

Your Ref:DC/19/0834/RM  
Our Ref: SCC/CON/3784/19  
Date: 30 September 2019  
Highways Enquiries to: Highways.DevelopmentControl@suffolk.gov.uk



**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**

Email: [planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk)

The Planning Department  
West Suffolk Council  
Development Management  
West Suffolk House  
Western Way  
Bury St Edmunds  
Suffolk  
IP33 3YU

For the attention of: Penny Mills

Dear Penny Mills

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 CONSULTATION RETURN:**

**DC/19/0834/RM**

**PROPOSAL:** Reserved Matters Application - Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission DC/15/2151/OUT (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) Submission of details for the reserved matters access, landscaping, layout and scale for the Spine Road and associated strategic infrastructure to support the delivery of the first phase of development at Great Wilsey Park.

**LOCATION:** Land Ne Haverhill Wilsey Road Little Wratting Suffolk

**ROAD CLASS:**

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments which form a HOLDING OBJECTION pending further information:

We disagree with the information on the Road Hierarchy plan drawing PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0170 Rev P05. The information provided in the Design Parameters table is not that previously agreed with the highway Authority and the LPA. (June 2019). We therefore do not accept the Design Parameters shown on this drawing. In addition the roads shown as 'secondary' should be 'primary'. Secondary roads should feed into the parcels only and should be indicated on this drawing along with a more robust indication of the hierarchy of other interconnecting roads. We cannot accept a drawing stating 'future link roads... to be defined in future residential reserved matters applications' as it is key to understand how all the parcel connect We further note that there is a Reserved Matters application (DC/19/1940/RM pending determination) for the residential parcels A1, A2 and A3. Layout drawings for this application appear to show differing hierarchies.

The Hierarchy or GA plan should also indicate the proposed adoptors of the various roads and footways.

The GA drawing (PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0150 Rev I06) shows different parameters to PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0170 Rev P05. Those shown on the GA drawing are more reflective of the Design Parameters previously agreed, however, the primary route should run through parcel A8, and not be disconnected as shown.

The visibility splay drawings do not show all the inter-visibility splays.

We are concerned about the location of the electricity sub-stations. Particularly the 2 accessed directly from the Primary Routes. These should be redesigned to be accessed from lower hierarchy roads, or so service vehicles can enter and exit in forward gear.

**Other Comments:**

We request the applicant re-considers the design of the roundabout shown on Inset A, as we feel the cycle and pedestrian crossings can be better and safer designed.

Overall we feel the applicant should consider the design and locations of the cycleways throughout the development with reference to the desire-line and destination. along with the hierarchy of the roads. Cycleways should not run adjacent to roads with numerous driveway crossings. Cycleways should feed into and through each residential parcel. Cycleways slightly offset from the main carriageway should be also be considered.

The lighting plans cannot be assessed at consultation stage as all street-lighting needs to be approved by the highway Authority Street-Lighting team as part of the highway adoption process. We accept that street lighting is proposed, however, we advise that street lights must be 5.0m from any trees.

The landscape drawings cannot be accurately assessed in regard to suitability of trees to be adjacent to the highway infrastructure. We advise the applicant that trees should be 3.0m or more from the back of the constructed highway (normally the footway or cycleway). It is not possible to accurately scale from the drawings but some trees appear to be too close to the highway. Where trees are proposed adjacent to the highway, the applicant should provide drawings showing the distance from the highway, species with mature spread and water demand so we can give informed advice.

We note the applicant has submitted highway construction drawings and advise that we cannot comment on these prior to the section 38 (of the highways act) application. We further advise that all highway construction designs must be based on correct, actual CBR results.

Yours sincerely,

**Hen Abbott**

**Development Management Engineer**

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure