capital investments) within the spatial packages to create new delivery points for further skills initiatives. These are initiatives specifically connected with the new National Skills Academies. There are plans for several of these including one for performance arts at DanceEast in Ipswich and one for sport and active leisure at the Weston Homes Community Stadium in Colchester. Others building upon leading knowledge based assets/investments (e.g. at Adastral Park), are being developed.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision and also to the RES/RSS

11.6 The importance of skills as a key driver of regeneration and economic development through increased productivity and competitiveness for businesses as well as social inclusion and personal fulfilment has underpinned the Government’s approach to skills since the publication of the first Skills White Paper in 2003. Indeed, this approach has been used as the basis of the Skills Strategy published by the Haven Gateway Partnership in 2008. The skills agenda is therefore central to the realisation of the adopted vision for the Haven Gateway.

11.7 In terms of the RSS, although the targets set for housing and job numbers are generally spatially based, there is a clear underlying requirement for an improvement in the sub-region’s skills base if these substantial growth targets are to be achieved and GVA performance is to be improved.

11.8 The more specific aspirations around skills are set out in EEDA’s new RES. Specifically, this sets goals and priorities around:

- Enterprise
  - strengthening the region’s enterprise culture
  - enabling high growth businesses to realise their potential
  - improving enterprise performance through effective business support

- Innovation
  - developing a thriving culture of innovation and creativity
  - commercialising R & D and adopting innovation
  - positioning the region and Greater South East as global innovation regions

- Digital Economy
  - equipping people and businesses with the skills and capability to innovate through digital technologies
• Skills for productivity
  ➢ increasing the demand for and supply of higher level skills
  ➢ create a culture where people aspire to train and learn throughout life
  ➢ providing education and training that meets the needs of individuals, employers and the economy.

Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (liking to logic chains)

11.9 The package is principally addressing the deficit in those of working age qualified to NVQ Level 4 (degree level) or above and those with no qualifications.

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the package

11.10 For the purposes of this IDP, the most important priorities are the two proposed University related capital schemes set out at the start of this section. Both are of subregional/regional importance and both act as catalysts for the spatial packages in Colchester and Ipswich within which they are located.

Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes and other potential impacts

11.11 See above.
PART C

SPATIAL PACKAGES
12: IP-One

Package Description

12.1 The IP-One Package is essentially the delivery plan that sits alongside the IP-One Area Action Plan, which is part of the Ipswich Local Development Framework. The Preferred Options document for the AAP was published by IBC in November 2007 as part of the Ipswich Local Development Framework Preferred Options documentation.

12.2 IP-One covers the traditional economic heart of Ipswich, including the town centre, the Waterfront, Ipswich Village and the Education Quarter. The area has undergone significant economic change over recent years leading to pockets of derelict or underutilised land and buildings, weak infrastructure and environmental decline. IP-One is therefore intended as the principal opportunity and hence focus for urban renaissance within Ipswich over the period to 2021, potentially creating over 3,450 new homes and substantial numbers of new jobs. Estimates on these job numbers vary. Early studies show between 1,500 and 2,800 new jobs but more recent work suggests that the area could have the capacity to support up to 6,000 new jobs. There is a clear need to ensure job creation opportunities are maximized. A map showing key locations within IP-One is provided overleaf.

12.3 The majority of projects included in the IP-One Package are still at an early stage in their development. Detailed implementation plans need to be prepared for many and the effects of the credit crunch will have to be factored in, particularly in terms of economic viability. It is therefore envisaged that the IP-One package will take perhaps 10-15 years to complete. To maintain the momentum that has already been achieved, some early priorities for investment are identified. However, it should be emphasised that these initial investments are only the start and they may need to be supplemented by substantial further investment in order to fully realise the ambitious objectives of the AAP to 2021. Partners within the Ipswich Policy Area are committed to advancing the further developmental work that is required to effect the full implementation of the AAP.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

12.4 The view of partners from across the Haven Gateway is that for the sub-region to grow and prosper, both Colchester and Ipswich need to function effectively and well as medium-sized cities.

12.5 With regard to Ipswich, some progress has been made in recent years. A good deal of investment has already been made and, as set out in the AAP, the process of change is most apparent in the Waterfront area: agricultural storage and processing have been replaced by hotels, offices and cultural and residential uses. However there is a good deal more to be done in restructuring the local economy and mending the urban fabric to establish Ipswich as a vibrant regional city and a hub of high value economic activity.
12.6 Ipswich is identified as a Growth Point and as a Key Centre for Development and Change in the East of England Plan. Hence the intention is that it should be a primary focus for development over the years ahead. It is also identified as a Priority Area for Regeneration; a Regionally Significant Strategic Employment Location; a Regional Town Centre; and a Regional Transport Node. In this context, the Borough, on its current restricted boundaries, is expected to deliver at least 15,400 net additional dwellings and something in the order of 18,000 jobs over the period 2001 to 2021. Taking into account recent growth, the target for 2008 to 2021 is now 10,100 new homes and approximately 15,000 new jobs. The IP-One package is designed to deliver around 3,400 of these new dwellings (over and above the 2,432 dwellings that already have planning permission within IP-One), and potentially up to 6,000 of the new jobs. IP-One therefore has the potential to deliver nearly 60% of Ipswich’s allocated housing growth to 2011 and 40% of the jobs. Hence it will contribute significantly to this key target in the RSS.

12.7 With regard to the Regional Economic Strategy, the delivery of this Package will help advance the vision of an ideas driven region that is internationally competitive, harnesses the talent of all and is at the forefront of the low carbon economy. In particular, by harnessing the potential of the new Waterfront-based University Campus Suffolk (higher education) and Suffolk New College (further education), by making available a variety of new employment development opportunities in mixed use schemes and by realising the potential of the town centre (which offers significant opportunities for further expansion), the IP-One Package ought to make an important contribution to the new RES targets.

12.8 Key elements of the vision for IP-One are:

- **Economy**
  - a more diverse, individual and competitive shopping centre
  - a choice of job opportunities with a particular concentration of office, commercial leisure and education jobs in the town centre

- **Environment**
  - a less car-dominated town centre with improved air quality
  - key walking and cycling routes that are obvious, and safe, convenient and pleasant to use
  - a greener centre
  - exciting new architecture designed to cope with changing conditions arising from climate change and reduce their carbon footprint, sitting happily alongside historic buildings which have been conserved through appropriate new uses being found for them

---

1 IP-One Area Action Plan preferred options November 2007, Ipswich Borough Council
2 Haven Gateway Employment Land Study, DTZ, December 2005
• Community
  ➢ facilities to meet local and borough-wide community, cultural and sporting needs
  ➢ a thriving university and college, fully integrated into the life of the town centre
  ➢ a larger resident population containing a good social mix and having a strong sense of community.

Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing

12.9 The IP-One AAP identifies ten key challenges which are specific to the local area:
• the need to attract a better range of higher quality shops to the town centre to provide more diverse shopping opportunities and make Ipswich town centre the first choice for shopping
• the need to improve accessibility and to improve connections
• the need to accommodate more people living within IP-One
• the need for additional facilities to support growth, change and urban renaissance (e.g. cultural, sporting and community facilities)
• the imperative to improve the poor image of the local area which is exacerbated by poor gateways to the town centre
• the need to make the best use of the river corridor as an asset which is fully integrated into the town centre
• the need to find economically viable uses for old buildings, many of which are of historic interest
• the imperative to deliver employment generation targets within IP-One, and to ensure the quality as well as the quantity of jobs
• the importance of addressing deprivation, health inequality and social exclusion
• the need to plan for the effects of climate change and the risk of flooding.

12.10 The IP-One Plan identifies twelve ‘Opportunity Areas’ which it is anticipated will be subject to most change over the next ten to fifteen years. These twelve main areas encompass some 46 separate development sites extending to over 54 ha. This fragmented pattern reveals the scale and complexity of the challenge that the regeneration of the traditional economic heart of Ipswich will entail.
12.11 Looking ahead, the key economic/employment opportunities linked to the implementation of the IP-One Package relate, essentially, to those that could/should follow from a more dynamic central area. The specific opportunities that the projects within IP-One are expected to deliver are:

i) Retail growth in the prime shopping area – this opportunity was assessed as potentially leading to the creation of 500 new jobs in a 2005 study but more recent work by Ipswich Borough Council suggests that expansion of up to 40,000 sq m may be possible and hence could in fact deliver up to 1,500 new jobs. It should be noted that Ipswich is currently ranked 35th out of over 1,600 centres nationally in the CACI shopping centre league table. However, increasing the range and quality of its retail offer as the local population increases and ensuring that it addresses continuing competition from other regional and sub regional centres will be vital to its long term viability and vitality.

ii) Employment development opportunities within generally mixed use schemes for office, B1, workshop, marine related, hotel and leisure opportunities spread throughout IP-One. Approximately 18 ha of land has been allocated for such uses in the AAP and it has been estimated that these sites should generate well in excess of 1000 new jobs. However, once again, more recent IBC estimates based on suggested site allocations in the Local Development Framework suggest that up to 4,800 new jobs could be created. Furthermore, the AAP includes proposals that could lead to up to 5 new hotels and 3 new leisure/tourist attractions and will therefore benefit the wider tourism industry in Ipswich and the sub-region by meeting the aspirations of the Tourism and Culture element of the Thematic Investment Package in this IDP.

iii) Educational opportunities in the new Education Quarter. Planned expansion here by the University and College envisages some 2,805 additional students by 2013/14 (bringing the total to 6,197), and 100 new full time equivalent jobs on the teaching and support side, which in turn would generate a further 200 jobs in the surrounding economy. Again these opportunities are of significance not just to Ipswich but also the wider Haven Gateway in terms of skills development.

12.12 There is also much evidence to suggest that agglomeration economies can be an important source of competitive advantage and, hence, it is important that the established business centre of Ipswich should be allowed to grow and become a place where people want to do business. In other words, the direct benefits from the planned IP-One projects will have a knock-on effect in boosting activity and hence supporting the growth of existing businesses in the town centre.

12.13 In terms of housing growth, the AAP identifies a large number of generally relatively small sites for housing development; these range in size from 0.16 ha (which will accommodate 21 units) to the 6.02 ha Island Site (497 units) and most (although not all) are within designated Opportunity Areas. In total they are anticipated to accommodate 3,459 new dwellings.

---

3 Haven Gateway Employment Land Study, DTZ, December 2005
4 CACI Retail Rankings 2005
5 Haven Gateway Employment Land Study, DTZ, 2005
12.14 In terms of constraints to the proposed residential and to some extent employment developments, flood risk is a key issue. Out of the total of 52 identified redevelopment sites in IP-One, 34 are in the flood plain. Indeed, 21 are in the Environment Agency’s Flood Zone 3 and have attracted objections to development from the EA for that reason. This constraint therefore affects the delivery of over 40 ha of new development, (over 2,500 residential units) including 14 ha of employment land. More particularly, of these sites, 21 have been identified as having a flood hazard rating of a “danger to most” or a “danger to all” within the 100 year timeframe for flood risk assessment required by the Environment Agency in terms of the risk to people from flooding\(^6\). Urgent action is therefore needed.

12.15 Unless this constraint is addressed, not only will around two thirds of the proposed residential development within the package be unlikely to proceed, but the viability of many mixed use schemes (where the residential element is needed to help cross-subsidise the employment component) will be affected, so jeopardising the delivery of the anticipated new jobs. Around 14 ha of employment land is affected in this way on the 16 most high risk sites.

12.16 Another constraint is the lack of skills amongst the local workforce. Apart from Tendring, Ipswich has the highest proportion of people of working age with no qualifications within the whole Haven Gateway\(^7\). This fact will prevent Ipswich people participating in any future economic growth unless it is addressed. The substantial expansion of the education sector in IP-One is intended to do just that.

12.17 Given that development opportunities in IP-One are on brownfield land, there will inevitably be constraints in terms of site contamination as a result of former uses. It should also be noted that some sites are within a “Landfill Site Consultation Zone”. This will increase development costs leaving less Section 106 funding to put towards achieving other elements of the overall vision.

12.18 A further constraint in IP-One is poor connections between key nodes within the area, such as the town centre and railway station. The Local Transport Plan major scheme bid ‘Ipswich Fit for the 21\(^{st}\) Century’ is designed to address some of these issues, for example through improvements to key pedestrian routes. The Council’s own investment in town centre environmental improvements will also contribute to improving accessibility and movement by sustainable modes throughout the centre.

12.19 Finally in terms of constraints, it is recognised that revitalising the economy in the IP-One Area is not solely a question of capital spend (which is the focus of the IDP) or simply addressing supply side issues. In addition and linking into the Local Area Agreement and also programmes such as Investing in Communities there is a need to take steps to attract new business and investment by appropriately packaging, presenting and marketing the major opportunities, to raise aspirations amongst the local population, to improve skills locally, and to encourage a strong culture of enterprise and entrepreneurship. Strong efforts will also be needed to persuade the development industry to accept the high levels of employment space within mixed use schemes. None of these broader changes will be achieved quickly, but the

---

\(^6\) Ipswich Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – Guidance on Site Allocations, Ipswich Borough Council, 15 November 2007

\(^7\) Coastal Initiative Socio-Economic Research, Final Report, Globe Regeneration Services et al, August 2008
requirements for capital spend identified in this Package are set within this wider context of incremental socio-economic restructuring. They will therefore be accompanied by the development and implementation of a targeted economic development strategy based in part upon the results gained from the current Employment Land Study.

12.20 When considering all of the issues and opportunities, it has been concluded that public sector capital investment in central Ipswich should concentrate on:

- overcoming Environment Agency objections to development and providing confidence for potential investors in proposed housing and employment sites by investing in flood defences
- addressing strategic transport issues and ensuring the central area is accessible by all forms of transport to encourage sustainable travel patterns
- improving the environment of the town centre to make the town more attractive for shoppers and retail investors
- continuing the significant improvements to the provision of education in central Ipswich - particularly in both the higher and further education sectors
- addressing other constraints to development such as site contamination, fragmented ownership and the relocation of existing users
- providing facilities that will enhance the opportunities for the development of integrated and cohesive communities.

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

12.21 The development of IP-One is a long-term venture. At this stage, there remains a good deal of work to do in developing a fully-fledged (and agreed) delivery plan in relation to IP-One, particularly in relation to the infrastructure (hard and soft) required to stimulate and accommodate significant economic / employment growth. However a number of short-term priorities have been identified, and these have achieved total partner buy-in. Medium term priorities have also been identified, but on a more indicative basis. In some cases, while there is agreement as to the challenges that need to be addressed, there are differences of opinion in terms of preferred solutions. This is particularly the case in terms of transport needs where the two local authorities have different views. These will be resolved through studies, through joint working across the IPA authorities, through likely local government reorganisation and through statutory processes over the months and years ahead.

12.22 In the short term, the interventions listed below have been identified as priorities that are expected to be completed during 2008/09. These can be divided into two groups: studies and substantive capital investments:
Revenue Funded Studies

- **Transport Modelling** - This project is concerned with developing a multi-modal, variable demand update to the existing Ipswich model. This is needed at the local level to predict transport impacts from various development scenarios and more immediately to provide appraisal information to support the business case to the Department for Transport for the proposed major transport scheme. The transport modelling proposal included within the transport thematic package will encompass this element. This will enable important public transport investments and Waterfront and Town Centre transport changes to be properly assessed.

- **Quay Walls Condition and Ownership Study** - This study is needed to investigate title, condition of retaining walls, gaps in ownerships, rights of way, easements and licences in order to regularise ownerships for maintenance, CPOs, development, flood and highway issues. This would ensure proper long-term public access to the quayside and ensure it is a high quality environment, which would help to encourage private investment as well as make the area attractive to potential visitors. It would also help to ensure that development sites come forward.

- **Employment Land Study** – Regional Spatial Strategy Policy E3 requires Local Development Documents to identify strategic employment sites in the Haven Gateway to support growth and regeneration at Ipswich, including the town’s role in ICT, and development associated with port expansion at Harwich and Felixstowe. There are several possible sites available within Ipswich Borough, Suffolk Coastal and Babergh to meet the requirements of this policy. The study is needed in order to consider how many sites are needed, where, and when, so that the possible sites may be prioritised and phased through development plan documents currently under preparation. The study also needs to consider the quality of the land available overall and the relationship between the strategic employment sites and the remainder of the land supply, in order to deliver jobs growth in the Haven Gateway. It is also vital to learn from the study what the job creation capacity (numbers and types) of the available sites might be in practice and how these jobs can be secured – through the normal operation of the market or only through public intervention. The cost of the study is to be shared between the three districts and revenue funding has been allocated from Growth Point funds.

- **Ipswich Housing and Employment Growth Transport Study** – This study is needed to enable the identification of any capacity issues at the A14 Junction 57 (Nacton Road). It links to the potential development of a proposed strategic employment site at the Cranes site on Nacton Road, and other development sites on the eastern side of the town.

- **Merchant Quarter Study** – The Merchant Quarter is the name given in the IP-One Area Action Plan to the transition area that lies between the Waterfront and the town centre. It contains potential development sites that, together with wider public realm and pedestrian/cycle route improvements, offer opportunities through their redevelopment to strengthen links between the twin attractions of the Waterfront and
town centre. Through the IP-One Area Action Plan, the Council aims to improve connections between all the four economic centres of IP-One: the town centre, Ipswich Village, Waterfront and Education Quarter. Many of the inter-connected projects contribute to this aim, and the Merchant Quarter study will enable the Council to tackle the particular barriers to movement between the Waterfront and town centre.

**Priorities for capital investment**

**Ipswich Flood Defence**

12.23 This is critical in terms of the early release of developable land in the IP-One Area Action Plan area. It therefore underpins much of the wider IP-One Spatial Package. The Ipswich Local Development Framework identifies 31 sites within the area that would be dependent on the defences and therefore have greater certainty about coming forward earlier in the plan period. This would include sites allocated for employment use amounting to approximately 12.8 ha including mixed use sites. Using the most conservative job densities in the DTZ Employment Land Study for the Haven Gateway, this could represent at least 1,500 jobs, which would represent a significant economic benefit to the community. The flood defence project will also reduce potential insurance problems/premiums and damage costs, and generate construction jobs.

12.24 The current defences are at the end of their life and in any case need improving to cope with rising sea levels. A tidal surge barrier across the River Orwell is the main part of a combination of proposals set out within the Ipswich Flood Defence Management Strategy. Design work started in February 2008. Flood gates in the Wet Dock are due to be replaced in November 2008. However the need remains for some £10m of non DEFRA / EA funding, to secure the wider package and bring forward its delivery to 2012, to enable development in IP-One to take place earlier than would otherwise be possible. The intention is that the barrier will be constructed across the New Cut, opposite the Island site with raised walls adjacent on the west and east banks, once further funding has been secured. If the funding package, around £45 million in total for the initial works, is secured the barrier is expected to be in operation early in 2012. If funding is not secured, the barrier would not be operational until 2018.

**Town Centre Environmental Enhancement**

12.25 Whilst there has been considerable investment in public buildings and parks in recent years in the central areas of the town, there has been very little investment in the public spaces over the last decade. Ipswich Borough Council is investing nearly £2.8m and further funding has been allocated in 2009/10 and 2010/11 from Growth Point monies. This will result in increasing the attractiveness of the town to visitors and to potential retail development investors. A plan is currently being produced that will prioritise locations and schemes for investment.
**Ipswich Village Improvements**

12.26 There are similar issues within the Ipswich Village area as there are within the town centre. The Village also contains two Council-owned development sites totalling 3.7ha, the delivery of which is linked, and also connects with a third site on the edge of the town centre. Any monies are likely to be focused at improving the area around the Portman Road Old Cattle Market site and West End Road Surface Car Park site (both allocated for mixed use in the Ipswich LDF), and the areas between the sites and the town centre, and along the river corridor. In the short term, improvements to the public realm in the Portman Road/Princes Street/West End Road would help to make the area more viable and attractive to potential investors and developers. £0.38 million of Growth Point Funding has been provided by DCLG in 2009/10 and 2010/11 for these works and the Council is seeking further funding from EEDA to enable these improvements to be undertaken. The Council will continue to develop its strategy for IP-One and these development sites in particular over the next year, so that a comprehensive range of proposals for the regeneration of the sites can be prepared for inclusion in the IDP for 2009/10.

**Phase II of University Campus Suffolk**

12.27 This will require public sector support and will involve substantial costs and risks. The purpose of this phase of investment will be to develop the campus facility further via the provision of an additional new building on Ipswich Waterfront. As well as ensuring a larger student population, this would generate important impacts in relation to the skills of local people and, potentially, technology transfer in relation to local (and other) businesses; the latter will be enhanced by links with developments at Adastral Park (see IPA-East Package) and those linked to the University of Essex in Colchester (see East Colchester Package). Hence supporting Phase 2 of the University Campus will be important in terms of addressing some of the weaknesses of the local economy.

**Dance East**

12.28 Due to open in September 2009, the Jerwood DanceHouse will be the cultural cornerstone of the waterfront regeneration in Ipswich. As part of the Mill development, the DanceHouse will occupy four storeys of the building and will offer three architect-designed dance studios, a 200-seat studio theatre, cafe bar, fitness suite, resource centre and offices. There will also be a resource centre for dance artists and dance students and a programme of professional development for teachers and artists from across the East of England. The DanceHouse will be home to the new DanceEast Academy, the Government-funded Centre for Advanced Training for the East of England, providing first class dance teaching to the region’s best young dancers. Further funding is needed to ensure that the scheme is fully completed by September 2009.

**Immediate Priorities**

12.29 Across the projects identified above, the most immediate priority is the investment required linked to the Flood Defence works. The Environment Agency started works on the flood defence activity in February 2008 and will call on CLG and EEDA capital funding over the
next three years. At the end of these three years, the Environment Agency will continue the project which has a value over £70 million and will be designed to last for 100 years.

12.30 The Transport Modelling is also essential, as the current model does not meet the Department for Transport’s standards for transport appraisal to support funding bids. The bid for modelling is detailed more fully within the Transport Thematic Package. This is because the County Council’s intention is to develop a model in support of improvement plans within Ipswich but which can also be used to test development scenarios across a wider area, including impacts on the major trunk road network (A12 and A14).

**Medium/Long Term Priorities**

12.31 In the medium/long term priority investments in relation to the delivery of IP-One include the following:

- **Town Centre Transport Investment** - This is important in terms of ensuring good and sustainable connections between different areas within and around central Ipswich, which currently experiences peak hour traffic congestion. The local transport plan identifies a major transport scheme, Ipswich: Transport fit for the 21st century, the aim of which is to achieve a step change in the use of sustainable modes for trips to, in, and around Ipswich town centre. This scheme is included as a priority 1A project for government funding through the regional funding allocations. The intention is to deliver this scheme between 2010/11 and 2012/13. The scheme is intended to adapt the transport facilities in and around central Ipswich in response to the very high growth that is taking place, including new developments at the Waterfront, the Education Quarter and Ipswich Village. The scheme will include the development of a £20m scheme for major improvements to town bus services, two bus stations, the implementation of an urban traffic management and control system and the further development of facilities for walking and cycling.

- **Phase 3 of the University Campus** within the Waterfront will require public sector support and will involve substantial costs and risks. The purpose of the later phases of investment will be to develop the campus facility further. As well as ensuring a larger student population, this would generate important impacts in relation to the skills of local people and, potentially, technology transfer in relation to local (and other) businesses; the latter will be enhanced by links with developments at Adastral Park (see IPA-East Package) and those linked to the University of Essex in Colchester (see East Colchester Package).

- **Proposed town centre retail development schemes**, which could be completed between 2012 and 2016, are likely to be influenced by progress on the transport link schemes, public realm improvements and enhancement to the socio-economic profile of the town. In particular, the Mint Quarter is of particular importance since it is the largest site and the most likely to deliver the increase in quality and quantity of the town’s retail offer. It is possible that it will require compulsory purchase to enable it to happen.
Looking ahead further - and at this stage very speculatively, the following projects could be required and some may need additional public funding:

a) additional transport investments eg a proposed Wet Dock crossing (potential cost £30 million). However, at this stage, there is a great deal of uncertainty linked to these schemes and no political agreement associated with them

b) new community facilities on the Waterfront

c) an open space/children’s play area at the Waterfront

d) a new or improved swimming pool

e) a new multi storey car park to replace the one at Crown Street

f) other new parking facilities if the full public provision expected from future private developments cannot be achieved

g) a new larger electricity sub station to replace the existing one at Turret Lane

h) a major leisure attraction at Portman Road

i) a new cultural facility/tourist attraction on the Waterfront

j) a new primary school in Duke Street

k) land purchase and assembly if needed to bring sites and projects forward

l) repair works to quay walls if required as a result of the Quay Walls Ownership and Condition study

m) sewer capacity improvements to support the new development.
### Timing and Critical Path

#### Figure 12-1: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the IP-One package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quay Walls Repairs</th>
<th>Uni Phase 3</th>
<th>Town Centre Env/POS/Transp Imps</th>
<th>Ipswich Village &amp; Waterfront devts</th>
<th>New Town Centre retail areas</th>
<th>Detailed planning, land assembly and public realm Imps</th>
<th>Replacement Pool and MSCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priorities for short term public sector funding**

**Investments either with public funding secured or privately funded**

**Possible calls on future public funding, but currently no details available ie dependent on studies, political decisions etc**

### Scoring of projects

12.33 Across the projects identified above, the table below indicates the scores that have been given to them by local partners – against agreed criteria for IDPs as a whole. The higher the score, the greater the level of priority afforded to the particular project.
Table 12-1: Scores for projects within the IP-One Spatial Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Priorities (Yrs 1-2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Flood Defence Works</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Walls and ownership study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Village Improvements (Release of land for redevt at Portman Road/Crown St)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Transport Investment and Environmental enhancement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich University Campus (Phase 2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Dance East</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Housing and Employment Growth Transport Study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Quarter study</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term Priorities (Yrs 3-10):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Transport Investment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Campus Phase 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Retail development schemes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Term Priorities (Yrs 10+):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional transport investments eg a proposed Wet Dock crossing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New community facilities on the Waterfront</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</td>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</td>
<td>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space at the Waterfront</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 3 5 15 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or improved swimming pool</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New multi storey car park to replace the one at Crown Street</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New parking facilities to ensure full public provision</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New electricity sub station in Turret Street</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 3 5 15 3 5 15 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major leisure attraction at Portman Road</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cultural facility on the Waterfront</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land purchase and assembly if needed to bring sites and projects forward</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 3 5 15 3 5 15 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New primary school in Duke St</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 3 5 15 3 5 15 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to Quay Walls</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer capacity improvements</td>
<td>1 2 2 0 4 0 2 5 10 3 5 15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB for many schemes where costs are not yet known it is impossible to score value for money
Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts

**Costs**

12.34 In terms of the short term priorities, the immediate call on funding for this Spatial Package is £28.285 million, within the context of total project costs of £117.285 million. It should be noted that this figure excludes the substantial private sector investment expected in areas such as new retail development. This public sector funding request is divided equally between CLG and EEDA.

12.35 In terms of the longer term investments:

- the cost of the transport schemes will include £20m for the *Ipswich: Transport fit for the 21st Century*

- Phase 3 of the UCS proposal is likely to have substantial costs but the land has already been acquired.

**Outputs and Project Level Risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Flood Defence</td>
<td>Defences would defend around 215ha and allow the redevelopment of over 40 Ha of land.</td>
<td>Failure to secure planning permissions and flooding and its consequences prior to defences being installed.</td>
<td>Controls over planning permissions where they are granted. Large contingency allowed for within the projected costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Public Realm</td>
<td>Improvement in town centre public realm environment. Increased pedestrian and bike accessibility.</td>
<td>Gaining broad-ranging support for proposals. A piecemeal approach may be needed due to funding spread.</td>
<td>A plan is being produced that would plot out the full sequence of expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Village Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement in public realm environment. Increased pedestrian and bike accessibility.</td>
<td>Gaining broad-ranging support for proposals. A piecemeal approach may be needed due to funding spread.</td>
<td>A plan is being produced that would plot out the full sequence of expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II of University Campus</td>
<td>Extensive additional high-quality University space enabling UCS to take a significant step forward.</td>
<td>Whilst the land has been secured the complete funding package is not in place.</td>
<td>Considerable work is taking place with a broad spectrum of partners and the building is being planned in a way that enables it to be built in three phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Wall</td>
<td>Ability to progress flood defence and improvements to quayside pedestrian routes. Removing risks to waterfront development sites.</td>
<td>Lack of information to complete the study or study outcomes highlight significant structural concerns.</td>
<td>The Study is being proposed to enable a full understanding of the risks to be assessed prior to deciding what action to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Modelling</td>
<td>An ability to appraise transport proposals and thereafter to support proposals. Including assessing impacts on businesses and the public.</td>
<td>Not identifying all factors required for the right inputs into the model.</td>
<td>Work to be led by the County Council – as highway authority with experience in this area. Work to be undertaken by experienced consultants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcomes

12.36 At Package level, the principal outcomes will be a significant contribution to the delivery of the housing and jobs growth targets established in relation to the Ipswich Policy Area, including a high proportion of those earmarked in relation to Ipswich Borough Council area. For example, in connection with the flood barrier alone, we anticipate a possible 2,300 new homes and possibly 1,000 additional jobs resulting from developments made safer, more certain and able to happen earlier through provision of the barrier.

12.37 Additionally, embedded within the Package are the imperatives to improve local skills, address continuing socio-economic deprivation, increase employment rates, improve IP-One’s performance in terms of per capita GVA, and enhance the area’s performance in terms of key environmental indicators, most notably CO₂ emissions.

12.38 Above all, the package is designed to remove key constraints on potential private sector investment by resolving the flooding issue, enhancing the town’s public realm and investing in educational facilities.

### Package level risks

12.39 A number of risks have been identified in relation to the IP-One Package, both in terms of process / politics and substantive issues.

12.40 In terms of the former, it is recognised that the investments identified to date are necessary and important, but not sufficient, in terms of achieving the objectives linked to the Package as a whole. Further work is required, particularly in identifying more clearly the scope of longer-term interventions needed to effect sustainable economic growth at the scale which is required. Some of this work is already planned, notably a study of strategic employment needs across the Ipswich Policy Area. However there is more to be done, and Policy Area partners are committed to exploring these issues further, such that a more complete and evidenced statement of longer-term investment priorities might be included within further iterations of the IDP.

12.41 Additionally, there are risks linked to joint working across the Policy Area. This is essential in relation to the IP-One Package, but currently, there are important differences of opinion with regard to some possible and potentially significant investments. These will be informed by studies and will need to be resolved over time, including through a number of statutory processes. However they do need to be recognised as a risk with regard to the timely progress of the Package as a whole. Equally the opportunities arising from local government reorganisation could well enable clearer decision making to at least resolve the differences of opinions. There is likely to be a need to review the package as and when the likely outcome of the Boundary Committee review is known.

12.42 In terms of substantive issues, key risks include, among others:

- that the economic down-turn will impact on the rate of private sector investment, including house building; and
• continuing risks in relation to climate change impacts. In this respect the main risk in relation to the barrier is the lack of the necessary capital to achieve delivery, most of the work needed to progress the scheme has already been addressed by the Environment Agency.
13: Ipswich Policy Area – East, including InnovationMartlesham at Adastral Park

Package Description

13.1 In broad terms, the Ipswich Policy Area – East (IPA-E) Spatial Investment Package is concerned with releasing the economic potential that exists on the eastern fringe of, and to the east of, Ipswich – an area which is located within the Ipswich Policy Area. The Package focuses on Adastral Park – and the potential linked to its ICT-related assets and specialisms – but it also recognises the significant potential that exists for housing development within the area. The geographical footprint associated with this Package spans the boundary between the Ipswich Borough Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council areas.

13.2 In summary, key elements of the IPA-E Package include a High Tech Cluster comprising:

- redevelopment and new development within Adastral Park itself, including the development of an Innovation Campus (InnovationMartlesham)
- the development and redevelopment of parts of the adjoining Martlesham Heath Business Park to create new, high quality premises; and
- the development of a strategic gateway to the High Tech Cluster.

13.3 The IPA-E Package also includes the Cranes Site (a proposed 16 hectare employment area next to Ransome’s Europark on Nacton Road which could become a strategic employment location) and a proposed Park-and-Ride facility on adjoining land which would provide links into Ipswich town centre from the Felixstowe Road. Infrastructure investments are needed to release a number of these opportunities; in particular there are transport and electricity infrastructure issues linked to further developments (both residential and employment-based), to the East of Ipswich.

13.4 A schematic map showing key actual or potential sites for housing and/or employment growth within IPA-E is set out overleaf.

13.5 The Ipswich LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options document (dated November 2007) and the Suffolk Coastal LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options document (dated February 2007 and December 2008) provide further contextual information on the local planning backdrop to the IPA-E Package. In Suffolk Coastal, the homes are required in order to meet the housing requirements identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Council has published its preferred location for public comment.
Ipswich East Map

Possible sites for 1,000 additional new dwellings

Cranes site
Ransome’s Europark extension
Adastral Park / SIP

Diagrammatic Only Not To Scale
13.6 Suffolk Coastal District Council also proposes that Adastral Park be identified as a Strategic Employment site, one of regional significance. In the meantime it is working with BT on the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document that will set out how the site can be redeveloped and reconfigured in order to:

- incorporate an Innovation Park centred on BT’s research and development facility
- create an appropriate policy context for a comprehensive and co-ordinated development programme to consolidate the area as a high tech cluster of the highest design quality
- incorporate ancillary and supportive activities such as a hotel and conference centre, leisure and local retailing
- incorporate opportunities for sustainable development, including transport modal shift, energy efficiency and renewable energy sources.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision (for Haven Gateway) and also to the RES/RSS

13.7 Adastral Park is one of the largest concentrations of research excellence in ICT nation-wide; at Martlesham Heath, BT employs more than 3,000 engineers and scientists at its research and development centre. The economic potential of this resource in relation to the economic development ambitions of both the Ipswich Policy Area – and the Haven Gateway and East of England in general – has long been recognised. It benefits the local and regional economy to the tune of over £800 million each year and is complemented by the adjoining Martlesham Heath employment area. Covering 21 hectares, the latter accommodates about 60 companies. Further development and redevelopment opportunities still remain within this area. The development and delivery of ventures such as InnovationMartlesham, linked to Adastral Park, needs to be advanced in response to the deficit of high quality and highly paid jobs in the local area. This is critical to achieving the objectives of the RES and RSS.

13.8 The Suffolk Coastal LDF Core Strategy is at the stage of the publication of Preferred Options. The overall strategy for the Ipswich Policy Area (that part of it within Suffolk Coastal) was published for public consultation in December 2008. The Vision to 2025 is an area (emphasis added):

- that contains well-planned, sustainable new housing of a mix of size, type and tenure linked to existing and proposed employment
- where the planned direction of controlled growth is eastwards from the A12
- where opportunities for new employment provision have been maximised, with major national and international companies sitting alongside smaller ones, particularly those associated with the strategically important hi-tech business at BT
- where development has been phased and scaled to ensure that new or upgraded utility and other social and community provision is provided in advance of, or parallel to, new housing and employment provision
that has created its own distinctive identity with smaller readily distinguishable villages, neighbourhoods and communities within the larger area

where **public transport provision and foot and cycle paths have been upgraded** and promoted to minimise the need to use private motor vehicles to access employment, schools and other key facilities

where priority has been given to creating a safe and attractive environment, including the provision of advanced planting and landscaping to create new settlement boundaries that blend with the surrounding landscape

that includes the retention of designated Sandlings areas on the edge of Ipswich because of their historic and biodiversity interests; and

that maximises opportunities to achieve access to green space, including the countryside.

13.9 In terms of headline targets and deliverables,

- The proposed Adastral Park reconfiguration and developments within the Martlesham Heath Business Park (including the creation of gateways comprising landmark buildings) fits well with wider objectives to provide more and better jobs, particularly in high technology, innovation and knowledge-based industries proposed in the East of England Regional Economic Strategy (RES).

- The number of jobs likely to be created as a result is estimated to be in the order of several thousand. Additionally the development and re-use of the Cranes site ought to contribute further net additional jobs. The extension of the Ransome’s Europark site (into Suffolk Coastal District) should make provision for further employment growth.

- Although neither the RSS nor either of the LDF documents sets out a formal jobs growth target for IPA-E, it is estimated that if IPA-E is to contribute fully to the growth ambitions of the wider Haven Gateway it ought to be contributing something in the order of 3,000-4,000 net additional jobs over the period to 2021. Hence in employment terms, it is a significant Investment Package.

- The RSS identified a requirement for 10,200 additional new houses in the Ipswich Policy Area (IPA) between 2001 and 2021. The Suffolk Coastal LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options document (the subject of public consultation between December 2008 and February 2009) seeks to address that requirement for its portion of the IPA, adjusted to reflect housing delivery between 2001 and 2007, outstanding planning permissions and projected housing needs between 2008 and 2025. The District Council’s preferred option for the location of the balance of these 1050 new dwellings is at Martlesham, east of the A12. Such a location is well-related to Adastral Park and will create a balance of houses and jobs.
The IPA-E Package ought to be capable of releasing significant economic/employment and housing growth, and contributing to the wider ambitions for sustained, sustainable and high quality growth in this part of the Haven Gateway.

**Opportunities/constraints relating to economic and employment growth**

13.11 In economic terms, the key opportunity within the Ipswich Eastern Fringe arguably relates to the latent potential of Adastral Park as the core of a world-class information and communications technologies cluster. As set out above, Adastral Park employs some 3,000 scientists and engineers. The majority of these are at BT, but the site accommodates a number of other organisations including Alcatel, Cisco, Fujitsu and Siemens. Additionally, a number of Higher Education Institutions are linked to Adastral Park, including Cambridge MIT Institute, Essex University and UCL. It is estimated that Adastral Park accounts for well over half of the UK’s activity in telecommunications research and development.

13.12 One key project linked to Adastral Park relates to proposals for InnovationMartlesham. Over the last six months, there has been considerable progress on that front and the new Innovation Park is operational within the boundaries of Adastral Park. Already this has attracted ten new companies, illustrating the huge potential of InnovationMartlesham as a generator of new high value employment opportunities and business growth in the sub region.

13.13 Suffolk Coastal District Council, with the cooperation of BT, is working towards the adoption of a Supplementary Planning Document to cover Adastral Park and adjoining employment areas. Within this context, the proposal is to generate a high quality business environment that will have a campus “feel” and will promote knowledge transfer; it will meet the property requirements of tenants but also provide access to scientific and technological breakthroughs in ICT, specialist support services and networks, and it will improve the competitiveness of businesses through clustering. About 2000 new jobs could be created. Key risks and uncertainties include the following:

- InnovationMartlesham may need some additional public sector funding to ensure that its growth continues to be successful. This public sector funding may be required in a catalytic initiative – one such project being considered is a Knowledge Hub combining education, training, innovation and incubator facilities.

- The risks and uncertainties linked to the exploitation of science and an unwillingness on the part of the private sector to invest in the surrounding physical business infrastructure.

- Issues around externalities where the public benefits deriving from clustering are far greater than the private gain through development.

**Opportunities/constraints relating to housing growth**

13.14 With regard to housing growth, as stated above, it is currently envisaged that the future direction of growth will be eastwards beyond the A12. However, the LDF Core Strategy still has to undergo the process of consultation leading to a Public Hearing before an independent inspector.
13.15 Thereafter, there will be an immediate need to ensure that an overall delivery plan [and potentially some further more detailed development brief(s)] is put in place in relation to the Preferred Option. This should identify the key components of sustainable growth including access, phasing, design principles, etc. as it will be important that housing growth is brought forward in a manner that is timely and aligned with planned employment growth. The delivery plan /development brief(s) will also help to define the infrastructure requirements, including physical infrastructure – utilities, water supply, drainage, etc. – and social infrastructure such as health, leisure, and education. Such knowledge would be vital in preparing a financial appraisal and calculating developer contributions towards its provision, and identifying any subsequent calls on public sector funding. Hence the findings from the exercise – due to commence in the early part of 2009 – will comprise a significant input into future iterations of the IPA-East Package, and indeed, the Haven Gateway IDP as a whole. Financial provision is needed to ensure that all elements of this work, including commissioning any independent financial appraisals ie not just the developer led elements, will be available to the local planning authority.

13.16 That said, a particular constraint on housing development, and one that is likely to apply whichever site eventually emerges as the Preferred Option, is the capacity of the local road system. Analysis of this particular issue, through traffic modelling, is important if mitigation and/or improvements are to be put in place thereby releasing opportunities for further housing and employment beyond the period of the current RSS.

13.17 An outline planning application for some 2000 homes on land adjacent to Adastral Park and 2000 jobs within it was submitted in September 2008. It is expected to be determined in 2009.

**Wider opportunities/constraints across the Ipswich Eastern Fringe**

13.18 A key issue with regard to unlocking the potential of IPA-E – in terms of both housing and economic/employment growth – concerns the supply of electricity. The growth of Adastral Park and InnovationMartlesham needs to be accompanied by the provision of a dedicated energy connection. This would create capacity in the remainder of the supply network to IPA-E. This will remove a major constraint to further housing growth in the wider area and enable such growth to progress unhindered.

13.19 Additionally, concerns have been expressed with regard to wider issues of transport access and potential overload on the A14 Orwell Bridge.

**The most important investments proposed, with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package**

13.20 The development of IPA-E is a long term commitment, and it is multi-faceted.

13.21 There is an on-going commitment to the delivery of InnovationMartlesham, including a Knowledge Hub. Additionally, in the **short term**, three priority interventions have been identified:
• The establishment of a Knowledge Hub, focussing on education, training, innovation, knowledge transfer, research and incubation of ICT companies. This centre will be a catalyst for larger private sector investment on the Innovation Park.

• A series of priority transport schemes have been identified linking into plans for the area. These have the primary purpose of linking employment and housing in a sustainable way. The first stage in the process involves study and modelling exercises.

• IPA-E delivery planning – this involves the commissioning of specialist consultants to assist in the overall delivery strategy for the area.

13.22 There is also a major issue regarding electricity provision to IPA-E – this is needed because electricity supply to Martlesham, including Adastral Park, is simply insufficient in relation to the scale of planned growth. A new supply will also release capacity elsewhere in IPA-E, thereby enabling housing growth to take place without being delayed by energy constraints. This is a priority; discussions are ongoing with EDF but timing of major new investment has still to be resolved.

13.23 In the medium term, there will be investment priorities associated with the development of InnovationMartlesham and the projects within it. Additionally, funding may be required to release the potential of the Cranes site (although this is currently unclear) and additional investment linked to the park and ride facility may also be necessary.

13.24 Working through these different interventions, Figure 13-1 below attempts to set out a critical path with regard to the delivery of the IPA-E Package.
### Scoring of projects

The table below sets out a framework for the scoring of projects within this package. At this stage it has not been possible to score all the projects but this will be completed shortly. In the meantime, partners have identified the top three priorities as being support for Innovation Martlesham, further master planning and transport improvements, although the priorities within this latter category are still to be determined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport modelling**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity supply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery planning *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and Knowledge Hub</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesgrave Cycle way</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martlesham cycleway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 – Traffic control/Martlesham bus priority corridor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Martlesham cycle/pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Fit” should range from 3 (high) to 1 (low) in relation to the criterion. “Fit” should be multiplied by “weight” to achieve a “score”. The scores from each of the domains should then be summed in the final column.

* Funded through the Transport Thematic Investment Package

** Funded through Maximising our Future Potential Sustainable Development Investment Package
Overall Package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts

Costs

13.26 Across the interventions identified to date, the immediate call on public funding is estimated to be £13.28 million (of which approximately £7.8 million is sought from CLG). This is made up as follows:

- £1.5 million is required from CLG to finance the multi million pound Knowledge Hub that will act as a catalyst for the continued expansion of InnovationMartlesham. A joint funding package (involving investment from a range of other bodies including EEDA) is required in recognition of the education, training and incubator elements of the project which cannot otherwise be developed entirely by the private sector.

- £11.63 million relates to transport projects (from bus priority measures to traffic modelling, traffic management and a pedestrian/cycle bridge and a cycle link), including capital and revenue items. The outputs will be transport management measures thereby reducing congestion and creating a modal shift from the private car to other forms of transport.

- a small amount of revenue expenditure – £0.095 million – will support the completion of the delivery plan/detailed development brief(s) exercise that will have considerable benefits by identifying infrastructure needs and constraints at an early stage in the development of a substantial area of housing and employment identified in the RSS. (These costs form part of the financial provision sought for master/delivery planning and other preparatory studies within the costings shown in the Longer Term Package).

Outputs and Outcomes

13.27 Package-level outcomes will be determined as the development work is undertaken. These are likely to include significant numbers of jobs created and houses delivered, but also important qualitative changes in the way the economy of the Haven Gateway works. In particular, there ought to be scope for the development of a very significant cluster of knowledge-based activity which will have an outcome of regional, indeed national/international, significance.

Risks/risk mitigation

13.28 No substantial risk has been identified in relation to the specific projects. There is however a possibility of underestimation of some project costs.

13.29 Package-level risks will be identified and managed as the Package is developed. However, macro-economic conditions – particularly with regard to ICT activities – will certainly be a factor. In relation to InnovationMartlesham, there are also state aid issues that need to be addressed.
14: North Colchester

Package Description

14.1 The North Colchester Regeneration Area (Severalls Hospital/Cuckoo Farm) is an established key focus for both substantial employment and housing growth within the functional urban area of Colchester. It is the subject of a comprehensive Master Plan (Cuckoo Farm/Severalls Hospital) and further proposals to take regeneration into a wider part of North Colchester are now being advanced by the Council as part of its LDF Core Strategy to consolidate this growth (North Colchester Greenfield LDF land release).

14.2 The whole area is well located in relation to transport infrastructure (the area is situated around Colchester North Mainline Railway Station and between this Station and the A12) and, with two sections of the Northern Approaches Infrastructure already completed and the third in prospect, it will have the benefit of an integrated transport system of new roads, a two lane segregated busway, Park and Ride and local cycle and walking routes.

14.3 A considerable amount of development has already occurred in the area and this has generated a good deal of momentum on which to build. However, development of the Severalls Hospital site and surrounding Greenfield land has stalled due to the current economic downturn and investment is now being sought to stimulate delivery of these key sites through the early completion of the A12 junction. Originally proposed to be funded as part of the infrastructure works within the Severalls Hospital S106 Agreement, a bid has now been made for CIF 2 funding to construct the junction and initial approval has been granted, subject to the submission of a detailed business case. In addition, discussions are continuing with English Partnerships as one of the landowners of the Severalls Hospital site, regarding the prospect of forward funding delivery of the remaining infrastructure works.

14.4 The map overleaf shows the location of the North Colchester Package, and the principal development sites within it.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

14.5 North Colchester is a substantial development area and there has already been significant progress with regard to the development of business park locations and housing sites. The Council has played a key role as a major landowner in facilitating this development including assisting the town’s largest remaining manufacturing company, Flakt Woods, to relocate to the area safeguarding almost 500 local jobs. The Council has also worked with developers to deliver part of the infrastructure needed to release the North Colchester regeneration area for development.
The challenge however – in line with some of the thinking set out in the RES – is to ensure that the jobs created are of a reasonable quality and – as far as possible – that they are both embedded within the area and keep pace with the very high recent levels of housing growth. The main existing employment area of Severalls Park has seen a number of larger traditional employers (e.g. Trebor) close and even newer large businesses (e.g. AXA) relocate away from the area. The trend seems to be one of the larger businesses fragmenting or relocating to consolidate with other plants leaving. Colchester’s principal growth sector is based on small and medium sized enterprises. The Council has therefore adopted a strategy of promoting incubator units around the town: hence the proposed development of a 26 unit Business Incubator at Colchester Business Park and also in selling its own land, trying to secure developments which offer a range of sizes and tenures. The recent development by the Easter Group on the site next to Flakt Woods is a good example of this.

In housing terms, an adjacent area, Highwoods, has previously seen rapid housing growth both in the private and social sectors. The rapid pace of this growth and the lack of support for the new community has taught the Council some major lessons in terms of the need to accompany new growth with an appropriate range of local support services. The adopted Severalls Hospital/Cuckoo Farm Master Plan sets out a clear framework for sustainable future housing and employment growth. This Master Plan includes the Colchester Community Stadium, which opened in July 2008, as a centrepiece to act as a catalyst to both employment and housing growth. This development not only provides a landmark building to act as a focal point to announce this latest phase of Colchester’s growth and to provide a focus for community activity. Not only does the new stadium accommodate Colchester United but it also offers a regional scale conference venue much needed by local businesses at Severalls Park and Colchester Business Park, and a range of community opportunities from five a side courts, to a new computer training suite for youth development run by the Colchester Community Sports Trust. The opportunity to develop a community facility such as an information centre and community café will also be realised over the next few months, and in the slightly longer term, there are proposals to create a crèche on this site.

Overall, it is anticipated that the North Colchester Package will deliver about 1,500 homes (with the possibility of an urban extension which will accommodate a further 2,200 homes) over the period to 2021. In terms of jobs, it is estimated that the Package will contribute around 2,600 new jobs.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing**

Most importantly, there is a need to ensure the delivery of the A12 junction and supporting Northern Approaches Road (NAR 3) infrastructure given outline CIF 2 approval. Development in the area has now reached a policy and physical threshold beyond which no further employment development and limited residential development can take place without this new infrastructure. Subject to market conditions, the private sector will deliver the required housing and job numbers but public sector pump priming will now be essential to remove this principal obstacle to development going forward. A substantial proportion of Colchester’s planned growth and indeed its LDF strategy is now at risk if the provision of this junction cannot be secured.

Within the context of North Colchester, there is also a need to achieve delivery of a Park and Ride facility and improved connectivity to the Town Centre to support proposals contained
within the Colchester Town Centre Investment Package. These planned developments are dependent upon the provision of adequate alternative public transport measures as they involve the redevelopment of existing town centre surface car parks.

14.11 Investment already planned by the Borough Council should deliver a 15,000 sq ft (gross) incubator unit on the adjacent Colchester Business Park. In order to ensure that small companies can find the premises and support that they need to survive and grow, the Council has selected the local Enterprise Agency, COLBEA, to operate the completed facility and, subject to a revised cost plan and confirmation of funding, hopes to be able to go out to tender for a developer shortly. A study by SQW in conjunction with EEDA suggested the need for additional incubator space of this type and the original Business Incubator in Magdalen Street Colchester, already operated by COLBEA, has proved very successful.

14.12 In a similar vein, a previous initiative to expand the supply of accommodation for local artists within redundant farm buildings on the north side of the A12 at Cuckoo Farm, has proved highly successful over recent years. Demand is such that the Council has been planning a second phase of accommodation. This project will support Colchester’s increasing profile as a major centre for the creative arts and links well to the expansion of the Colchester Institute’s centre for Art and Design, the Firstsite project and planned Cultural Quarter.

14.13 The main part of Cuckoo Farm area is also identified as a Strategic Employment site within the Haven Gateway area and the release of this land for high quality development is therefore a high priority not just for the immediate benefit of North Colchester. The potential contribution of 1,500 new homes towards local and sub-regional housing targets from this Regeneration Area is also a key opportunity.

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

14.14 Priority investments in relation to the long term development of North Colchester include:

- **Colchester Community Stadium, Imagine Centre.** Now that the stadium is finished, the development of the community element is starting to gain momentum. A number of initiatives to use space within the building are being explored as are some developments around the periphery (eg a children’s nursery). The next confirmed phase is the Imagine Centre, which is to be funded by Essex County Council and is planned to open in early 2009. This will bring new learning opportunities to local people.

- **The proposed new junction on the A12 and final sections of the Northern Approaches Road** (including the segregated two lane bus way). Without this 16ha of future employment development at Cuckoo Farm and approx 1,500 units of housing development at Severalls Hospital (and the proposed 2200 units shown in the LDF core strategy) are prevented both by adopted planning policy and by the practical lack of proper access and utility services. This was intended to be developer funded (already secured through a Section 106 Agreement) but requires the active support and involvement of the Highways Agency in order to achieve its delivery and may yet require public sector support if difficult market conditions prevail. Outline approval for CIF 2 funding has been given.
• **North Colchester Rapid Transport Link** – without which both existing bus services and proposed Park and Ride services will struggle to negotiate an existing bottleneck between North Station bridge and Colchester town centre. This is Colchester’s most congested section of road network and will similarly constrain future development in the area, unless urgently addressed.

• **Park and Ride** – this is essential due to increasing levels of traffic congestion in North Colchester and the need to move forward the Colchester Town Centre investment package which involves the redevelopment of several town centre car parks. The delivery of the A12 junction and two lane busway will release the long awaited opportunity to create a first class Park and Ride facility in Colchester.

• **Social housing** – securing the provision of 25% social housing within the forthcoming residential development is fundamental to meeting local housing need and ensuring “key workers” and others are not excluded from this new community. Economic circumstances are reducing developer funding (secured through a signed Section 106 Agreement), the active involvement and support of the Housing Corporation, and in the future the HCA, will be necessary to maximise the benefits from this opportunity.

• **Business Incubation Centre** – securing the provision of further small business units operated by the Colchester Business Enterprise Agency will add to the opportunities to grow this sector in the economy in this important regeneration/growth area of Colchester and address a longstanding shortfall in local provision.

• **Artists workshops/studios** - provision of enhanced creative business opportunities is planned at Cuckoo Farm Studios by the proposal to develop a further 11 workshop studios, together with associated office and gallery space which builds upon the success of the existing facilities. The studios will support the firstsite programme of provision of training, business support and mentoring to creative industries and will be linked to the proposed creative business centre in the Town Centre. This cluster will increase existing skill levels, meet strong demand in this sector and provide further opportunities for entrepreneurship within the Borough and the wider sub region.

• **Further Master Plan work** associated with areas proposed for longer term development in Colchester’s LDF Core Strategy Preferred Option – Greenfield Land Release.

**Timing and critical path**

14.15 The Community Stadium opened for business in August 2008. Park and Ride and the associated Rapid Transport link project, given local congestion, is still a key priority, however, the crucial priority is to ensure that the construction of the A12 junction is delivered as soon as possible and securing the CIF 2 funding could mean it would be open by 2011. Delivery of the junction and match funding for associated infrastructure will be a catalyst for both housing and employment sites in the area and will also enable Park and Ride to be delivered in the same timescale. The other main priority is the provision of a business incubation centre to support small business formation and growth – an important measure in the current economic climate. Here the site is available, an operator has been appointed and subject to confirmation of funding, development could commence in 2009.
14.16 Working through these different interventions, Figure 14-1 below attempts to set out a critical path with regard to the delivery of the North Colchester Package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>LDF proposed resi devt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Severalls Residential Devt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Severalls 106 inc Social Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Severalls Emplymt Devt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Park and Ride &amp; Rapid Transport schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>A12 Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>North Col BIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cuckoo Farm Studios Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>LDF Greenfield Release - Master Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Imagine Centre in Stadium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priorities for short term public sector funding**

**Investments either with public funding secured or privately funded**

**Possible calls on future public funding, but currently no details available ie dependent on studies, political decisions etc**

### Scoring of projects

14.17 Across the projects identified above, the table below indicates the scores that have been given to them by local partners – against agreed criteria for IDPs as a whole. The higher the score, the greater the level of priority afforded to the particular project. As can be seen, the top three priorities are the A12 Junction, Park and Ride/Rapid Transport Link and the North Colchester Business Incubator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12 Junction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride and Rapid Transport Link scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Centre, Community Stadium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Creche, Community Stadium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Colchester Business Incubation Centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuckoo Farm Studios Phase 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalls - Left slips off A12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalls - New Primary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalls - Allotments and Open Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalls - Community Centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severalls - Social Housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Stadium - sale of leisure enabling land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF Greenfield Release-Master Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts

14.18 The total funding required to pump prime this investment package is £5.25 million in terms of capital (EEDA) and £700,000 in terms of revenue (CLG). In addition, there is a bid for CIF funding of over £11 million. This investment is primarily aimed at essential transport measures (particularly the delivery of the A12 junction) in advance of approximately £15m of planned further private investment in Transport Infrastructure by private developers already secured by Section 106 Agreement. This will help accelerate an estimated £200 million of private sector investment in building 1,500 new homes and 64,000 sq m of employment space. This pump priming will also make the development more sustainable and will assist longer term growth in North Colchester (2,200 dwellings) as proposed in the LDF as well as the regeneration plans in the Town Centre, which rely on improved transport arrangements in this Northern Sector.

14.19 The investment in the business incubation centre will deliver 134 new jobs, 85 new businesses and will assist 120 businesses to improve their performance and 700 people in skills development (all in first 3 years).

14.20 The investment in further Master Plan work will clarify how development in these areas can be taken forward and establish the potential for job creation within them.

Risks/risk mitigation

14.21 The great advantage of the North Colchester Investment Package is that most of the preparatory work has already been done so risks are generally low. However, the bulk of the private sector investment including major infrastructure works in North Colchester has been secured through a comprehensive Section 106 Agreement signed in 2006. These obligations will be discharged by the eventual residential developer of the Severalls Hospital Site and given the downturn in the property market, there has been little interest in the site from developers. Therefore the risk of a delay in relation to the scale and later development has substantially increased and without public funding, little development is likely to occur in the short term.

14.22 In respect of the CIF 2 bid, there is a risk that the junction cannot be physically completed by the proposed date of March 2011. However, mitigation is already underway in the form of early design work which is being funded at risk from ECC. There is also a risk that the major transport package secured will not effectively link with the town’s remaining infrastructure because of a particular bottleneck. The Rapid Transport Link project will address that risk and will also support the Park and Ride proposals.
15: East Colchester

Package Description

15.1 The regeneration of East Colchester is based around the future potential of the area for the creation of a new waterside community alongside the expanding University of Essex. Substantial new housing and jobs growth is envisaged. Early development has been of the easier sites and there is a risk that the remaining sites will be more difficult and expensive to deliver. It is also likely to mean that their potential to generate Section 106 funds to support area-wide environmental and transport improvements will be very limited.

15.2 Of all the Haven Gateway Spatial Investment Packages, East Colchester is among the most traditional as a regeneration project. It addresses persistent social, economic and environmental decline in the area of Colchester’s former port. This was closed by Act of Parliament in 2000 and one of the main sites (Coldock) was acquired by EEDA. A number of specific interventions made by the Council funded through SRB rekindled private sector investment interest in the area and the Council published the Colne Harbour Development Framework to channel and co-ordinate that interest. Substantial development has since been undertaken but it remains fragmented and there is clearly a need to build a coherent community and not just a large number of new homes.

15.3 The multiplicity of complex ownership arrangements across much of this remaining area and the high cost of redeveloping these contaminated brownfield sites will make the Council’s task in realising its overall vision for the area challenging. A revised and more detailed Master Plan has now been developed and adopted as SPD by the Council to provide more focus on the remaining sites and overarching infrastructure requirements. However, although East Colchester has some important assets in relation to the growth ambitions of the wider Haven Gateway, most notably the presence of the University of Essex, these are premised on some key interventions.

15.4 A map showing the location of the East Colchester Investment Package – and the principal physical sites and assets within it – is provided overleaf.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

15.5 The role of the East Colchester Package in relation to the wider vision of the Haven Gateway, and the objectives of the RES and RSS, can be portrayed at a number of different levels.

15.6 Potentially, the regeneration of East Colchester has the opportunity to go hand in hand with the development of the knowledge economy, not only in Colchester but across the wider Haven Gateway and also regionally. It has the huge advantage that it has, right alongside it, the University of Essex – one of the region’s foremost higher educational institutions with a number of world class research specialisms. At the centre of the Package is a series of planned investments which will facilitate the commercialisation of knowledge linked to the University of Essex. This in turn should make a tangible contribution to the development of higher value-added economic activity within the locality, the Haven Gateway and the region. Additionally, the provision of more, higher quality, jobs ought to encourage more graduates of the University of Essex to remain in the local area following graduation. All three aspects should address identified weaknesses in the Colchester and Haven Gateway economies.
The East Colchester Package will also be associated with the delivery of around 2,600 new homes over the period to 2021; many of these will be provided in high density mixed use developments. The role of Colchester East with regard to Colchester’s overall housing commitment was set out clearly in the Borough Council’s Amendment to the Core Strategy Preferred Options which was published in May 2007.

Housing growth on this scale will itself generate demand for local services, etc. It is estimated that the jobs growth associated with planned investments linked to the University of Essex, combined with that associated with the development of additional housing, will together provide the basis for around 3,000 net additional jobs over the period to 2021. Not only will these jobs secure the sustainability of the new residential units, they will replace the large number of traditional jobs lost in this former commercial heartland of Colchester, based around the former port. This will be of Borough-wide significance.

Over the period, Haven Gateway as a whole has committed to delivering 50,000 net additional jobs and a similar number of net additional dwellings. Hence the East Colchester Package ought to contribute around 5% of both of the two key delivery targets.

Description of the opportunities the Package is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing

As stated above, if there is one major opportunity in Colchester to assist the Borough and the Haven Gateway Sub-Region to harness existing knowledge-based assets to increase GVA and increase the metrics of enterprise and entrepreneurship, it is the University of Essex – one of the UK’s leading research-based universities – and in particular its proposed Research Park. This Package includes a number of environmental and transport measures which will provide a proper context for the development of the planned University Research Park.

Due to the credit crunch, the University has recently lost its planned sale of some residential enabling land and as a result cannot immediately generate the cross subsidy needed to support the provision of infrastructure to service the 16 ha research park site. This fact, coupled with the wider economic downturn, suggests that the University may now struggle to progress any major phases of the research park in the short term. However, it has recently undertaken a root and branch review of the proposed first phase of this project and is now in the process of developing a proposition based upon some specialisms for which it is world renowned. This would support the development of a flagship building and encourage the University’s development partner to build an accompanying office village. Further details should be available shortly.

The Research Park has always been conceived as a means of stimulating new business ventures based upon collaboration with (or even entrepreneurship by) University academics. This will also assist in boosting graduate retention levels. The intention is to provide a variety of unit sizes and types to be able to offer business a growth path into the eventual larger units of the Research Park as they expand. Another advantage of the Research Park is that not only will it attract high value jobs but it should have a significant “multiplier effect”, creating jobs in the economy of the surrounding area. This should help to address the need to provide economic benefits to deprived areas nearby (i.e. St Andrew’s Ward, Colchester’s most
deprived) but is also vitally important to meet the needs of the Haven Gateway and the region in terms of increasing GVA per capita. The University has expanded its Research and Enterprise Office significantly in recent years as a means of bringing business and academia together in readiness for these opportunities.

15.13 The key constraint for the East Colchester area is the challenge of securing high density housing redevelopment on a multiplicity of small sites and ownerships (some with contaminated land and abnormal costs for strengthening quay walls). Hence the cost of growth in East Colchester is relatively high, and the challenges are exacerbated by the high cost of potential projects to be funded by (S106) planning gain. The projects within the package therefore seek to ease the burden on individual development sites (or providing overarching infrastructure that they could never be expected to provide) by delivering public realm and transport improvements, thus improving the viability of these sites and bringing forward some of the key infrastructure required to regenerate the area.

15.14 The key opportunities for the East Colchester IDP are to clean up the old port, to provide new jobs and new homes, together with high quality community facilities, to promote innovation and the growth of knowledge-based industries, and to do so in a location that is potentially well served by public transport. However there is a potential shortage of Section 106 contributions as evidenced by the Financial Model prepared to support the new Master Plan and this has been further exacerbated by the economic situation which exists currently. Despite the investment of £1 million of Section 106 monies into the expansion and improvement of Hythe Station along with £600,000 of CLG funding, there is generally a lack of public sector funding for the required infrastructure improvements, public realm improvements for the area and for the proposed Research Park Business Incubation Centre.

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

15.15 Key projects identified in relation to this Package include:

- The University of Essex Research Park (including flagship Phase 1 building and office village) – this is critical in encouraging high value/high tech business start ups, innovation/commercial exploitation of University Intellectual Property and attracting more knowledge based companies to the Region.

- The former Coldock site – the sale of this site by EEDA for a development which complements the overall strategy and master plan for East Colchester is extremely important. This is a large waterfront site and is in public control. The quality and content of its development will set the tone for the redevelopment of King Edward Quay. Like other riverside sites, its development is constrained by failing river walls and public funding will be needed to address this if redevelopment is to be economically viable.

- The river walls study and repair/enhancement programme – This is needed to determine what other repairs might be needed to the quays and river walls in the regeneration area and to deal with them, again to address environmental and viability issues following the successful completion of the King Edward Quay repair works.
• **River Colne railings and pontoons** – these are enhancements to the quayside areas proposed once the basic repairs are completed.

• The **former Travellers/Wheelers Site** – this is part-owned by Essex County Council and its role within the Package is similar to Coldock. It is a landmark site and must be developed to the highest sustainability and design standards to facilitate the redevelopment of the Waterfront.

• **East Colchester Rapid Transit Link Study** – The improvements to Hythe Station are important in the short term to provide credible alternatives to the use of the private car. In the longer term, with a further 2600 dwellings envisaged in the East Colchester area and further expansion of the University, a more radical solution may be needed. This project will examine the potential of using the existing rail tracks and rail corridor connecting Hythe Station and St Botolph’s for a rapid transit link and work is already underway in respect of the study using Growth funding revenue monies.

• **East Colchester Park and Ride Feasibility and site allocation study** – Alongside the Rapid Transit link study, it is also proposed to consider the allocation of a Park and Ride site on this side of Colchester. Again, any radical measures to address the long term transportation needs of the regeneration area must be considered.

• **Greenlinks feasibility and implementation study** – In order to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle links from the Hythe to the town centre work is required to examine and where necessary upgrade existing well used routes, and create further links where possible to ensure maximum accessibility. This project is linked to Colchester’s Cycling Town status.

• **Breakers Park** - The provision of good quality public open space with this area of high density residential development is crucial. The site identified for such provision in the adopted master plan is a former scrapyard. Extensive remediation is needed in order to realise the new use and financial support for this will be needed.

### Timing and critical path

15.16 The most immediate project is The Hythe Station environmental improvements as the project to deliver the platform extensions is underway and will be completed in late 2008 and hence an early decision on funding for improvements to the immediate environment is required.

15.17 The delivery of an infrastructure package to open up the wider Research Park is under review in partnership with the University of Essex and EEDA. Funding has provisionally been allocated from Growth Point sources for 2010/11 (although work currently underway and due for completion by Christmas 2008 will reassess the viability of the original vision for the Research Park and will focus in particular on the proposals for an incubator within this development).

15.18 The current improvements to the Hythe Railway Station and the proposed Rapid Transit Link are the key to providing good quality access for proposed development – the proposed improvements to the A133 (east-west road) will link the University to the A12 at a later stage.
A study to assess the feasibility of a rapid transit link is underway, funded through CLG Growth Funding, and is due for completion in March 2009.

15.19 The proposed public realm improvements and open space are essential requirements before the proposed high density housing development can begin. However, the development of the proposed Research Park and river front housing can proceed step by step as the capacity of the existing transport system is improved.

15.20 The other major issue of concern, and one that has featured in responses from the public in all consultation exercises, is the lack of public open space in the area. The new Master Plan identifies the former Hythe Scrap Yards site as the preferred location for such a new open space. Although in Borough Council ownership, it is known to be heavily contaminated and a NGP1 funded study has revealed remediation costs at £2.4m. With high density developments proposed on all sides, it is vital that funding is found for the remediation of this site so that it can offer a “green lung” in what will become a heavily developed area.

15.21 Working through these different interventions, Figure 15-1 below attempts to set out a critical path with regard to the delivery of the East Colchester Package.
**Scoring of projects**

15.22 Across the projects identified above, the table overleaf indicates the scores that have been given to them by local partners – against agreed criteria for IDPs as a whole. The higher the score, the greater the level of priority afforded to the particular project. As can be seen, the top three priorities in this package are the University of Essex Research Park Phase 1 Development, the Repair of the River Walls feasibility/implementation and the Hythe Scrapyards Public Open Space projects.

**Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts**

15.23 Ultimately, private sector investment of over £275 million could be attracted into East Colchester with the private development of the variety of sites earmarked for redevelopment in this regeneration area. To ensure this investment is secured and the most sustainable new community possible is created, grant support of around £30 million may be needed: £14 million during the period 2008/09 to 2010/11, with perhaps a further £16 million in the longer term. This will address identified and suspected barriers to the realisation of the current vision for the area.

15.24 These interventions could be needed to fully address the environmental degradation of the area, effectively link the new community both internally and externally to the rest of the town and to secure the economic opportunities at the University. However, half that investment would be needed just for a river barrage and those capital costs currently seem difficult to justify. Therefore this particular project remains aspirational only at this stage. Of the rest, a significant proportion will be needed to deliver the necessary package of infrastructure to support the new growth (see figures contained in the new Master Plan).

15.25 Over the next three years, key investments of £13.64 million will be required to catalyse further development: around £3.1 million to turn the Hythe Scrapyards into a new public open space (to ensure a decent quality of life for new residents and to encourage more family homes), £1.5 million to help support the University Research Park Phase 1 (to deliver high quality job opportunities and drive the development of the wider research park) and £3.5 million towards the programme of repairs to river walls and enhancements such as railings and pontoons. Further funding is sought for the feasibility studies.

15.26 These investments will deliver regionally significant high value employment and innovation benefits, approximately 800 new housing units and crucial elements of the master plan in terms of public realm to consolidate the very fragmented nature of recent development caused by the multiplicity of land ownerships in the area.

**Risks/risk mitigation**

15.27 The University of Essex Research Park Business Innovation Centre project has been developed over several years by the University and its advisors but has been delayed by the current economic climate. The project will require funding from a number of other public sources and a review, led by the Haven Gateway, is currently being progressed to take into account deliverability. This will include stringent risk management considerations.
### Table 15-1: Scores for projects within the East Colchester Spatial Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe Station Platform extensions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe Station Environmental Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Essex Research Park Phase 1 building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Quay phase 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Colchester Rapid Transport link study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe Scrap yards remediation/Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hythe Lifting Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Walls repair feasibility/implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Colne railings &amp; pontoons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldgates site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxmans site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Travellers site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moler Works option site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldock site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/maritime business development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelers site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green links</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowhedge cycleway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town to Sea Trail phase 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Colchester transport package</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Barrage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University rail halt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Fit” should range from 3 (high) to 1 (low) in relation to the criterion. “Fit” should be multiplied by “weight” to achieve a “score”. The scores from each of the domains should then be summed in the final column.
15.28 For the other projects, King Edward Quay is now low risk with all sheet piling having largely been completed on site and the Hythe Scrapyard Remediation project has been the subject of NGP1 funded revenue study.

15.29 The Borough Council has established a Renaissance Programme Office specifically to deliver regeneration schemes and has successfully achieved its programme of developments funded through the first round of Growth Point grants. The Programme Office operates a sophisticated project planning and risk management regime and reports to a joint Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council Member Board.
16: Colchester Town Centre

Package Description

16.1 The Colchester Town Centre Package is concerned with a series of initial public interventions that are seeking, incrementally, to enhance the economic performance of Colchester Town Centre as a sub-regional shopping centre, business centre and historic/cultural centre through a co-ordinated programme of substantial private sector investments. Co-ordination is needed both to secure the private sector investment and to ensure that a fragmented pattern of development is not experienced by visitors, employees and businesses.

16.2 These actions all stem from an ambitious comprehensive master plan developed for the regeneration area (St Botolph’s Quarter) and adopted by the Council three years ago as Supplementary Planning Guidance. This high quality master plan has already supported the delivery of a £17 million visual arts facility, currently under construction, which sets the tone for a major step change in Colchester’s offer to visitors and residents alike. The Council hopes that, if delivered in its entirely, this master plan will reinforce the Borough/Haven Gateway’s position as a high quality place to both live and work. A series of project level interventions is proposed in order to effect this outcome.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

16.3 The development of Colchester town centre links with wider thinking about sustainable communities. It is also wholly consistent with the regional-level commitment in relation to the role and purpose of medium-sized cities, enhancing viability and vitality and the preservation of the historic environment.

16.4 In terms of targets for housing and jobs growth, it is envisaged that development within the town centre will deliver over 700 new jobs and attract an additional 500,000 visitors per annum to Colchester Town Centre. The Amendment to the Preferred Option for the Core Strategy, published by Colchester Borough Council in May 2007, stated that:

*Over the plan period it is projected that approximately 2,000 new homes will be delivered in the Town Centre. In addition, Colchester Borough needs to accommodate more business, tourism and retail developments, including 67,000sqm of net retail floorspace and 70,000sqm of gross office floorspace by 2021, as well as 270 to 490 hotel bedrooms by 2011. These targets reflect the findings of current studies assessing Colchester’s retail, business, and hotel requirements. This development will be primarily focused on the Town Centre, and other highly accessible locations, to create a sustainable and prestigious regional centre.*

Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing

16.5 The Package is multi-faceted and hence it links with a range of different opportunities and constraints.
16.6 One important element relates to the potential of the cultural and creative industries within Colchester town centre – linking to Firstsite – a new facility for the Visual Arts designed by the internationally famous architect Raphael Vinoly. This will be a regional icon as well as an important amenity for Colchester and through the Package, there is a strong desire to work the potential of Firstsite further and harder. The first evidence that this is starting to attract interest from the cultural industries is the fact that the Colchester Institute has decided to run, in conjunction with the University of Essex, an MA Art course based in a building adjacent to the new Firstsite building. The Council anticipates that the next most direct beneficiary of this effect will be the adjacent Cultural Quarter. Following an extensive competition, development team Garbe/Ash Sakula were chosen to become the Council’s preferred developer for this project. Their innovative mixed use scheme won best future projects in 2008 at the MIPIM property fair in Cannes. The scheme proposes the creation of a hub for cultural industries and the exact scale and scope of this project is currently being assessed although it is intended that start up space for creative businesses attracted by the association with Firstsite. Unfortunately, this facility may now need additional public support in the light of the effects of the recent “credit crunch” and development will almost certainly be phased with Phase 1 containing a new 100 bed hotel, the creative business centre and independent retail, together with high quality public realm.

16.7 Additionally, land assembly is important in terms of realising ambitions for Colchester as a whole. Currently the structure of land ownership is complicated and, particularly around St Botolph’s cultural quarter, there is an imperative to address some of the surrounding issues. This is particularly the case with the proposed 500,000 sq ft Vineyard Gate shopping centre where around 60 private property interests will need to be acquired under Compulsory Purchase. The Council’s preferred developer for this scheme, the Caddick Group, is continuing to drive this project forward with the Council’s support even in the current economic climate, although public funding may be sought for elements of public realm within the scheme. However, in order to vacate the current surface car parks upon which the new developments are planned, the Council needs to deliver both park and ride (in North Colchester) and a new multi storey car park in Magdalen Street. The latter will also require land assembly. In addition a comprehensive improvements programme in respect of public realm in the town centre is underway, particularly in the St Botolph’s area and the Council’s proposal to develop a public realm strategy within the urban area will further underpin its desire to create good quality fully accessible public spaces which support the social and economic drivers.

16.8 Most importantly, the opportunity exists in Colchester Town Centre, with perhaps £3-5 million of early pump priming funds (to support public realm and transport improvements and potentially develop elements of the offer within the Cultural Quarter), to facilitate potentially up to £300 million of private sector investment in the Cultural Quarter, Magistrates Courts (likely to be a PFI project), Vineyard Gate and Britannia Works residential development. These developments will directly contribute only around 400 of the new homes planned for the central area of Colchester but will deliver all the jobs and economic benefits and strengthen Colchester’s long term economic potential.

16.9 In terms of constraints, the most obvious are releasing sites for development, resolving the traffic and environmental issues for those using the new developments and moving around the town centre.
The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

16.10 In view of the above, the key projects within the package are as follows:

- **Cultural Quarter** – this project not only brings back into use a semi-derelict area in Colchester Town Centre, but will create an attractive area adjacent to the Firstsite development that is currently under construction. Overall the project will include units for small specialist independent retailers, bars and restaurants, creative business space and residential accommodation to add vitality to the area. The project is intended to be entirely privately funded but elements such as the creative business centre may need public sector pump priming and the current economic downturn means that a phased development will now be delivered with the hotel and creative business centre proposed as part of Phase 1.

- **Vineyard Gate** – this project will deliver the scale and quality of new retail accommodation needed to enable Colchester to maintain its position as an important sub-regional shopping centre. The project is intended to be entirely privately funded but again some elements, in particular in respect of public realm, may require public support in order to achieve the level of quality desired and supported by the public through a consultation exercise in 2007.

- **St Botolph’s new multi storey car park** – Town Centre regeneration projects will take place on the sites of a number of existing surface car parks and one multi storey car park. While Park and Ride is expected to replace much of this lost capacity, one new multi storey car park will be essential to maintaining adequate overall parking capacity. The project is intended to be entirely privately funded.

- **Car parking during regeneration measures** – In anticipation of the disruption caused by major construction work on car parking generally, and the lead in time to deliver the new multi storey car park, the Council will be undertaking, at its own cost, a number of temporary measures to manage the situation for the benefit of local traders, shoppers and visitors.

- **Public Realm Strategy** – The Council proposes to develop a comprehensive strategy which will be a guidance document for all future public realm improvements to ensure that good quality fully accessible public realm is created across the town. This project is part of the Haven Gateway Green Infrastructure Strategy but is being managed as part of the Colchester Town Centre regeneration work.

- **St Botolph’s Public Realm improvements** – Improvements to the public realm are a key strand of the master plan for the St Botolph’s Quarter regeneration and are already underway, funded through NGP 1, although it is proposed that they will tie into the overall Public Realm Strategy in due course. A series of phased improvements are proposed aimed at linking the various component development schemes in St Botolph’s together, whilst enhancing and providing access to Colchester’s hidden heritage treasures and linking into the Council’s Cycling Town status. These include Colchester Castle, St Botolph’s Priory, the Roman Wall and Berryfield (the site of a Roman mosaic and now to be a new open space to the South of the Firstsite
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This particular project is the subject of a feasibility study funded by NGP round 1 revenue monies and is subject to extensive consultation with English Heritage, the local community, local businesses, and local educational establishments. Once completed, these public realm improvements will create a network of new pedestrian and cycle routes linking both heritage assets and new developments in the area. As part of the overarching public realm strategy, they will aim to give Colchester Town Centre a distinctive cohesive identity.

- **St Botolph’s Priory Feasibility and Implementation** – As part of the considerable programme of improvements to public spaces already underway in the St Botolph’s area, it has been recognised that the 12th Century priory and its grounds are valuable assets which are currently underused and where considerable social problems exist. Given the central position and historical value of this scheduled ancient monument, the Council is seeking to carry out a feasibility study and subsequently develop an improvements programme which will ensure this area becomes a well used and integral part of the Town Centre public realm.

- **Town Centre Core Improvements (feasibility and delivery)** – This project will, first, enable identification of, and, second, achieve the delivery of, the improvements needed to ensure the vitality of the town centre, facilitate development of the Cultural Quarter and Vineyard Gate areas, and promote sustainable travel into the town centre, including the relocation of the temporary bus station from Queen Street to a permanent solution in the town centre. The project will seek to address cross town traffic movements which currently cause significant environmental problems in the narrow town centre streets such as St Botolph’s Street and aims to create a new high quality pedestrian-friendly environment which will rejuvenate run down tertiary shopping areas. This project also proposes to address some of the existing social and economic issues in the Town Centre, and in particular the High Street, and the guidance of the proposed Public Realm Strategy will be key in delivering the high quality spaces referred to above.

- **Cycle town initiative** – a crucial component of town centre accessibility will be realised through Colchester’s successful application and this initiative links into most of the other Town Centre projects.

16.11 In the longer term, there may be a need to look at ways of bringing forward the Britannia Works site for residential development (with potential for 200 units) and to investigate/address the serious contamination issues affecting this former factory site.

**Timing and critical path**

16.12 Ensuring Firstsite opens with the best possible local environment (i.e. with Berryfield Park) and is followed as quickly as possible by the Cultural Quarter is the vital first stage in the regeneration effort described in this Package. In addition it is essential that the Town Centre Core Project runs simultaneously in order to ensure the new developments are accessible to visitors and residents alike. Similarly it will be necessary for the public realm strategy to be completed at the earliest possible stage to ensure that public spaces are created to provide a unique and high quality Colchester identity. Clearing the way for Vineyard Gate and other
developments on current car parks by making appropriate re-provision is the next step and then delivering Vineyard Gate is the ultimate goal. This is unlikely to be achieved before 2014.

16.13 Working through these different interventions, Figure 16-1 below attempts to set out a critical path with regard to the delivery of the Colchester Town Centre Package.

**Figure 16-1: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the Colchester Town Centre package**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2028</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre resi devt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Public Realm Imps &amp; St Botolph's Priory</td>
<td>Vineyard Gate</td>
<td>Town Centre Core Imps</td>
<td>St Bots MSCP &amp; temp parking measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cultural Quarter/ Creative Business Centre</td>
<td>Firstsite</td>
<td>Public Realm Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Priorities for short term public sector funding**
- **Investments either with public funding secured or privately funded**
- **Possible calls on future public funding, but currently no details available ie dependent on studies, political decisions etc**

**Scoring of projects**

16.14 Across the projects identified above, the table below indicates the scores that have been given to them by local partners – against agreed criteria for IDPs as a whole. The higher the score, the greater the level of priority afforded to the particular project. As is evident, the top three priorities are Public Realm Strategy, Cultural Quarter and Vineyard Gate.
Table 16-1: Scores for projects within the Colchester Town Centre Spatial Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm Strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm Improvements - phases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Botolph’s Priory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre Core Improvements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Quarter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking during regeneration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Botolph’s new Multi Storey Car Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Town Initiative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia Works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fit” should range from 3 (high) to 1 (low) in relation to the criterion. “Fit” should be multiplied by “weight” to achieve a “score”. The scores from each of the domains should then be summed in the final column.*
Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts

16.15 The initial requirement for grant support for this package is £7.63 million, funding that will be invested in three main projects – the public realm strategy and phased programme of improvements, Town Centre Core improvements and support for the Creative Business Centre in the Cultural Quarter. Further work on individual projects may identify additional public investment needs e.g. public realm elements within Vineyard Gate and further public transport improvements. This investment will however help to lever in an expected £257 million of other funding, most of it private sector, in the Cultural Quarter and Vineyard Gate Shopping Centre.

16.16 These are the necessary enabling steps that provide the environment to release the growing tide of developments that have begun to emerge following the start of work on the catalytic Firstsite development and the adoption of the bold master plan. Vineyard Gate alone promises to deliver up to 500,000 sq ft of retail space and other planned developments will increase this further. In total, these enabling steps will facilitate approximately £300 million of private sector investment using Colchester’s potential to greatly increase its own profile and that of the Haven Gateway. This will assist in creating both direct new jobs in the developments and indirect new jobs as a result of an anticipated additional 500,000 visitors to the town each year based upon research undertaken for the St Botolph’s master plan and regular tourism volume and value assessments.

16.17 Looking ahead, the Council is considering promoting a further master plan exercise for other sectors of the town centre once all the St Botolph’s developments are underway. The scale of development here, particularly of retail development at Vineyard Gate, will undoubtedly lead to changes in retailing and pedestrian patterns and further challenges and opportunities for the town centre will need to be considered. This will be a project that is addressed in future iterations of the IDP.

Risks/risk mitigation

16.18 Major town centre development schemes are inherently risky but the Cultural Quarter and Vineyard Gate developments are progressing well in spite of the current market, based upon a huge amount of preparatory work and liaison with stakeholders and regulatory bodies. The improvement works to Phase 1 of the Public Realm Projects is underway as is the Historic Town Centre Improvements Project, and within each project, risks have been identified and are being managed.

16.19 The Council has established a Renaissance Programme Office specifically to deliver regeneration schemes and has successfully achieved its programme of developments funded through the first round of Growth Point grants. The Programme Office operates a sophisticated project planning and risk management regime and reports to a joint Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council Member Board.
17: Coastal Towns

Description of the Package

17.1 The Haven Gateway Coastal Towns Package is intended to address the particular problems facing coastal communities as described in the introductory chapters of this document. It proposes a series of measures which are designed to address the regeneration needs of the towns of Felixstowe, Harwich, Clacton, Walton and Jaywick but also includes measures in other smaller coastal settlements.

17.2 This Package is concerned with issues relating to the economic decline and peripheral locations of these coastal communities. In so doing, it seeks to promote socio-economic inclusion targeted on some of the most deprived communities within the region and, the country. The intention is to effect long term regeneration and sustainable economic growth, often in the context of managing challenging flood issues and coastal erosion.

17.3 The five towns vary substantially in terms of their size: whereas Clacton has a resident population of 54,000, Jaywick is home to approximately 5,000 people. But taken together, the five towns’ combined population is approaching 125,000: larger than that of Colchester (urban area) and a significant part of the Haven Gateway sub-region. All five towns exhibit, to varying degrees, the consequences of a lack of investment and there is evidence of acute deprivation. At the same time – particularly for Felixstowe, Clacton and Harwich – significant housing growth is planned and it will be important that appropriate jobs growth is encouraged: at the time of the last Census, there was net out-commuting even from Clacton (the largest of the five towns) suggesting that some of the towns were at risk of becoming places to live rather than work. This is not sustainable. Felixstowe on the other hand has a different problem – although its tourism employment is in decline and this issue needs to be addressed, its Port is rapidly expanding and further housing provision is needed to accommodate the influx of workers.

17.4 In looking to the future, the assessment of precisely what is needed, why it is required and how it might be achieved varies for each of the towns. Moreover progress towards addressing these issues is also at different stages: whereas plans for Harwich and Clacton are well established, those for Jaywick, Felixstowe and Walton are in the process of development. The majority of proposals already agreed or likely to emerge – and included within this Spatial Package – will seek to stimulate private sector investment and confidence by public agencies working together to contribute to the provision of the necessary infrastructure to unlock development potential. The Package also seeks to encourage land assembly projects which will become ‘turnkey’ projects to secure private sector investment and venture capital.

17.5 Presentationally, the Package is divided into two elements: those coastal towns within Suffolk Coastal district (Coastal Towns 1) and those within Tendring (Coastal Towns 2).
Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

17.6 The Coastal Towns Spatial Package has important links both to the overall vision of the Haven Gateway IDP and to the aspirations of both the RES and RSS. The Regional Economic Strategy recognises that the region’s coastal towns are under-performing against a range of economic performance indicators. Leaving aside the Port (as opposed to the town or resort) of Felixstowe, they are failing to act as strong employment magnets or exert a significant influence on their wider hinterlands. Policy HG1 of the RSS seeks to achieve transformational development and change which will regenerate areas and in particular address unemployment, deprivation and social issues. Providing appropriate sites, premises and infrastructure to attract a diverse range of employment to these towns is also highlighted in policy HG2.

17.7 In terms of the headline targets of the two strategies:

- The five coastal towns are planned – between them – to deliver substantial numbers of additional dwellings – something in the order 8,000, the majority of which will be in or close to Felixstowe, Clacton and Harwich. When fully implemented, this Package of proposals will contribute directly to RSS and local targets for the provision of new housing, with a focus on the need to substantially increase the number of affordable housing units. This will address a particular problem in these areas as illustrated by Tendring District which needs to reduce its current deficit of 1,395 units per annum¹.

- Additionally, the expectation must be that much of the planned jobs growth needs to be in or close to the five settlements: the challenge will be to stimulate high value and enduring jobs that can effect long term restructuring of the economic base and complement employment connected with planned Port expansion.

- Within the five towns are some of the most deprived communities within the region: effecting long term regeneration will be challenging but it is a regional aspiration which is quantified through indicators relating to the employment rate and earnings inequality.

17.8 This Package complements the Haven Gateway’s Programme of Development which identifies Harwich as a ‘growth node’ and also recognises the special needs of Jaywick. That area – together with Clacton Town Centre – features within the 3% most deprived areas in the Country². As such they need to be given priority in terms of intervention. Felixstowe is also recognised in the Haven Gateway Framework for Growth as a “growth node” and a centre that is potentially capable of providing for the needs of an expanding tourism sector as well as being a priority area for regeneration.

¹ TDC Housing Strategy 2005-10
² Index of Multiple Deprivation 2007
Coastal Towns 1, Part A – Felixstowe, the Trimleys

Overview

17.9 This element of the overall Package is concerned with the release of housing, social and economic potential that exists at the employment centre of Felixstowe and Pin Mill. It focuses on the achievement of a vision based upon a sustainable pattern of development, where residential and economic growth are supported by appropriate infrastructure.

Local context

17.10 A recent report on socio economic issues in Felixstowe has revealed a number of causes for concern. These are not dissimilar to those of other coastal towns but are worthy of mention. For example, between 33% and 36% of all households in Felixstowe contain at least one person with a limiting long-term illness.

17.11 There are also significantly high numbers of households living in unsuitable accommodation in the town. 14% of households in Felixstowe live in unsuitable premises, compared to just 3.5% in the Ipswich fringe area. Felixstowe North, South and West wards also have a particularly high percentage of households without central heating (but with sole use of bath/shower and toilet). This amounts to 8.70% of households in Felixstowe North, 9.47% of households in Felixstowe South and 11.94% of households in Felixstowe West ward.

17.12 Whilst Suffolk Coastal is one of the safest districts in the country in which to live, crime statistics rise when considering Felixstowe alone. Felixstowe South Ward suffers particularly from criminal damage and disturbances in a public place. Felixstowe West has a higher rate than the county average for vehicle theft. These represent significant ‘hot spots’ within the district.

17.13 Felixstowe West has a particularly high percentage of adults with no qualifications with almost 35% of adults in this category. All wards however contain a considerable number of adults with low or no qualifications. All these issues need to be addressed through comprehensive plans for the regeneration of the area. There are several means by which these interventions are being planned.

17.14 The Suffolk Coastal LDF is at an early stage in its preparation but a draft vision for Felixstowe was published for public consultation in spring 2007. Of the eleven points in the Vision, the following are the most relevant to the seafront and town centre.

17.15 “The Vision for the Felixstowe and Trimleys Peninsula in 2021 is for an integrated area that:

- has embraced the opportunities for regeneration, growth and change
- has maintained and protected the high quality and variety of the built environments
- has provided additional housing to accommodate the existing and some new population, by making maximum use of brownfield opportunities
- provides an extended comprehensive range and scale of facilities
• has developed its tourism role in terms of services, facilities, and accommodation, which builds on the qualities and facilities offered by the town creating strong links between the seafront and town centre and the qualities of the surrounding natural environment

• has expanded the retail, service and other facilities available

• is well defended from risk of flooding and coastal erosion.”

17.16 With the completion of an £11 million programme of coastal defence works in the summer of 2008, the final part of the vision has now been realised and progress with the remainder of the vision can be made. At this stage, investment priorities are focused around revenue expenditure on masterplanning and studies, the purpose of which is to identify infrastructure needs. However, a Master Plan prepared by David Lock Associates published in December 2007 identified a number of suggested projects and areas for enhancement including a Seafront Leisure Path, major investment in Seafront Winter Gardens and a major development on an underutilised site at Convalescent Hill. Efforts will also be made to progress these which may lead to further calls on public funding.

Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (linking to logic chain(s))

17.17 The growth of jobs in Felixstowe, driven by expansion of the Port, is out of balance with the availability of housing. The Port has continued to expand and to create more jobs, both directly and in the businesses that support its operation. But few new homes have been built recently. More of the new jobs are being taken up by people who are not able to find a home in Felixstowe even if they would like one.

17.18 The 2001 Census revealed that there was a daily net inflow to Felixstowe of 2,719 workers. This comprised an outflow of 3,600 Felixstowe residents to jobs in Ipswich and elsewhere and an inflow of 6,319 non-residents who work in Felixstowe but live elsewhere. The Port is proposing to expand further and these plans are forecast to create an additional 680 direct jobs and 860 indirect and induced jobs in the area. This suggests that the existing housing imbalance will get worse. At a time when planning policy is aimed at minimising the need to travel and the use of finite energy resources, and the production of greenhouse gases, this pattern would not be sustainable. The answer, therefore, is the release of substantial land for housing growth to take place. Given the nature of the town and lack of brownfield sites, such growth will occur on greenfield land on the edges of the town. An overall allocation of 1660 new dwellings is proposed in the Suffolk Coastal District Draft Core Strategy to cater for this growth. A key priority is therefore to progress the detailed masterplanning of the area to establish exactly how these new dwellings will be accommodated and to expedite their delivery.

17.19 Such growth presents the opportunity to address other issues in the town:

• There is a shortage of affordable housing for local first time buyers and lower wage households in the town. The general upward movement of house prices nationally and regionally has been compounded in Felixstowe by the increase in the number of jobs compared with the number of homes, and the growth of smaller households. Clarity
over the siting and delivery of overall housing allocation will assist efforts to secure the early delivery of the much needed affordable housing component.

- Felixstowe Port is the largest container Port in the UK and the 5th largest in Europe. It dominates the Felixstowe’s economy and use of land. Its value to the local economy is supported and the need for further land to accommodate port-related activities is recognised. However, Felixstowe is also a town/seaside resort and the two elements are not well connected. The town/resort has the built infrastructure of the traditional Victorian/Edwardian resort including promenade, gardens, pier and a range of commercial attractions. The resort covers a sizable area of the town to the north of the Port. The economic buoyancy that has resulted from Port growth has masked the decline of the tourism economy of the town. In simple terms, it could be argued that port-related jobs will replace tourism-related work. However, the land occupied by the resort is not suitable for port development and without regeneration to stimulate new opportunities, the greater part of the town infrastructure will decay further. In addition, it is not good for the economy of a town to be so reliant on one activity. It has been estimated that over 45% of employment in Felixstowe is Port related. Felixstowe needs to diversify its economy to offer new opportunities. To do this it may need different and distinct employment development away from the Port. A contributor to this diversification strategy will be the package of projects centred on resort regeneration and the catalytic effect that this investment will have on other privately owned local sites and businesses.

- Social and community infrastructure already does not match the requirements of the existing population and this will be exacerbated given the growth expected and the changing age profile of the population. Aspects already requiring expansion and enhancement, but particularly relocation, because of cramped sites or outdated facilities include:
  - sport and leisure
  - health
  - green infrastructure (a separate Thematic Package)
  - cemeteries and
  - cultural assets

- The resort of Felixstowe is in physical as well as economic decline. The seafront is Felixstowe’s greatest attraction with long beaches, wide sea views and an extensive promenade, along with a variety of other leisure attractions. However, the existing portfolio of leisure attractions and accommodation is declining in quality and hence patronage. There is a longstanding lack of investment in the fabric of the resort and hence a downward spiral of deteriorating physical environment and townscape. As part of efforts to address these problems through a new master plan for Felixstowe, Suffolk Coastal District Council took the initiative in establishing a regeneration partnership - the Felixstowe and Trimleys Peninsular Futures Group. Constituted as a Sub-Group of the Haven Gateway Partnership, the Group has published within its
delivery plan a prioritized range of projects to regenerate the Felixstowe peninsular in accordance with the proposals contained in the David Lock study. These projects cover physical enhancements to:

- **Victorian and Edwardian vernacular townscape.** This encompasses the heart of Felixstowe. This townscape character appears to be cherished locally but underplayed as a leisure attraction in its own right. It suffers from three sets of problems – vacant and derelict sites/buildings, poor public realm and a need to expand/update the tourism offer. Included within the latter are the seafront gardens and cafes. The primary constraint to be overcome in addressing these problems is a lack of public sector funding.

- **Transport.** This is considered significant given the need to create spaces dedicated to or shared safely by pedestrian, car or cyclist. Here the constraint to be overcome is a lack of knowledge of the interrelationship between the three modes of travel. Once the knowledge has been obtained, the projects can progress to the implementation phase.

17.20 Quantifying and costing these projects is gradually enabling detailed plans for delivery to be prepared, negotiations with developers held and further partnership arrangements and funding opportunities explored. The full list of proposed projects is set out in the scoring table.

*The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package*

17.21 In the short term, the priority investments are in the form of three key studies:

- **Master planning of the greenfield development areas** – this involves the commissioning of specialist consultants to prepare an overall strategy for the area. Such an exercise is vital for the effective planning of growth. It should identify the key components of sustainable growth including access, phasing, design principles, etc. It will be important that housing growth is brought forward in a manner that is timely and aligned with planned employment growth. In addition, a master plan will define infrastructure requirements, including physical infrastructure – utilities, water supply, drainage, etc. – and social infrastructure such as health, leisure, education, etc. Such knowledge would be vital in calculating developer contributions towards its provision.

- **A transport study** – this will form an important component of this masterplanning exercise by identifying the impacts of growth on the local transport network.

- Parallel with this will be a **study of sport and leisure requirements** to serve the expanding community. This is considered critical given the lack of facilities, particularly of a high quality, within the town.

17.22 In addition, there are plans for the early improvement of the Felixstowe to Trimley cycle route to improve connectivity and promote the use of alternative means of transport.
17.23 In addition:

- Development of Planning briefs for brown field sites. This will help to focus attention on how to bring forward these sites for the most productive purpose.

- Bent Hill and Hamilton Road “shared space” schemes. These improvements, currently being progressed by Suffolk County Council, will address some longstanding problems in relation to pedestrian/vehicle conflicts in key areas of the town and also provide an opportunity to improve the public realm.

17.24 In the medium and longer term, these feasibility and master planning studies and work on other projects is expected to lead to the need for further public intervention but the scale of this cannot currently be established.

**Timing and critical path**

17.25 The anticipated timescale and key linkages in terms of the critical path to delivery are set out in the attached Gantt Chart.
Figure 17-1: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the Coastal Towns 1, package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>New resi devts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Brownfield site redevts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Bent Hill/ Hamilton Rd shared space imp, Seafront Leisure Path, Seafront beach cafes &amp; shelters, Winter gardens and Spa Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cycle route devt, Transport study/Leisure study, Brownfield sites design briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Priorities for short term public sector funding, Investments either with public funding secured or privately funded, Possible calls on future public funding, but currently no details available ie dependent on studies, political decisions etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring of projects

17.26 The table below provides a basis for scoring the projects outlined above. At this stage in their development it has not been possible to score them on a reliable basis but this will be addressed in the coming months. However, it is possible to say now that apart from the three short term revenue funded studies, the top three priorities for capital investment are regarded as being Spa Gardens/Wintergardens, Seafront Leisure Path and Beach Cafes/Shelters.
### Table 17-1: Scores for projects within the Coastal Towns Spatial Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felixstowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planning of Greenfield sites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Leisure Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bent Hill Shared Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road Shared Space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimley to Felixstowe cycle path imps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Furniture Strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafront Leisure Path</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Persons Hang Out</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle routes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Shelters/Cafes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Triangle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convalescent Hill site redevt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Road Phases 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafront Winter Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pin Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to The Hard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts**

17.27 The total package seeks CLG and EEDA funding of £2.3 million. The outcome will be a renaissance of the seaside resort of Felixstowe and a strategy to ensure the efficient delivery of new housing, as required by the RSS, and the means of overcoming any constraints imposed by a lack of local infrastructure.

**Risks/risk mitigation**

17.28 No significant risks. Costs are estimates only at this stage.

**Coastal Towns 1, Part B– Pin Mill**

**Overview**

17.29 This small spatial investment package comprises one project centred on the small riverside community of Pin Mill. It is concerned primarily with achieving economic, community and environmental regeneration. The project will create and safeguard local jobs and those further afield. It focuses on making the small village of Pin Mill (and neighbouring Chelmondiston) a more sustainable local community. In this way, the package / project seeks to ensure that these locations remain as viable as possible, in the face of losses of local community services and facilities and is promoted by the District Council.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and / or the constraints it is addressing**

17.30 The local area offers relatively few local job opportunities. Whilst considerable jobs provision is available in Ipswich, this is some 8 miles away and commuting (albeit a relatively short distance) is not conducive to local community sustainability. There are existing businesses at this location that are ailing and its essential facility for its context – The Hard - is now in severe disrepair, having been damaged by misuse and not repaired for a considerable time. The repair of this and enhancement of the local environment will allow for the creation of a Thames Barge repair facility. This would be achieved by the creation of a locally based not-for-profit management company to ensure sustainability of the capital investment to be made.

17.31 This project will also promote tourism, which is a valuable source of income in the local area, with an attractive riverside setting, existing boatyards and repair facilities and highly popular local catering outlets. These attractions provide well for visiting tourists but do not promote the local maritime sector in any substantial way.

17.32 Without local intervention, the locality faces possible further stagnation or potential decline in relation to its quality of environment, the health of local maritime businesses and its economy and wider vitality.
The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

17.33 The priority investments are the repair of ‘The Hard’ boat landing facility (plus enhancement of the local environment and the creation of a Thames Barge repair facility. This would be achieved by the creation of a locally based not-for-profit management company. Thus the project is basically a relatively small, but easily deliverable (funding aside) capital project.

Timing and Critical Path

17.34 The project has already been worked up to a highly advanced stage. It can be commenced in the current financial year and completed within about a year (September / October 2009).

Overall Package costs, outputs and other potential impacts

17.35 Total scheme cost is £169,000, all in capital funding, nearly 30% of which is to be provided by a broad range of other funding bodies. In this way, it is considered to represent very good value for money. Scheme costs are firm. Outputs and outcomes have been set out above in project aims. The scheme enjoys widespread local community support and this is illustrated by the level of local investment that local bodies, such as the Parish Council and the local boatyards. Accordingly, it represents a highly valuable local community project which would be based on all the local interests and stakeholders working in close partnership to deliver a local scheme and a series of outcomes that they support strongly. Consideration has been given to any potential impacts on the River Orwell SSSI and the necessary licences are to be obtained from the Environment Agency and Natural England.

Risk / Mitigation

17.36 All scheme risks have been thoroughly assessed and no significant risks are involved.

Coastal Towns 2: Harwich, Clacton, Walton, Jaywick

Overview

17.37 This element of the Package deals with the main coastal towns in Tendring. Whilst Harwich, like Felixstowe, has a major port, the employment it currently generates is far less and although major expansion plans exist for the development of new port facilities at Bathside Bay, these are some years off in terms of implementation. As is documented elsewhere, the social and economic problems in the Tendring coastal towns whilst similar to those in Suffolk are more acute.

Local Planning Context

17.38 In addition to the regional strategic context, it is also important to be clear how the Tendring elements of the package fit with the local planning context in that district.

17.39 Within the adopted Tendring Local Plan (2007), Harwich, Clacton and Walton are identified as Urban Regeneration areas. The Plan includes a number of relevant policies focussing on
the regeneration of all the district’s seaside towns and has specific chapters which identify the opportunities that exist. The District Council adopted the Harwich master plan as a Supplementary Planning Interim Document in September 2006.

17.40 Tendring District Council’s Local Development Scheme published in June 2008\(^3\) states that its Local Development Framework will include specific Local Development Documents for Clacton and Jaywick as well as for employment and housing land. Work has already commenced on collecting the evidence to support the proposals to be included in these documents.

17.41 The District Council has as its main corporate priority ‘a strong local economy’. In response, in April 2008, the Council established a regeneration company to act as its Local Delivery Vehicle. Trading as INTend\(^4\), the company is limited by guarantee and has the specific remit to facilitate, promote and achieve physical, economic, social, and environmental regeneration in the District. INTend has published its first Delivery Plan\(^5\) which sets out the key eleven physical regeneration projects it will seek to undertake with its partners; many of these are included within this Package. It has also identified the need for further development works and other initiatives where public sector pump priming funding may be required.

*Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing*

17.42 Through spatial planning techniques and the delivery of specific projects, the objective of this element of the Package is to create a framework for regeneration, through which many socio-economic challenges will be addressed insofar as they relate to the Haven Gateway coastal towns of Harwich, Clacton, Walton and Jaywick.

17.43 Together, the expectation is that these different interventions should contribute to the existing known targets for housing and employment. Investments will seek to address the current imbalance between wage rates and GVA levels locally compared to the regional average. (Currently the gross weekly average pay is £364 compared to a regional average of £429\(^6\).) They will also address the issues of pockets of high levels of deprivation within areas of apparent prosperity. The costs of this range of interventions is still being developed through a project based approach and will be quantified both through the INTend Delivery Plan and the District Council’s Regeneration Strategy.

---


\(^4\) [http://www.in-tend.org/](http://www.in-tend.org/)

\(^5\) [INTend Delivery Plan 2008/09](http://www.in-tend.org/)

\(^6\) A Sustainable Community Strategy for Tendring 208-2016
The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

To address these challenges, Tendring District Council has adopted a master planning approach to regeneration. Where appropriate, these plans will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents or Area Action Plans.

Details of specific and emerging investments are detailed below. At this stage, proposals for the four key areas are at different levels of development. The overall approach of this Package is to identify those systemic issues that need to be addressed, pinpoint the barriers that are frustrating the delivery of potential solutions, and test and then implement applicable solutions. The interdependence of particular components in respect of each community will then be assessed and funding gaps identified which may require intervention. These will be articulated in future versions of the IDP when more precise detail ought to be available.

Harwich

Local Context

The population of Harwich is about 20,000 people. Harwich has a key role in relation to the Haven Gateway’s international gateway functions and investment opportunities are expected to be derived from the development of a new major container port at Bathside Bay. In itself, this should create jobs for 770 people eventually but there is also a need to address wider structural issues of deprivation and generate other employment opportunities, building upon the success of retaining a major Trinity House facility in the town.

Harwich East Ward, which covers the old town of Harwich, featured in the top 10% of wards in the 2007 Index of Multiple Deprivation. The town, with the adjoining area of Dovercourt, has been the subject of various regeneration funding initiatives between 1997 and 2004 including, SRB2, A Towns and Heritage Initiative scheme and funding under the EEDA Market Towns Initiative.

Priorities for regeneration and growth

In recognition both of various redevelopment opportunities, but also the imperative for a coherent and co-ordinated approach, a masterplan was commissioned by key owners and stakeholders in 2006. It was subsequently adopted and it is now in the process of phased implementation. It includes a series of physical regeneration projects aimed at addressing key issues, including:-

- generation of employment opportunities in new sectors – in particular the provision of a 500-600 berth marina development
- provision of growth through new housing developments (700 dwellings) that also seek to address the lack of affordable housing in the local area

7 Tendring DC Housing Strategy 2005-10
provision of 4,000 sq m of commercial and retail floorspace to create a sustainable town centre and destination facility

securing commercial and employment potential from secondary employment related to the existing and proposed port complexes.

Based around these investments, the economic vision for Harwich is to develop a mixed use pattern of development with elements of differing use types that complement and build upon the existing historic character of the town. The provision of new employment opportunities in both the retail and commercial sectors will increase opportunities for existing residents as well as providing future employment arising from the housing developments which in themselves will provide residents with the opportunity to remain within the community. It is anticipated the proposed developments will lead directly to the creation of some 400 new jobs. The first phases of the public realm improvements are now being implemented using New Growth Point funding, but there is a good deal more to be achieved. The most critical component of the master plan is the marina and associated housing development; this is scheduled as Phase II for implementation commencing in 2010-2020. The InTEND Delivery Plan identifies the second and third phases of masterplan implementation as key spatial projects within the town.

In addition:

A Streetscape Design Guide has been formally adopted for Harwich which sets out the phasing and costs of the various public realm components. The total value is estimated at £3.3m and with known committed funding identifies a residential unit cost contribution of £3,817 per new dwelling.

The first components of a Plan to create a new ‘gateway’ into the town with new car parking, and a new highway configuration with streetscape enhancement to the quayside are at design stage and initial funding secured from the Haven Gateway New Growth Point allocation.

As well as the masterplan, the INTend Delivery Plan identifies the following specific spatial projects to be undertaken as part of this package:-

- Barrack Lane – a new multi-purpose community facility potentially including affordable housing
- relocation and redevelopment of Harwich Football ground with a mixture of housing and commercial opportunities
- redevelopment/regeneration of commercial and retail property in Dovercourt town centre.

In addition, INTend is keen to find a means to support the introduction of a Harwich/Shotley/Felixstowe ferry service (see Transport section of the Thematic Package).
Clacton

Local context

17.53 Clacton-on-Sea is the largest of the four coastal towns in Tendring. Despite this, Clacton town centre has not kept pace with some of the more affluent parts of the wider area and is in need of regeneration. The Pier Ward has been identified as being one of the 3% most deprived wards in the country. This has reinforced the immediate need to provide a holistic regeneration strategy to improve the quality of life for the town’s residents.

17.54 Previous consultations have highlighted the town centre’s unattractive public realm, poor retail offer and car dominated environment. A retail ‘healthcheck’ undertaken by GVA Grimley in 2006, for example, found that the town suffered from a range of physical and economic restrictions by virtue of its very location on the coast and the subsequent catchment. It did, however, function as a relatively strong shopping location that could benefit from a diversification of retail offer and new commercial investment to create a sustainable town centre offering new employment opportunities.

17.55 The Council has undertaken a number of studies which have informed the recently adopted Tendring Local Plan. These include the Town Centre Strategy and associated district-wide retail studies. Some of the recommendations are currently being implemented, the most significant being the Clacton town centre streetscape work which was completed in 2007. This was a joint effort by Tendring District Council and Essex County Council to enhance the public realm in the town centre by reconfiguring traffic direction to provide a more legible pedestrian environment and an attractive fountain.

17.56 With support from Safer Stronger Communities Funding, a regeneration study has been commissioned for Clacton Town Centre. This was developed by undertaking a thorough baseline assessment of precisely what is needed in Clacton and why it is required. The baseline assessment identified a number of physical and socioeconomic issues that reinforce the need for intervention.

17.57 A thorough SWOT analysis was undertaken on the physical structure and associated barriers to issues of socioeconomic prosperity in the Town Centre. This analysis is provided in further detail in the baseline summaries available on INTends website8.

17.58 The baseline research and subsequent consultation on the issues in Clacton led to the identification the seven key objectives which would deliver the Clacton Town Centre Vision for regeneration.

17.59 The Vision for Clacton was set out in the following key objectives, which state how the vision is to be delivered:

- Objective 1: Revitalised Town Centre
  - create a place for the people of Clacton with new retail opportunities, community, entertainment and civic uses and a vibrant public realm

---

8 www.in-tend.org
Objective 2: Seafront Quarter and Sustainable Pier
- capitalise on Clacton’s Greatest Asset – the seafront – be creating a seafront quarter. Re-invent Clacton Pier as the sustainable Pier with views to the new wind farms. Establish legible routes between the town centre and the seafront.

Objective 3: Young People
- ensure that young people have the opportunity to be more engaged socially, physically and economically within Clacton Town Centre, allowing them to develop into active citizens who are proud to live in Clacton.

Objective 4: Intergenerational Relationships
- create positive relationships with the town’s older population and the growing younger cohort to create an atmosphere of trust, respect and community cohesion.

Objective 5: Business and Economic Activity
- increase the economic activity in the town by supporting business growth and employment locally. This includes making Clacton a more competitive economic location and a more obvious choice for businesses, customers and visitors.

Objective 6: Enabling Skills Improvement
- reverse the prevailing trends in relation to skills locally. Develop a culture of lifelong learning and use this to create opportunity for Clacton and its population.

Objective 5: Enabling an Active Population
- facilitate the development of a more healthy community who take advantage of Clacton’s coastal location and favourable weather conditions to become fitter and more active.

Objective 7: Sustainable Community Solutions
- develop a long term response to the high number of HMOs and bedsits and the problems related to those living in them to create a more cohesive active community.

A strategic framework of interventions has been created to deliver the above objectives. These are set out in the Clacton Neighbourhood Plan and Clacton Town Centre Vision Documents. These documents clearly show how the interventions link directly with National, Regional and Local regeneration priorities.

The Neighbourhood Plan sets out a comprehensive action plan to deliver objectives 3 to 7. The Town Centre Vision documents also sets out the spatial vision for the delivery of the
objectives 1 and 2, which effectively includes creating different land-use zones in the town centre.

17.62 Seven opportunity sites for physical redevelopment have been identified.
- Pier and Seafront
- Seafront promenade
- Retail core expansion
- Civic quarter
- Warwick Castle
- Station Gateway
- Waterglade Park.

17.63 The proposals were subject to positive public consultation during the summer of 2008.

Priorities for regeneration and growth

17.64 The Vision for Clacton is now at the implementation and delivery stage. INTend have been tasked with delivery and are working to implement the objectives of the Vision with key partners. The seven opportunity sites are to be tested further with market appraisals and viability studies, and more detailed design proposals on each of the sites will come forward. The intention is that these projects should be taken forward through INTend’s Delivery Plan. Further important infrastructure work is also proposed to compliment the environmental traffic management scheme completed in 2007.

17.65 Proposals for the seven opportunity sites will also be incorporated into the Clacton Area Action Plan that the District Council is producing as part of the Local Development Framework. This will provide a sound policy framework from which to take proposals forward. This is in accordance with planning policy guidance which sets out how the planning system can provide a supportive framework for wider socio economic regeneration objectives.

17.66 The Warwick Castle site is to be the first of the seven opportunity sites to be developed further. Funding for this will be direct from Tendring Council. A key gateway to the Town Centre, Warwick Castle presents an exciting opportunity to make a strong architectural statement and stamp a new image and architectural impression on Clacton Town Centre. Work is now underway to develop the detailed design proposals for the site which will stimulate private sector investment.

17.67 The investment to date, including the important infrastructure work, has already stimulated private sector interest in Clacton, and it is considered that further developing proposals on each of these key sites identified, will unlock further private investment.

17.68 Subject to further funding, the remaining opportunity sites in the town centre are ready to be taken forward with similar options appraisals and design work.
The vision is not simply about physical work. Proposals seek to promote socio-economic inclusion targeted on one of the most deprived areas of the Country. The Neighbourhood Plan contains detailed action plans to address socio economic inclusion. Implementation and delivery, subject to the availability of funding, is now proposed.

The holistic regeneration strategy required has now been delivered; implementation of the strategy is now the key to transforming one of the 3% most deprived wards in the country.

Jaywick

Local context

Across nearly every indicator, residents in Jaywick experience some of the highest levels of deprivation in the Country. The Grasslands and Brooklands area in particular is the most deprived area in the East of England. However, Jaywick’s situation is compounded by a combination of unique circumstances:

- Jaywick is situated in a high risk flood zone (though it is currently defended to a high standard)
- most of the dwellings when originally constructed had only two rooms
- dwellings were originally intended for holiday use and not year-round occupancy
- the estate roads and open spaces are not publicly owned
- there is no significant public housing in the area; and
- private rented accommodation amounts to approximately 30% of occupied properties in Grasslands and Brooklands.

Past interventions have not arrested the decline of the neighbourhood. Today a very significant proportion of the population remains entirely dependent on state benefits.

Priorities for regeneration and growth

This Package – encompassing measures yet to be fully developed as part of an overall masterplanning approach – aims to set out a comprehensive, wide-ranging, and coherent response to Jaywick’s acute social and economic problems that also addresses the constraints on regeneration due to the unique combination of land ownership, tenure pattern, physical infrastructure, flood risk, and deprivation. The specific aims are:

- to establish a new sense of trust and collaboration with residents that enables them to shape the future of their community
- to explore credible and cost-effective solutions to the chronic problem of poor housing
- to develop proposals that are capable of supporting existing residents during a period of long-term change; and
• to consider ways of securing private investment to create jobs and prosperity for local people in the future.

17.74 Tendring District Council and Essex County Council are working with partners to develop long term solutions to these challenges. Already partners are committing resources; Tendring DC, for example, has committed over £1 million from its capital programme to support initiatives that address the above issues.

17.75 There is a need to develop a collaborative approach with the local community to develop a long-term vision for the area. In the short-term, however, in order to improve the core Grasslands and Brooklands area, there is a need, in addition, to secure:

• a government commitment formally to consider Jaywick’s case
• the help of a ‘sponsoring department’ that would be willing to assist in the development of a long-term strategy over the next 24 months or so
• initial revenue funding for at least 3 years to help establish an expanded and dedicated neighbourhood management team located in Jaywick building on the existing Interaction work; and
• a capital grant to fund a range of basic neighbourhood improvements over 2009-12 such as demolition of derelict properties, limited improvements to estate roads (these are not adopted highways), land acquisition and improvements to signage and street lighting, etc.

17.76 Looking to the longer term, a Prospectus is being developed which sets out a range of ideas that could secure the area’s future prosperity. Underpinning this is a number of aspirations, including:

• attracting private investment to create jobs, training and economic activity benefiting a much wider area than Jaywick itself (including West Clacton and Clacton)
• tackling the worst housing by providing new homes and rehousing considerable numbers of existing residents (ideally locally); and
• undertaking selective public investment to improve and boost the seaside and tourist economy.

Walton

Local context

17.77 Of all the coastal towns, Walton is perhaps the most reliant on its role as a “seaside town”. It is a small town with a population of around 16,000 and it is characterised by major seasonal fluctuations in employment. Potentially, however, it has some important assets, not least the internationally recognised SSSI of Hamford Water. It also has some key opportunities – including the scope to redevelop a major deteriorating asset in Walton Mere as site for leisure, commercial and housing use.
Priorities for regeneration and growth

17.78 The production of a Master Plan, including a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and an Economic Impact Assessment for Walton, is a Priority One Project for INTend, set for completion in the financial year 2008/2009. Growth Point Funding has been secured for this project from the Haven Gateway. The Masterplan is proposed to be submitted to the District Council for adoption as a supplementary Planning Document in 2009.

17.79 To focus upon delivery, INTend consider it imperative that the Spatial Master Plan is linked intrinsically to a comprehensive delivery strategy (as per the Clacton Vision Document). It is considered that the most effective way to do this is by the delivery of a 10 year regeneration framework for Walton. It is anticipated that the regeneration framework will be one comprehensive document containing the following key information.

- Baseline Assessment of Walton and Policy Framework as it is today, including a level 2 strategic flood risk assessment
- Definition of Core Strategic Objectives for the Regeneration of Walton over a ten year period. These are likely to be themed objectives
- Action Plans based upon each theme, setting out a broad range of interventions required to meet the Core Strategic Objective
- Area Action Plan for Walton, detailing the spatial development framework for the regeneration of the Town
- INTend Implementation Strategy. This will set out an implementation strategy for delivery of the regeneration framework, to include key priorities for INtend to focus their attention in the first three years of the strategy
- a funding and inward investment strategy.

17.80 This is in accordance with government planning policy which sets out how the planning system can provide a supportive framework for wider socio economic regeneration objectives.

17.81 By linking spatial planning techniques with a delivery strategy, the objective of the regeneration framework for Walton, will be to tackle many of the challenges to regeneration of Walton in a coordinated manner with INTend, the Council and key delivery partners working together to deliver an integrated strategy which has been prioritised in terms of meeting strategic objectives Locally, Regionally and Nationally.

17.82 It is intended that the framework will be capable of being adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance under the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) for Tendring District.

17.83 The aim of this project is to commission consultants to prepare the framework, coordinate the delivery of the framework, and to project manage the implementation of the delivery strategies with delivery partners and key stakeholders.
Timing and critical path

The overall Package constitutes a 15 year investment plan, focused on the delivery of key outputs and outcomes. The major considerations for each aspect of the Package are set out below.

- **Harwich**: Phase 1 of the masterplan will be implemented over the period 2008/09. Phases 2 and 3 are envisaged for completion over the next ten years. The significant public realm improvements for Old Harwich (which are now at the detailed design stage) will create more extensive attractive waterfront pedestrian areas and provide a setting for three key development sites to be redeveloped for mixed uses. They are due to be supported by potential Haven Gateway Partnership and Tendring District Council funding of £1.7m but this leaves a funding gap of some £1.35m for the works proposed in Phase 1 of the project.

- **Clacton**: A five year strategy for intervention has been developed. Discussions are underway with existing landowners to explore the potential for land assembly/joint investment projects. Further design work on the sites will be subject to the receipt of funding either from the public sector or a joint initiative with the landowners. The interventions on the Neighbourhood Management plan are being investigated, and links with key agencies are being made to explore the resources required to deliver the interventions suggested.

- **Jaywick**: The Jaywick Strategic Leadership Group has been established and agreed its terms of reference. A draft prospectus setting out the issues and opportunities is being finalised; it should be available in December 2008.

- **Walton**: The consultants brief for the regeneration framework is currently being prepared and the framework is set for completion in 2009.
The anticipated timescale and key linkages in terms of the critical path to delivery are set out in the Gantt Chart below.

**Figure 17-2: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the Coastal Towns 2, package**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>Clacton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phased</td>
<td>Walton/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>redevt</td>
<td>Jaywick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private</td>
<td>Plans/imp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phased</td>
<td>Clacton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>redevt</td>
<td>7 key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of</td>
<td>site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private</td>
<td>redevts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>streetsc</td>
<td>Clacton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design</td>
<td>Seafront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>enhancmnts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>Clacton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>site</td>
<td>Env TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>redvnt</td>
<td>scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quayside</td>
<td>Clacton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>7 key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>redevts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring of projects**

The table below provides a basis for scoring the projects outlined above. At this stage in their development it has not been possible to score them on a reliable basis but this will be addressed in the coming months. However, on the basis of the work undertaken to date, it is possible to identify Harwich Phase 1 improvements, Clacton - Seven Development Sites (options appraisals, viability studies and design briefs) and Jaywick Master Plan and feasibility work as the top three priorities in this element of the package.
### Table 17-2: Scores for projects within the Coastal Towns Spatial Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich Streetscape design guide implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Gateway Project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Quayside Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy yard redevelopment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrack Lane feasibility study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich Town FC relocation - feasibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich/Shotley/Felixstowe Ferry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovercourt - town centre regeneration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clacton Environmental Traffic Management scheme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven development sites - options appraisals, viability study and design briefs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clacton Seafront enhancement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clacton Neighbourhood Plan Delivery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Regeneration Framework/Master Plan/public realm improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFRA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaywick Master Plan and feasibility work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential Impacts

17.87 Although currently assessed requirements for CLG and EEDA funding amount to £14.9 million, the overall package is still under development. In the case of Harwich, for which proposals are most advanced, the need for further public sector investment in excess of £1.35m has already been identified over the next three years. Thereafter, the requirement is for funding to match Section 106 and other sources to undertake catalytic or turnkey projects to unlock private sector investment and initiate the delivery of key development sites.

17.88 Across the four towns, the masterplan approaches and associated design work will generate a demand for capital funding in the future. In the case of Jaywick this demand is likely to be for between £45 and £75 million and as such will be a separate bid to Government since Jaywick is such a special case for regeneration. Any bids for funding will be supported by rigorous economic and financial appraisals which will, wherever possible, seek to secure the maximum developer contribution.

17.89 The overall outcome will be the regeneration of the four coastal towns with sustainable development creating full time employment that moves the economy away from its historical seasonal employment patterns with high levels of outward commuting.

Risks/risk mitigation

17.90 The risks identified in relation to the proposed investments across the four towns are consistent with their development stage. Key risks include:

- **Harwich** – Failure to attract investor for key housing/marina project will delay implementation of phases 2 & 3. Local partners are in active discussion with a development consortium but market conditions may delay the project as currently designed with large levels of housing.

- **Clacton** – A comprehensive strategy assessing precisely what is needed, why it is required and how it might be achieved has been developed. Without sufficient public/private sector funding the objectives of the regeneration vision may not be realised. Some key redevelopment sites are in private sector ownership. Proposals will be the subject of early and detailed negotiations with owners to establish buy-in and financial support through negotiated Section 106 contributions. This is already occurring. Match funding by the public sector would enable joint options appraisals and design documents to be prepared with the support of the private sector. In delivering the Neighbourhood Plan, close collaboration between all delivery partners is essential for the strategy to work.

- **Jaywick** – Continuation funding for the existing neighbourhood management arrangements would affect the ability to remain actively engaged with the community. Without a major injection of capital financing, the underlying problems of Jaywick cannot be addressed.

- **Walton** – None at the initial masterplanning phase.
PART D
LONGER TERM PACKAGES
18: Maximising our potential for further sustainable growth

Description of the Package

18.1 This package aims to support the development of further spatial investments based upon similar objectives to those set out in the preceding chapters but with more particular emphasis on enhancing the sustainability of the sub-region.

18.2 The package therefore focuses primarily on the commissioning and subsequent application of findings from a series of studies. These studies examine subjects ranging from broad strategic issues such as water, renewable energy and biodiversity, to cross boundary issues such as employment land, economic development and inward investment, as well as encompassing more localised studies and master planning of specific major sites. This package also explicitly recognises the needs of the rural hinterland of the Haven Gateway and of the market towns within it.

18.3 A particular priority in this package is maximising the benefits from the expansion of the Ports. The Haven Gateway Partnership recognises the significance of planning effectively for the long term logistics provision to support the key gateway function and specifically, the increase in capacity resulting from the current £250 million investment in the Felixstowe South reconfiguration which, together with the expected future £500 million investment in the redevelopment of Bathside Bay, will mean that capacity in the Haven increases from the current 3.5m teus per annum to 8 million teus by 2021. This will have a significant impact on both the transport network and land requirements to secure sufficient space for shoreside logistics activities.

18.4 In the light of this, the “Dryport” initiative being promoted through this package and indeed the more widely focussed employment land study will consider these questions. They may influence the delivery of existing spatial packages but are as likely to lead to the need to promote further specific spatial interventions, particularly in terms of bringing forward the very large vacant former sugar beet factory at Sproughton just outside Ipswich and addressing the findings of the recent Port Land Study¹ which identified a lack of adequate land to support future growth in Port related activities.

Links to the delivery of the overall vision, and also to the RES/RSS

18.5 The Haven Gateway Partnership strongly supports the growth in employment (and housing) in the East of England Plan. Within the districts covered by the Gateway there is a requirement for 50,000 net additional jobs, of which 30,000 are expected to be in Babergh, Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal districts, in order to match local housing provision. With the expansion of both Harwich and Felixstowe ports it is expected that many port-related jobs will be created throughout the Haven Gateway. The package therefore aims to ensure that the

¹ Felixstowe Port Logistics Study, Final Report, Royal Haskoning October 2008
nationally significant growth of the Ports and the economic driver these expanding enterprises represent are not only supported but harnessed to provide maximum local benefit.

18.6 The transport goal from the current Regional Economic Strategy is also relevant and refers to:- ‘increasing economic benefit to the East of England from major international gateways’.

18.7 The spatial economy goal of the current Regional Economic Strategy, Inventing our Future, is concerned with creating sustainable places bringing into focus the fact that our towns and cities have a critical role in attracting and retaining the people and investment necessary for a world class economy. The other projects within this package are intended to help realise this goal. In terms of other links and relevance to other policy goals, a priority in ‘Transforming Suffolk’, Suffolk’s Community Strategy, is to develop a prosperous and vibrant economy which inspires and encourages people and communities to succeed. Support for the development of Suffolk’s key Haven Gateway market towns such as Sudbury and Stowmarket would contribute to achieving this, and would also go some way to providing improved access and opportunities to local jobs; a ‘cross-cutting principle’ identified within the Community Strategy.

18.8 One of the objectives of the Community Plan for Babergh East is ‘to support and advocate projects which raise opportunities for local communities to access jobs and training’. The projects identified to help deliver this objective include: 1) ‘supporting the redevelopment of industrial land at Brantham’; and 2) ‘securing sustainable use of the disused British Sugar site at Sproughton’. These are huge sites extending to 65 ha in total area.

**Description of the opportunities it is releasing and/or the constraints it is addressing (linking to logic chain(s))**

18.9 The key opportunities this package offers to release are those that will enable the Haven Gateway to improve its use and management of water, identify its ability to generate renewable energy and to improve local biodiversity. The management of water is a very topical issue given recent years’ floods across the UK. The Haven Gateway commissioned its Water Cycle Study earlier this year\(^2\) and plans have been developed to progress and implement its initial findings. A further study has been identified to address some outstanding issues.

18.10 The package will also help maximise local benefits from Planned Port expansion. “Dryport” is a three year public/private sector European project with core partners drawn from the ports and logistics sector and from local authorities representing important logistics areas. It aims to examine the design, development and effective operation of dryports. A dryport is defined as “a hinterland intermodal freight transport hub”. The concept offers a means of significantly increasing the capacity and efficiency of existing sea ports and of providing them with vital support while shifting traffic off roads and onto other modes, so making an impact on CO2 emissions. A dryport can also provide valuable space for logistics and onward distribution for existing ports that have little land left for expansion. They thereby maximise local employment opportunities rather than see these dispersed to more remote locations. The package will assist the Haven Gateway to identify one or more suitable dryport sites and may deliver the interventions needed to secure these.

---

\(^2\) Haven Gateway Water Cycle Study – Draft report (final report due January 2009)
18.11 The package will also address current constraints in terms of lack of information and detailed planning to bring forward strategic sites both for housing (for example for 800 new dwellings to the west of Colchester) and traditional employment purposes (throughout the Ipswich Policy Area through the Employment Land Study), as well as identifying and addressing constraints to retail growth in the Suffolk market towns.

18.12 In terms of particular site constraints, many have already been identified. For example in relation to the Sproughton site in Babergh district, current constraints to be addressed include considerable site accumulation / acquisition, preparation and feasibility costs before the site can be delivered to the market for uptake. These upfront cost requirements present problems of potential risks to future occupiers or site developers that together may need to form a consortium, none of whom individually are large enough in financial stature to bear advance costs of preparing a large overall site suitable for a number of end users and for which demand is known to exist (including from a major local shipping company associated with the Ports). Intervention at Haven Gateway level can unlock the significant employment potential offered by this large but difficult to develop site.

18.13 Similarly, for the Sudbury town centre redevelopment, critical issues include overcoming land ownership fragmentation, avoiding piecemeal developments that conflict with comprehensive redevelopment, development feasibility and viability analysis. The package aims to address these and provide for a comprehensive redevelopment approach, through a development brief developed by consensus.

18.14 The package also contains a proposal to investigate the expansion of the Business Incubation Centre in Sudbury.

18.15 Finally, to support these planned capital investments, the Haven Gateway partnership will need to consider how it can ensure the realisation of the expected growth in both employment numbers (ie quantity of jobs) and potential growth in GVA (quality of jobs) can maximised. Left to itself, the market is not expected to deliver what is required and economic development support measures ranging from traditional business support to inward investment and general promotion, will require some measure of sub-regional co-ordination if not direct intervention.

The most important investments proposed with an explanation of the role of the priority investments in the Package

18.16 These are essentially covered above and include studies and investment / interventions to prepare, deliver and market development sites, possibly by provision of essential infrastructure, services, etc. Assistance with site acquisition here, such as in Sudbury Town Centre, should not be ruled out and would represent the best possible use of investment and intervention particularly given current market conditions where forced sales may take place and sites fall into the hands of speculators.

Scoring of Projects

18.17 The table below provides a basis for scoring the projects outlined above. At this stage in their development it has not been possible to score them on a reliable basis but this will be addressed shortly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Nature and scale of risks including deliverability</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Wider potential impacts, linking to identified constraints/opportunities to growth</th>
<th>Role of project in Package – critical interdependencies</th>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Fit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dryports initiative</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Cycle Study</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich Employment Land Study</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprroughton site</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester - Stanway LDF release</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Gateway renewable energy, biodiversity and master planning etc</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantham site</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowmarket Town Centre</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury Town Centre</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury Incubator expansion</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Support</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Timing and critical path**

18.18 The diverse range of projects within this package will be delivered over several years. However, it will be important to set in train the various studies as these will clarify the exact nature and cost of future interventions.

18.19 In terms of critical path, this is set out in Table 18-1 below.

### Table 18-1: Schematic High Level Gantt Chart in relation to the delivery of the "Maximising our potential for further sustainable growth" package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Employment Land Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Sproughton Site project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ipswich area employment devts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Felixstowe &amp; Harwich Port Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Further HG area resi devts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Sudbury &amp; Stowmarket redevs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB** Across these initiatives and the other Spatial Packages, proposals will be developed to provide appropriate economic development support.

**Overall package costs, outputs and outcomes, and other potential impacts**

18.20 Total package costs are estimated at £6.735 million (not including the total cost of the international Dryport project at 4.8 million euros from which the Sub-region will derive substantial benefits). By far the largest element of this is £4.15mn for Sproughton, although this cost should be offset by the projected input of £3million from land sales upon site delivery making the net cost for the purpose of the package, £1.15 million.
18.21 In addition, the package includes a total of £4.5 million for studies and measures to effect the release of a variety of sites for development and up to £500,000 for phase 1 activity associated with Sudbury Town Centre.

18.22 Apart from study results, specific Package outputs include facilitation for delivery of approximately 65 ha. of new and available employment land, situated in two key Haven Gateway locations (in Babergh). One of these is ideally located to serve eastern Babergh, Ipswich, southern mid Suffolk and the parts of Suffolk Coastal district closest to Ipswich. The town centre redevelopment schemes offers very substantial potential to promote the health of Sudbury and Stowmarket town centres and to effectively expand them, helping to cater for a growing local population. The schemes could also promote local public transport use and further outputs are likely to include improved local community facilities and services.

18.23 To the above outputs must be added the protection of existing jobs within the Haven Gateway sub-region. The retention of at least one key port shipping operator in the sub-region and the national / international competitive advantage of the ports themselves (particularly Felixstowe) need to be factored in.

18.24 Taken overall, very early estimates suggest that the projects identified in this package have the potential to either deliver or support the delivery of perhaps 1,500 to 2,000 new jobs and over 1,000 new dwellings.

**Risks/risk mitigation**

18.25 This package carries some site specific risks mainly due to ownership issues:

**Sproughton**

18.26 Uncertainty here exists in the form of a High Court challenge by the site’s owners and prospective developers against the Secretary of State’s recent decision to refuse their planning application for large-scale residential development. The outcome of this challenge should be known before Christmas 2008. The risk of a successful High Court challenge could serve to re-open a further planning appeal. This would delay any form of physical works on the site being progressed until the outcome of that second appeal is known. This also introduces the possible risk of withdrawal of a key site occupier (and perhaps others), who urgently require a new site for their Felixstowe-based operations.

18.27 Mitigation is to be provided by the course of action outlined in this package.

**Brantham**

18.28 The risk with this site is the possible receipt of early hostile landowner / developer proposals, particularly for significant residential development, reflecting closely the situation at Sproughton. Babergh District Council foresaw this risk and to mitigate it, it has already produced a relatively detailed site-specific planning statement making its planning position even clearer regarding the site’s future. The proposed package measures are also specifically aimed at mitigating this risk, as well as providing a sound and objective evidence base upon which to formulate proposals for its redevelopment. This evidence may serve to assess any material submitted in support of redevelopment proposals.
Sudbury

18.29 Risks identified affecting the Sudbury redevelopment include the effects of further delays since there have been intentions to redevelop the site for a long time and further delay could have a negative effect on confidence. This could also serve to ward off any current developer interest in the sites. A successful High Court challenge by a developer to construct a retirement complex on a key part of one of the sites (outcome to be known before Christmas 2008) may also have a harmful effect, although this risk is not assessed as high and the Council has taken a series of specific actions to guard against this possibility.
PART E

NEXT STEPS
19. Moving forward

19.1 This document constitutes the fourth version of the Haven Gateway Integrated Development Programme. Although considerable progress has been made since the original draft, this document still continues to be work in progress. While the details of individual project delivery understandably continue to evolve as preparations take place and more detailed plans emerge, given the recent credit crunch and economic downturn, now even assumptions based upon economic statistics or market expectations will need close monitoring and careful review if this investment plan is to remain relevant. The preparation of this document and the recognition of the need to respond to changing economic circumstances continues to strengthen the Partnership’s understanding of its strengths and weaknesses and in particular the robustness of its economic strategy and investment planning.

19.2 Within the Haven Gateway, partners are convinced that the new arrangement of five Thematic and six Spatial Packages that have been identified, are the right ones in terms of managing – and prioritising – the investments required to deliver substantial growth sustainably and well.

19.3 The preparation of the IDP to date has helped inform our thinking in terms of our Programme of Development submission to Government for Growth Point Funding (where the Partnership identified the need for £58m of public sector investment (2008-11) and to date has secured £17.457m and Community Infrastructure Funding.

19.4 However the IDP process has been an ambitious one – in concept, scope and timescale. For instance, it has, for the first time, brought together the disciplines and timescales linked to new approaches to spatial planning and those associated with key funding cycles. Hence the exercise itself has been quite challenging particularly in the context of the LDFs being at different stages of development (and therefore certainty).

19.5 Partners within the Haven Gateway are committed to taking the IDP process further, in subsequent iterations. This will mean, inter alia, a broadening of its scope (by involving a wider range of delivery bodies) and striving to ensure that a wider range of stakeholders are aware of its role, purpose and importance (indeed, specific events of this nature may follow the public launch on 2 December 2008).

19.6 Additionally, several of the Packages identified still need further work and elaboration, particularly with regard to interventions focused in later stages in the planning period, as does the task of scoring all the projects within the packages in accordance with the IDP toolkit. In some cases, detailed work has not been possible over recent months owing to the timing of LDF processes. In others, detailed technical work remains to be done within an agreed policy framework and/or following studies which are still awaited. However across the Gateway, there is a commitment to advancing the actions set out in this document and using the IDP de facto as a ‘live’ project management tool.

19.7 While the interventions identified in this IDP for Haven Gateway are not all fully developed, partners are convinced that those which have been specified in detail are the right ones. Given the scale of both opportunity and challenge that the Haven Gateway represents, it is
partners’ belief that – given its rigour – the IDP ought to be of serious interest to a wide range of different funding bodies and, equally, it ought to influence in a material way, the contents of the East of England’s submission to government in response to the Regional Funding Allocations (this is a process which will conclude in early 2009) as well as future Growth Point Funding, the Community Infrastructure Fund, the Regional Infrastructure Funding and mainstream funding and priorities from Government sponsored agencies.