

**From:**Planning.Help  
**Sent:**Wed, 20 Jan 2016 12:36:56 +0000  
**To:**Rand, Chris;planning.technical  
**Subject:**FW: Comments for Great Wisley Development

**From:** Vicky Phillips [<mailto:vicky.phillips@haverhill-tc.gov.uk>]  
**Sent:** 20 January 2016 10:31  
**To:** Planning.Help  
**Subject:** Comments for Great Wisley Development

FAO: Chris Rand

Please find below comments from Haverhill Town Council's planning committee and appendix to the minutes containing comments from the members of the public. Sally Adlen, Hallam Land Management, Marcia Whitehead, Bidwells and Lee Witts, Brookbanks Consulting Ltd were also present.

**DC/15/2151/OUT- Outline Application (Means of Access to be considered) – Residential development of up to 2,500 units (within use classes C2/C3); two primary schools; two local centres including retail, community and employment uses (with use classes A1/A2/A3/A4/A5, B1 and D1/D2; open space; landscaping and associated infrastructure - Great Wilsey Park, Wilsey Road, Little Wratting, Suffolk**

The Town Council welcomes the development with the provision that for means of access the following criteria is met:

- The footpath must be narrowed and should be made 'S' shaped so as not to see break in the trees.
- Retain open green and open spaces
- Trees to be protected and footpaths retained when sewer is constructed
- 1 hectare of tree belt area to be retained
- Access for country park car park should be from the estate, not onto Coupals Road
- Utilise the Borough owned land in order to move exit onto Chalkstone Way to opposite Millfields Way
- The Town Council challenges the figure from SCC on traffic surveys of 8.2% . There should be a proper ANPR survey carried out as promised
- North West Relief Road must be built first in accordance to Vision 2031 Page 30. Policy HV4: *"If planning application(s) to develop all or part of the site come forward in advance of the provision of the North-West Relief Road, permission will not be granted unless it is demonstrated that the transport impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated without the Relief Road"*
- Infrastructure improvements for A1307 must be based on more accurate information

**Appendix (i) – P16/018 Report of contributions made by Councillors and the public**

*Mr Ian Johnson asked the Council to support his objections:*

- *The loss of 1660m<sup>2</sup> of woodland abutting the green area between the development and Roman Way, which is not in accordance with Vision 2031 requirement to preserve and enhance tree belts. The plan should be amended to demolish no more trees than required for an 'S' shaped path to maintain the visual integrity of the trees and maintain the enclosed nature of the green lane and wildlife corridor.*
- *The loss of 1 hectare of the tree belt for housing.*
- *That the proposed pumping station be underground and the accompanying sewer construction be achieved without cutting through the tree belt and demolishing trees.*

- *The position of the proposed access road onto Chalkstone Way, which should be moved to exit at the existing junction at Millfields Way creating a single four-way traffic light controlled junction instead of two three-way junctions in close proximity.*
- *Proposed siting of a car park access in Coupals Road to serve the country park. This is at an accident blackspot. The access should be moved to be from the new development, not Coupals Road.*

*Mr Johnson also would like to see the protection of the public footpaths that cross the site. The Agent confirmed rights of way would be protected.*

*Cllr J Burns – the query on the land ownership opposite Gannet Close could be easily sorted as the land belongs to the Borough Council and that the junction could be re-sited to Millfields Way.*

*Resident – although there was a workshop held to discuss the open spaces and woodland, he feels as though their wishes have not been met.*

*Resident – Feels that traffic flow figures given in the application bear no relation to Haverhill and his personal experience*

*Lee Witt – The transport assessment data required that the 2015 traffic count data was taken at various locations in Haverhill and at various times through the day. This was data validated by Suffolk County Council.*

*Resident (Kedington) – does not accept that the figure of 8.2% of the population travelling to Cambridge and feels this does not bear any resemblance.*

*Lee Witt – The figure of 8.2% was provided by Suffolk County Council. The 2015 Traffic Survey is an automated system which was in place for 14 days.*

*Resident (Linton) – Feels that with additional large developments taking place in Haverhill and Saffron Walden, there is not sufficient regional infrastructure. The additional developments will be sending traffic on to the A1307.*

*Resident – The existing infrastructure is inadequate for the current population, a trip from Haverhill to Cambridge can take up to 1 hour for a 14 mile trip.*

*Cllr P Hanlon – Unfortunately, improvements are demand-led, so the population needs to expand, then the infrastructure will be put in place.*

*Resident – Traffic data shows that there are 1000-1200 vehicles per hour using the A1307*

*Lee Witt – Due consideration has been given to North West Haverhill. Development has to adhere to planning guidance and will mitigate against itself. Highways England have requested further information on the A1307/A11 Junction (Fourwentways). Brookbanks are currently in dialog with Highways England and are preparing an addendum on access impact.*

*Resident – residents will not be working in Haverhill, most will travel out of Haverhill.*

*Cllr C Turner – Matthew Hancock MP is campaigning for improvements on A1307.*

*Resident – concerned that Suffolk County Council has fed false information regarding the 8.2%*

*Cllr J Burns – Sustainability Committee at St Edmundsbury Borough Council approved the Masterplan with reassurance from Planners that issues with transport were resolved first.*

*There is a campaign that the North West relief road must be built first. It was agreed that there would be a comprehensive ANPR survey of Haverhill to fit in with an unpublished Cambridge survey. This still needs to be done.*

*Cllr M Byrne – Supports Cllr Burns and considers that the figure of 8.2% is laughable. Also would like the Town Council to support Mr Ian Johnson with the green and open spaces, that the gap should be narrowed and that the car park entrance / exit from estate will be situated in a safer position.*

*Cllr B Robbins – Supports Cllr Burns.*

*Cllr Q Fox – Agrees with comments in the room. 8.2% is based employment traffic and does not take in School runs etc.*

*Cllr C Turner – Supports Mr Johnson and Cllr Burn. Cllr Turner would like to reiterate that the Town Council are statutory consultees and represent the people's views, however the decision is taken at Borough. Cllr Turner feels that the Town Council should not support the Chamber of Commerce view on an access from Coupals Road.*

*Resident – Development is a wider than just a Haverhill issue.*

*Resident – With regards to air quality, Withersfield Road is already at 95% of the statutory limit. Extra traffic will breach statutory limit.*

*Lee Witt – Air Quality has been assessed and remains within statutory limits.*

*Resident – Roundabout on A143, can it be confirmed that this will be moved further North.*

*Lee Witt – Yes, roundabout will be moved.*

*Resident – Lives on Withersfield Road and has concerns that vibrations from construction traffic will damage her property. Who would be responsible if any damaged occurred?*

*Lee Whit – An environmental assessment on noise and vibrations has been made. A Construction and Environment plan covering construction vehicle access onto roads, times of day etc, will come at a later date.*

*Resident – There is a provision for schools and a doctor's surgery in the application, what rules would dictate the timing and delivery of these?*

*Sally Adlen - S106 agreements dictate these but the developers do not decide the details.*

*Resident (Linton) – increased traffic on the A1307 through Linton will worsen air and noise pollution.*

*Resident – Lives opposite the proposed junction on Chalkstone Way. Also is concerned that this development will increase the already heavy traffic on Chalkstone Way. Suggested controlling the traffic, maybe traffic lights?*

*Cllr P Hanlon – confirmed that the town council wishes for the junction to be moved from opposite their house.*

*Cllr Burns – Public Transport arrangements only appear to cover bus routes in and out of Haverhill, what about internal bus routes?*

- *Anglian Water, can they cope with both developments?*
- *Samuel Ward have been given land to extend the school, is there a traffic management plan for extra pupils*

*Lee Witt – Based on consultations with local bus companies who have endorsed the development. Confirmation of details of internal bus routes are agreed after construction, when demand can be gauged.*

- *Anglian Water have planned a new Sewage treatment works have capacity for the new development only, so none of the foul water will go into existing infrastructure.*
- *It is unknown what plans Samuel Ward have for the land allocated to them.*

*Resident – There is a provision for a medical centre in the application, will this be manned?*

*Sally Adlen – We have provided the land and have been in consultation with NHS England and local doctors. Provision of medical care for the enlarged population is down to NHS England to decide.*

With kindest regards

**Vicky Phillips**

Assistant Town Clerk

**Haverhill Town Council**

01440 712858