

# Great Wilsey Park- Infrastructure RMA- Applicants Response- Highways

Redrow Homes

19/12/2019

DC/19/0834/RM Highway Authority Response		
May 2019 Comments	October 2019 Comments	Redrow Response
<b>Parameter and Hierarchy Plans</b>		
Northern road through Parcel A2 (road sections reference B1 and B2) shown as secondary route, at 5.5m wide. Downgrading the access road through Parcel A2 will reduce the permeability through the site, and lead to traffic being focused on a limited number of streets and on a small number of key junctions.	Partly resolved. Parameter plans agreed with Redrow but not submitted with application. Drawing PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0150 REV G (GA) shows more acceptable hierarchies, except there should be a Primary 2nd Tier road through parcel A8 and not stopped as shown on this drawing. The agreed parameter plans should be part of this submission as they will inform the parcel layouts as well.	This has been dealt with under the Non Material Amendment Application: NMA(B)15/2151. Decision issued 12 November 2019.  Additional length of Primary 2nd Tier road through parcel A8 is included within the application.
It is difficult to confirm the exact location and number of access points from the Spine Road into the development parcels without further details.	Not resolved. Primary 1st tier roads should show all access points. Some are indicated but not clearly shown. To the west of A8 no access are shown, but the RM for the parcels shows private drives. Other have a indicative blue line but these are not noted as the only access points. Primary upper tier roads should have no direct accesses and Primary lower tier roads should have as few as possible. Areas with potential single dwelling (reversing) driveways should be shown.	The exact location of junctions will be fixed as part of future RMA's for the specific parcels to which they relate. Indicative access locations with an indicative junction location envelope are shown on the dwg. The location and acceptability of private drive accesses onto the Primary Tier road should be determined as part of the housing RMA.
A large proportion of the site (Parcels A2,3,5&6) are only served from a secondary route, which would not be acceptable. The same issues are present on the southern parcel A8.	Partly resolved, but part of the Primary 2nd tier road through A8 is missing	The additional primary second tier through A8 has been incorporated into the application provided a connected loop
A looped arrangement of Primary Street would be required to give residents multiple routes to the spine road. The road width shown on road section reference B1 is not sufficient for a primary movement corridor.	Not resolved, no additional detail has been supplied regarding road looping, and the roads through A8 do not loop.	The additional primary second tier through A8 has been incorporated into the application provided a connected loop.
Some are shown as 40 metres, and some are 22 metres. have to assume the default 30 mph speed limit would be in place, and the necessary splays would be needed to be provided.	Not Resolved. Drawing 0230 does not show any splays. We do not believe all accesses are shown. We believe there are a number of private driveways accessing these roads that are not shown on these drawings.	Please refer to the letter issued by Bidwells on 22 October 2019 that addresses the comments regarding visibility splays. As above, we have provided junction visibility splays for all indicative junction locations on the updated drawings. Their exact locations will be fixed as part of future reserved matters applications for the specific parcels/development plots to which they relate.
One splay, at D1 north access point, appears to cut across parcel land. This will need to be protected during the S38 process to avoid buildings, planting or fencing from restricting visibility in the future. We would require that the correctly drawn splay is clearly shown within the highway corridor.	Not resolved, as above.	Please refer to the letter issued by Bidwells on 22 October 2019 that addresses the comments regarding visibility splays. As above, we have provided junction visibility splays for all indicative junction locations on the updated drawings. Their exact locations will be fixed as part of future reserved matters applications for the specific parcels/development plots to which they relate.
<b>Cycleways and Footways</b>		

<p>Safe traffic free cycle access to each of the development parcels will be required.</p> <p>Currently A1 doesn't have a shared cycle footpath all the way along the spine road to the junction, and into the parcel. From parcel A7 to the spine road junction (Inset B) the shared cycle way is not continuous along the spine road (serving phase 2) and deviates to the north of the remainder of parcel A7. Likewise, the proposed shared cycle route that is to the west of parcel A8. If there is a cycle route to the west of parcel A8 the transition point where cyclists need to re-join Chalkstone Way will need to be carefully detailed with a suitable transition point.</p> <p>Spine road and principal road network should have a shared cycleway throughout, and all development parcels should have access to off road cycle routes</p>	<p>Partly resolved. The cycleway now continues around the east of A8, however, connectivity issues remain around connecting to Chalkstone Way and north of A7. The crossing shown between A8 and A7 is not suitably located between the roundabout and junction. This may be better connecting further west. There is a lack of connectivity to the north east of the site. The cycleway running north east through the site will not be confirmed or delivered as part of this RM.</p>	<p>An additional footway/cycle link has been indicatively shown running through Parcel A7 to provide additional connectivity between the main spine road and the primary cycleway link running between A7 and the Meadows. A cycleway has been added along the northern side of the spine road to link these two indicative connections. A controlled crossing has also been provided linking Parcel A7 with the proposed play area across the main Primary spine road.</p>
<p>The Access Parameter Plan confirms that all footways should be a minimum of 2 metres wide, and shared cycle paths are to be 3 metres minimum. Any short length pinch points will be assessed on their merits, and inter-visibility will need to be maintained between approaching pedestrian and cyclists to avoid safety issues arising.</p>	<p>Not accepted as no details have been provided nor confirmation there are no exceptions.</p>	<p>Drawing number PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0159 (Footway and Cycle Widths) has now been provided clearly detailing the widths of the proposed cycleways and footpaths across the site.</p>
<p>Zebra or Tiger (cycle Zebra) or uncontrolled crossing points are unlikely to operate safely.</p>	<p>Not resolved. No acceptable evidence submitted. Locations are not accepted. The northern one is no longer on the cycleway desire line and no safe crossing is shown east of the roundabout. The southern one is between the roundabout and a junction and the cycleway link is not clarified. Also there are none proposed for the primary or secondary school accesses or links.</p>	<p>A Pedestrian Crossing Assessment dated 2 July 2019 was submitted with the amended submission in September 2019. The Assessment was prepared by Royal Haskoning DHV in response to consultation comments issued by Suffolk County Council's Highways officer to West Suffolk Council on 29 May 2019 and the reference number for the document is PB8301-RHD-ZZ-XX-NT-Z-0001.</p> <p>RHDHV assessed the three proposed crossing points on the proposed internal highway network, in accordance with Local Transport Note 1/95 and took into consideration various factors including traffic flows, vehicle speeds, pedestrian demand, carriageway and footway geometry and road safety. Their appraisals demonstrated that informal crossings would provide an appropriate level of provision given future predicted traffic and pedestrian demand but given the high proportion of school children using the crossings in the AM peak, Zebra crossings have been proposed at all three crossing locations. The assessment confirms there is no demonstrated need for signal-controlled pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>An additional controlled crossing has been provided north of the northern roundabout to create a stronger connection along the main cycleway desire line. An additional length of cycleway has also been provided around the north western arm of the roundabout.</p> <p>As above, an additional footway/cycle link has been indicatively shown running through Parcel A7 to provide additional connectivity, between the main spine road and the primary cycleway link running between A7 and the Meadows. A cycleway has been added along the northern side of the spine road to link these two indicative connections.</p> <p>A controlled crossing has also been provided linking Parcel A7 with the proposed play area, across the main Primary spine road.</p> <p>The new primary school within the site has cycleway connections around its boundary on two sides. A future crossing location has been identified to provide a connection to the Secondary school should one be needed in the future. There is no requirement within the Outline planning permission for a new link to be provided to the secondary school, or whether this is something desired/required by the school, as it is our experience that multiple accesses to schools can create security issues.</p>
<p>No access from the development to Samuel Ward School appears to be shown</p>	<p>We can adopt the verges, but need to see indication of links.</p>	<p>Comment not clear</p>

<p>It is difficult to fully comment on the pedestrian and cycle access to the onsite Primary School until the internal layout is confirmed. However, all options for safe and sustainable travel to the school, with multiple safe crossing points of the main road corridor, need to be secured through the site layout. Some vehicle access and 'kiss and drop' will be required, along with parking for staff. The design of the access junctions, and their interface with the shared use cycle paths and other walking and cycling facilities will be critical. Ideally on a 'blank canvas' site like this totally traffic free cycling routes from the main parcels to the school should be provided through the layout of the site, to encourage children and parents to cycle to school.</p>	<p>Not resolved. No access points at all are shown for parcel B1 and E1. This needs to be resolved or at least indicated now.</p>	<p>The exact location of junctions will be fixed as part of future RMA's for the specific parcels to which they relate. Indicative access locations for B1 and E1 with an indicative junction location envelope are shown on the drawing.</p>
<b>Lighting</b>		
<p>All adoptable carriageways, footways and cycle paths will need to be illuminated with standard lanterns to an agreed Suffolk County Council specification. Any potential conflicts between lighting columns, planting, trees and ecological mitigation will need to be set out clearly to the SCC Street Lighting Engineer so these factors can be considered when approval is formally sought.</p>	<p>The street lighting plans do not highlight areas where there are clashes with ecological constraints. However, from a highways perspective the lighting concept is acceptable, but full agreement cannot be given until the developer has approached SCC street lighting team.</p>	<p>The street lighting design has been carefully considered taking into account ecological constraints. The design is considered to be appropriate and sympathetic to the bat hops and dark corridors and there are not considered to be any lighting clashes with ecological constraints to highlight on the plans.</p>
<b>Additional Comments</b>		
	<p>All submitted drawings should show the same information. There are access shown on the visibility drawings which are not shown on the GA.</p>	<p>See Bidwells response of 22 October 2019</p>
	<p>The northern roundabout should be re-designed as the cycleway location has changed.</p>	<p>See Bidwells response of 22 October 2019 An additional length of cycleway is now proposed to the north west arm of the roundabout to improve cycle connectivity</p>
	<p>The landscape drawings show potential clashes with the location of highway infrastructure. This may affect adoption by the highway authority.</p>	<p>See Bidwells response of 22 October 2019 An additional length of cycleway is now proposed to the north west arm of the roundabout to improve cycle connectivity</p>
	<p>We cannot comment on section 38 adoption drawings at planning stage. These will form part of the section 38 technical checking process, but we accept the developer intends to offer these roads for adoption.</p>	<p>See Bidwells response of 22 October 2019</p>
	<p>There is a gap in the cycleway where it should connect to the Haverhill Rd (A143) roundabout.</p>	<p>See Bidwells response of 22 October 2019 The General arrangement drawing number 150 has been updated to confirm that this section of cycleway will be provided as part of the S278 works</p>