

Your ref: DC/19/0834/RM
Our ref: ET/acb
DD: 01223 559810
E: Emma.thompson@bidwells.co.uk
Date: 27/02/2020

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, HAVERHILL**

Further to receiving additional comments from Suffolk County Council regarding highways and drainage matters, and additional comments from West Suffolk District Council regarding landscaping and ecology, I set out below an overview of the changes and clarification, as requested.

The latest updated submission pack comprises the following information:

- Updated Highway and Drainage drawings prepared by Royal Haskoning;
- Updated Landscape drawings prepared by Exterior Architecture;
- Ecology Note, prepared by Ecology Solutions;
- Updated AMS: prepared by FPCR; and
- Drawing register detailing revised plans.

Highways

The highways officer has requested clarification and revised information on a number of matters that are set out below.

Access Locations

- Confirmation needed whether all are to be assessed with individual parcels or some to be assessed with this application;
- Spine Road though A8 needs amending;
- Visibility north east of A2 (southern) is compromised by a parking layby.

Applicant Response

- A8 accesses have been updated to reflect and align with the latest drawings for the Residential RMA (reference DC/19/1940/RM). Therefore, we confirm that all accesses shown as actual are now fixed across both the Infrastructure and Residential RMA's;

Bidwells, Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge CB2 9LD
T: 01223 841841 E: info@bidwells.co.uk W: bidwells.co.uk

- Additional widening has been implemented around the 90 degree bend and chicane feature within parcel A8. Swept path drawings have been included with the updated submission pack to confirm that the road is of sufficient width to accommodate the anticipated traffic movements;
- All visibility splays shown have been added to the drawings. Parking bays have been removed where visibility splays had previously cut through the bays.

Cycleways and footways

- Layout of A8 to be clarified;
- Loss of footway and narrowing of cycleway north west of A8 must be explained and may need to be safety audited;
- Chalkstone Way link not provided;
- Footway north of A2 not shown;
- All pedestrian and footway crossing will be subject to a safety audit;
- Pedestrian & Cycleway access to school site not defined.

Applicant Response

- The footway/cycleway narrows at the bat hop location. This has been refined to be more focussed, so the narrowing is reduced only to the interface area. Drawing PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0159 Footway and Cycleway widths has been updated to reflect this;
- The cycleway links to Chalkstone Way are indicated on the General Arrangement plan (drawing reference PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0150);
- We will carry out a safety audit on the tiger crossings; however, we are awaiting confirmation from SCC Highways as to whether our independent team can carry this out. We are therefore happy for a condition to be added to the RM approval requiring submission of detailed design drawings (which would also be submitted for the Road Safety Audit as part of the technical approval process) for the proposed crossings to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of construction of the crossings;
- The secondary footway/cycleway access envelope has now been added onto the drawings for the southern access to the school plot.

Lighting

- Potential clashes with ecology not shown;
- Bat hop dark zones have streetlights in them for pedestrian crossings.

Applicant Response

- Lighting plans have been updated to maximise spacing to Bat hops using 5/6m columns. A balance has been sought which addresses the requirements of the ES in terms of proximity of light units to Bat Hops and SCC Highway's position in terms of minimum lighting for the main spine road. SCC has advised that areas of the spine road which bisect tree lines (bat hops) will still require a system of lighting consistent with the appropriate BS and European CEN codes to enable the lighting to be adopted by Suffolk County Council;
- Dimmed lighting in the Bat hop areas post adoption has been put forward by the highways lighting officer as a possible option, which can be explored during S38 discussions.

PROW'S

- New proposed PROWs not clearly shown.

Applicant Response

- The key on drawing reference (PB8301-RHD-DE-H1-DR-D-0150) has been updated and colours amended to provide more clarity to Public Right of Ways.

Layout

- The alignment of the roundabout by parcel A7-A8 may need to be altered for adoption which may affect parcel A7;
- A large number of parking laybys on the spine road (A8 in particular) do not fit with the parameter and hierarchy plans.

Applicant Response

- The alignment of the roundabout for parcels A7/A8 has been adjusted to give further deflection on the west to east movement;
- The parking bays have been removed from the eastern edge of Parcel A8.

Drainage

The drainage details have also been revised following consultation with SCC drainage officers.

Applicant Response

- Updated crossing locations have been provided in line with land /ordinary watercourse consent discussions;
- Some ditch crossings have been removed in line with land /ordinary watercourse consent discussions and survey works carried out onsite;
- Replacement of the high-level overflow between ponds 4.1 and 4.2 with a piped overflow;
- Refinement of headwall locations in ponds;
- Refinement of batters to maximise maintenance zones.

Landscape and Ecology

Following comments from the Landscape and Ecology Officer, received on 14 February, we set out below a summary of the comments received and our response.

Hazel Dormouse

- Proposed hedgerow removal would affect hedgerow connectivity and clarification is needed on specific mitigation;
- Conflicts between the Dormouse Strategy/EIS and the plans submitted in regard to hedgerow removal;
- Need for a method statement and details of how hedgerow removal will be minimised close to the headwall construction and where replacement planting will be required.

Applicant Response

- Outstanding issues of hedgerow retention/removal and protection fencing has been clarified on this iteration of drawings and the EIS. Please see the Ecology Briefing note for a detailed response to the Landscape and Ecology comments;
- Hedge alignments have been adjusted to comments. Sections to be removed clarified and measurements given;

- Drainage updates have been integrated across the site, with maintenance accesses updated to prevent obstructions and to provide additional access information.

Badgers

- The badger sett located in the tree group on the main GI Spine is not shown on plans – an easement will be required;
- Appears as if the sett will become isolated.

Applicant Response

- Careful monitoring has been undertaken for a significant period of time. The mitigation measures appropriately address these matters, however, in the event that activity was to change, it is not expected that there would be any difficulty in obtaining a licence. Please refer to the Ecology Briefing note and landscaping plans for a detailed response to the Landscape and Ecology comments.

Bats

- It is unclear from the information that the bat hops will maintain a dark corridor;
- Tree planting is much smaller in height than specified in the lighting strategy. It is not clear if SCC highways will allow 4m street lights;
- Bat Boxes should not be placed on mature trees – best located on trees of poor quality and have a short useful lifespan.

Applicant Response

- This has been explored extensively. There is an overriding element of highway safety to consider. The positions and type of luminaires has been reviewed, and wherever possible, positioned away from bat hops. The spacing of lights has been reviewed in the bat hop locations with a view to maximise the distance between them (see comments above). All lights are directional LEDs;
- Further advice has been received from SCC highways that indicated arrangements could be made to dim the lights closest to the bat hops once they are adopted;
- Bat boxes will serve as a long-term enhancement, trees with significant potential roost features will generally be avoided but established trees will be selected;
- Stud lighting on the cycle path through the southern meadows has been considered and Redrow would be happy to accept stud lighting, however, we understand this is unlikely to be acceptable to SCC Highways as part of their technical approval process;
- The bat hops have been sufficiently integrated into the design with additional planting;
- Tree sizes and planting mixes have been adjusted based on comments;
- Please refer to the Ecology Briefing note and submitted landscaping plans for the detailed response to comments.

Birds

- Swift boxes would be better fixed to houses.

Applicant Response

- This comment is relevant for the Residential RMA. The provision of Swift boxes will not preclude other features being brought forward in the residential parcels (i.e. Swift bricks).

Comments on planting plans

- Path surface is not clear;
- Barriers have been removed;
- Planting in visibility splays below 600mm;
- Bench Locations and positioning needs to be reviewed.

Applicant Response

- Hard material hatches have been added to planting plans;
- Tree planting has been reviewed with additional root barriers added;
- Tree sizes and planting mixes have been adjusted based on the comments received;
- Native planting has been strengthened throughout the scheme with mixes embellished to include more shrub species;
- Additional bollards have been added, and bench locations adjusted to reflect comments;
- Drainage updates have been integrated across the site, with maintenance accesses updated to prevent obstructions and to provide additional access information;
- The mown footpath south of The Great Field Plantation has been realigned to the foot of drainage mounds and other mown paths removed to reflect comments received;
- The comments received on ecological matters have been discussed and amendments have been made which are captured in the updated landscaping plans, EIS, BMS and LEMP.

As previously discussed, the design team have spent a lot of time forming the amended submission to be a very bespoke presentation against all the individual points raised. We have, therefore, sought to address, where possible, the suggested changes and, given the timescales, we trust the above and enclosed is sufficient to address the final consultee comments and allow the application to progress.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Emma Thompson
Principal Planner

Copy **Chris Gatland (Redrow Homes)**