

Your ref: Application Reference: DC/19/0834/RM
Our ref:
DD:
E:
Date:



Ms Penny Mills
Principal Planner
West Suffolk Council
West Suffolk House
Western Way
Bury St Edmunds
IP33 3YU

Dear Penny

APPLICATION REFERENCE: DC/19/0834/RM

GREAT WILSEY PARK- INFRASTRUCTURE RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION

Further to the consultation responses received to the application, the enclosed information is submitted to the reserved matters application to address recent feedback from statutory consultees.

This submission comprises the following information:

- Updated Landscape drawings, prepared by Exterior Architecture;
- Updated Ecology reports, prepared by Ecology Solutions;
- Updated Highway and Drainage drawings, prepared by Royal Haskoning;
- Updated Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Retention Plans;
- Drawing register detailing revised plans; and
- Detailed applicant response document

I set out below an overview of the revised changes and clarification that has been requested.

Landscape

The landscape officer has requested clarification and revised information on a number of matters and a detailed response to each individual comment has been provided in the enclosed applicant response document.

Headline Comments

1. *The trees to the south of Great Wood Plantation have not been surveyed and most of these trees have veteran features. The SUDS banks could have direct and indirect impact on these trees which have not been adequately assessed.*

Applicant Response:

We can confirm that the trees were surveyed as part of the initial Arboricultural Assessment carried out by FPCR in August 2015 and submitted as part of the outline application. The assessment recorded the mature oak trees along the southern edge of Great Wood plantation within W5. The Arboricultural Assessment (dated March 2019) submitted as part of the infrastructure RMA to discharge condition 41, gives details as to why the woodland blocks were separated to form W5 and W7 however, the orientation of the mature oaks is referred to as the eastern portion and should have been the southern.

The survey of trees was carried out in accordance with the criteria set out in Chapter 4 of BS5837:2012. Trees were assessed for their arboricultural quality and benefits within the context of the proposed development in a transparent, understandable and systematic way. Woodlands were recorded where it had been determined appropriate and had been applied where trees formed cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically, visually or culturally including biodiversity or habitat potential. As a result of this assessment W5 was given a Root Protection Area (RPA) of 15m which is the maximum standoff available and is calculated off the largest stem diameter found along the southern boundary.

In preparation of the Reserved Matters application a topographical survey has provided detailed locations for the mature oak trees along the southern edge of W5 and as result of this individual trees have been shown on the Tree Survey Plans, Tree Retention Plans and Tree Protection Plans. Each tree was given a capped RPA of 15m despite the fact that many of these trees measure below the required stem diameter needed to warrant this protection. In addition to this, to provide the landscape officer with additional certainty, each tree has now been surveyed in detail and individual RPA's plotted to illustrate this with a full suite of plans are provided as part of this submission.

- 2. A number of unsuitable tree species have been proposed including white willow, white poplar, crack willow. The predominant oak around Haverhill is Quercus robar rather than Qurecus petraea.*

Applicant Response:

All tree species have been reviewed by EXA and Quercus petraea replaced with Quercus robur.

- 3. Great Wood Plantation has not been properly considered as part of the proposals*

Applicant Response:

The Great Field Plantation has been given careful consideration as part of the submission proposals. As set out in section 7 of the LEMP, Great Field Plantation represents a special case in terms of habitat establishment and management. The information in this and other documents set out the general prescriptions for management, protection and monitoring, but the detailed measures in terms of which trees to fell to establish glades, and which areas to coppice on which rotation will be subject to a further submission, for which Redrow Homes is content to accept a planning condition on the Infrastructure Reserved Matters permission. This allows time for further consultation on the detail of this key aspect of the green infrastructure, without unduly delaying the commencement of construction.

- 4. It was never envisaged that the southern woodland would essentially remain private – a management plan for the woodland is required as required by the land-use parameter plan*

Applicant Response:

Access to the Southern Plantation has been restricted in accordance with the legal agreement with the landowner. The plantation is to be crossed by two roads to access A7 from A8, the spine road in the west and the secondary road in the east. The area is to remain largely intact with access and new paths deterred. There are 'informal footpaths' if people chose to meander through the plantation.

The Landscape and Ecological Management Plan provides details as to how the woodland will be managed and maintained.

5. *Some of the proposed new Public Rights of Way have not been provided*

Applicant Response:

The plans have been reviewed and all proposed new Public Rights of Way have been provided and annotated on the enclosed revised plans.

6. *A safe road crossing for the play area in the south east is not included*

Applicant Response:

An additional shared/tiger crossing has been provided. See drawing number ExA_1868_P_111 Revision B (South Playspace)

7. *The main route to school footpath on the western boundary has not been properly resolved.*

Applicant Response:

This is outside of the control of the applicant's ownership boundary.

8. *The SUDs infrastructure will impact on landscape amenity and on trees and will not provide the level of ecological interest (embayments, scrapes, ponds etc) that was intended and detailed in the ES.*

Applicant Response:

The SUDs infrastructure design has been reviewed with a view to ensuring diversity of form is maximised to meet the aspirations of the ES including maximising ecological interest and diversity, whilst ensuring the basins do their job of drainage as the number one priority. A number of additional features have been included as part of the SUDs design including some small areas of permanent water and scrapes to maximise available ecological niches for plants and wildlife and provide visual and recreational amenity.

Some of the specific terms referred to in the outline ES such as embayments and spits are more usually coastal terms rather than those typically used for inland features, nonetheless the updated proposals align with the intention which is to create diversity and variation in slopes and banks, and thus it is considered that the aspirations of the outline ES are delivered by the strategy.

Highways

Parameter Plans and Road Hierarchy Plans

1. *Partly resolved. Parameter plans agreed with Redrow but not submitted with application.*

Applicant Response: This has been dealt with under the Non-Material Amendment Application: NMA(B)15/2151. The decision was issued 12 November 2019.

- 2. 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.*

Applicant Response:

The additional length of Primary 2nd Tier road through parcel A8 has now been included within the application and the red line boundary adjusted accordingly.

Location and number of access points

- 3. Primary 1st tier roads should show all access points. Some are indicated but not clearly shown. To the west of A8 no accesses are shown, but the RM for the parcels shows private drives. Others have an indicative blue line, but these are not noted as the only access points.*

Applicant Response:

The exact location of junctions will be fixed as part of future RMA's for the specific housing parcels to which they relate. Indicative access locations with indicative junction location envelopes are shown on the drawings. The location and acceptability of private drive accesses onto the Primary Tier roads should be determined as part of the future housing RMAs.

- 4. The Primary 2nd tier road through A8 is missing*

Applicant Response:

As noted above, the additional primary second tier road running through A8 has been incorporated into the application providing a connected loop.

Visibility Splays

- 5. 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.*

Applicant Response:

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.

Cycleways and Footways

- 6. 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.*

Applicant Response:

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 spin 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.

- 7. 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*

Applicant Response:

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.

- 8. Zebra or Tiger (cycle Zebra) or uncontrolled crossing points are unlikely to operate safely. 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.*

Applicant Response:

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.

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.

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.

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.

A controlled crossing has also been provided linking Parcel A7 with the proposed play area, across the main Primary spine road.

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.

9. *No access points at all are shown for parcel B1 and E1. This needs to be resolved or at least indicated now.*

Applicant Response:

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 indicative junction location envelope are shown on drawing number PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0158 Rev I01 (Highway Adoption Plan).

There are also a number of additional comments from Suffolk County Highways which were addressed in our response dated 22 October 2019 and we would ask that you refer to this letter for clarification on the matters raised.

I trust the above and enclosed is sufficient to address the consultee comments and that the application can progress to a positive determination; however, please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries or require any further information.

Kind regards



Harriet Wooler
Planner

Copy Chris Gatland, Redrow Homes Ltd