

Your Ref:DC/19/1940/RM
Our Ref: SCC/CON/4047/19
Date: 14 October 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

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/19/1940/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, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 503 dwellings (parcels A1, A2 and A8) and associated internal roads, car parking, landscaping, amenity and public open space. Application to Partially Discharge Conditions 4 (Updated survey information), 6 (waste and recycling), 7 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan), 8 (Landscape), 15 (Open space strategy), 28 (Garage /parking provision), 30 (Travel Plan - Residential), 40 (Arboricultural method statement), 42 (Ecological implementation strategy), and 45 (Biodiversity monitoring) of DC/15/2151/OUT

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 on the grounds of Highway Safety for the following reasons:

The following comments apply to ALL SITES:

Parking Allocation:

Some plots, appears to have insufficient parking allocation. For instance FOG's (plot A8-67 for example) shows only one garage space for a 2-bedroomed dwelling.

Tandem parking:

Parking for many plots is 3 tandem (nose to tail) spaces. Where this is provided for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms this configuration is contrary the Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019) and is therefore not acceptable.

Visitor parking:

There appears to be an under allocation of visitor parking spaces, and those that are provided are not distributed evenly throughout the parcels. While we accept visitor parking cannot be 100% evenly distributed, every effort should be made to ensure these spaces are reasonably accessible to all dwellings and not concentrated in a few locations or only provided as a single row of parking laybys along a Primary Street.

Parking information:

The parking strategy (drawing P18-2192_17 No. 03 Rev B1) shows inaccurate information. Some apparent visitor spaces are missed and some residential spaces are missed. Dwellings do not have the capacity shown and parking spaces are not dimensioned. It is therefore difficult to assess the overall parking strategy from this drawing.

Direct Accesses:

There is a significant number of frontages with driveways necessitating reversing manoeuvres onto Primary (lower tier) roads. This is contrary to the agreed clarification of hierarchies and parameters for this site. This has safety implications as multiple reversing manoeuvres onto higher hierarchy roads (across footways) with higher vehicle flows and pedestrian usage can cause unacceptable conflict with pedestrians and vehicles, particularly where vehicles are waiting for a gap in traffic to pull out of a driveway and pedestrians are not always clearly visible. Children and wheelchair users are particularly vulnerable with this configuration as they may be out of the driver's line of sight. We strongly recommend driveways directly accessing Primary (lower tier) roads are removed as far as possible, in line with the agreed hierarchies and parameters, and any remaining driveways are redesigned to allow vehicles to enter and exit the highway in forward gear.

Vehicle Tracking:

The tracking of some vehicles appears to be close, on or over kerb-lines and visitor laybys. This is a safety issue as vehicles should not have to over-run the kerb in any circumstance, and larger or poorly parked vehicles in laybys could force turning vehicles off the correct lane. Where the tracking appears very close to the kerb, parking or other feature more detailed modelling should be provided.

Visibility Splays:

Some splays around bends are shown as 43m, 25m and 18m. The applicant should explain in the key why these dimensions have been chosen to be relevant.

Construction Drawings:

We cannot comment at planning stage on the construction details for any infrastructure to be offered for adoption by the highway authority, but would note that all should be designed in accordance with the Suffolk County Council Estate Roads Specification current at the time of adoption, and this will include designing and constructing to actual ground strength test results (CBRs)

Shared Surface roads:

These must have a service strip on both sides of a minimum width of 1.0m. This may have to be wider where multiple services are present. Service strips should be hardened to full depth carriageway construction, unless they run adjacent to grassed areas for more than 10m.

Trees:

We advise that all trees should be at least 3.0m away from the proposed adopted highway, including footways and cycleways. Actual accepted distance will depend on species, root protection zones, soils type and tree-life maintenance. It is therefore not possible to assess the proposed distance for all trees from the proposed adopted highway from the provided information.

Parcel A2:

- Please explain how the bins will be collected from plots 58-66 and 68-76 as the bin store appears to be accessible only from the Primary road.
- Should the bend near 113 have a hardened over-run area?
- The parking for plot 30 is not acceptable as it is directly opposite a junction.

Parcel A8:

- The parking for plots 149 to 164 and 54 to 55 are not acceptable as they are directly opposite a junction/s.
- The shared surface feeding plots 239 to 269 feeds too many dwellings. A shared surface road should not feed more than 25 dwellings, and only the pedestrians associated with those 25 dwellings. Where a shared surface road feeds more than 25 dwellings and/or has a pedestrian connection beyond those dwellings it should be redesigned as a Minor Access Road.
- The Focal Space junctions are not accepted as a design concept. More details should be provided of how these will work with the expected traffic flows associated with the completed development.
- The parking spaces for plots 76 and 77 are not acceptable as they involve reversing manoeuvres onto a Primary Street, on a bend and directly adjacent to a private Drive.

The above issues do not necessarily form a complete list of our concerns with the layout of these parcels, but form the basis of our HOLDING OBJECTION on the grounds of Highway Safety.

Yours sincerely,

Hen Abbott

Development Management Engineer

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure