

Your Ref:DC/19/1940/RM
Our Ref: SCC/CON/2655/20
Date: 13 July 2020
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 (BSE)
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: Some aspects of the layouts proposed do not meet the highway authority's adoptable standards, which we have noted below.

Discharge of Conditions:

Condition 4

We are not commenting as this does not affect the highway.

Condition 6

We do not recommend this condition is discharged as the Refuse Strategy plans submitted for the 3 parcels do not show suitable refuse collection points. These is a high risk that bins will be presented on the footway or carriageway causing an obstruction and potential safety hazard for pedestrians. We also have concerns with the tracking of refuse vehicles on some hammer-heads as the refuse truck's manoeuvrability could be impeded by parked cars and overrun the footway or verge.

Condition 7 & 8

We are not commenting directly as this does not affect the highway, but we advise any trees to be within 2.5m of the highway (regardless of adoption) should be designed with a specialist tree-crate design and be suitable for the shrinkable clay soil.

Condition 15

We are not commenting as this does not affect the highway.

Condition 28

We do not recommend this condition is discharged as there are a number of triple nose-to-tail parking spaces. This configuration is not recommended in the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 as it can lead to obstructive parking on the highway. Also parcels A2 and A8 have clustered visitor parking meaning the location of most spaces are not where visitors would want to park and therefore is not effective as a visitor parking strategy. Also the parking strategy does not mention the location or provision of Electric Vehicle Charging points.

Condition 30

No new documents are submitted for this condition so our comments of 15th October 2019 still apply.

Condition 40, 42 & 45

We are not commenting as these do not affect the highway.

Parcel A1

- We note there are a number of triple parking (3 nose-to-tail) spaces. Plots 41, 43 and 44 are 4-bed roomed dwellings sited on roads proposed to be adopted by the highway authority. This configuration leads to parking on the highway which can be obstructive and the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 does not recommend this configuration. The remaining 4-bed roomed dwellings with 3 nose-to-tail spaces are located on private drives where obstructive overspill parking on the highway is less of a risk. Should the LPA be minded to approve this application; prior to acceptance for highway authority adoption we would wish to discuss the parking configuration with the developer and attempt to achieve a design which reduced as much as possible conflict between pedestrians and inappropriately parked vehicles.
- The shared surface roads are shown as 5.5m with grass service strips. In some locations, such as by plots 27 & 28, where parking and/or over-run from larger vehicles on the service strip may be expected and wherever street lights are to be installed, a hardened service strip would be required. This was discussed with the applicant at a Highway Authority Adoption meeting in March 2020.
- There is a narrowing of the carriageway by plot 29 to accommodate a tree which we note is to be partly offered for adoption. We advise that this design may be acceptable in principle on an adopted highway, subject to the tree-crate and road-narrowing design, tracking for refuse and larger vehicles and tree species.
- Some trees appear to be close to the proposed highway, we advise that specialist tree-crate design may be required in some locations.
- We note the submission of drawings EXA_1868_701 to 703 showing tree pit designs and advise that depending on the species and location these may not be suitable for trees in or very close to the highway.
- There are only a few bin presentation points shown on the refuse strategy drawing, these are for multiple dwellings and the space allowed does not appear sufficient for the expected number of bins. Most dwellings fronting the proposed adopted highway do not have bin presentation points shown, this is likely to lead to bins being presented on the footway or carriageway which would be obstructive to pedestrians.

Conclusion on Layout & Access of A1.

Overall the layout and access as shown on drawing P18-2191_04 01 Rev AT is acceptable, accepting that should the roads and footways be offered for adoption the above noted minor amendments may be required.

Parcel A2

- We note there are a number of triple parking (3 nose-to-tail) spaces. This configuration leads to parking on the highway which can be obstructive and the Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 does not recommend this configuration. The most concerning of these are plots Plots 44 & 45, and 112 &

113 which are 4-bed roomed dwellings sited on roads proposed to be adopted by the highway authority. Plots 112 & 113 are sited on a Secondary street which is proposed to be a through route to the next development phase. Should the LPA be minded to approve this application, prior to acceptance for highway authority adoption we would wish to discuss the parking configuration with the developer and attempt to achieve a design which reduced as much as possible conflict between pedestrians and inappropriately parked vehicles. This could include a kerbing design on the Principal and Secondary streets which will prioritise pedestrians and deter parking. The triple parking on plots 97, 129, 148 and 150 are on shared space roads but in these specific locations there appears to be available space for overspill parking which would not be obstructive. The remaining 4-bedroomed dwellings with 3 nose-to-tail spaces are located on private drives where where overspill parking is less likely to affect the highway.

- Visitor parking appears to be clustered with many spaces on private drives. The central north-south core of the parcel is poorly served for visitor spaces. This is likely to lead to obstructive parking on the highway and footway, which could have safety implications for pedestrians.
- The shared surface roads are shown as 5.5m with grass service strips. In some locations where parking and/or over-run from larger vehicles on the service strip may be expected and wherever street lights are to be installed, a hardened service strip would be required. This was discussed with the applicant at a Highway Authority Adoption meeting in March 2020.
- Some trees appear to be close to the proposed highway, we advise that specialist tree-crate design may be required in some locations.
- We note the submission of drawings EXA_1868_701 to 703 showing tree-pit designs and advise that depending on the species and location these may not be suitable for trees in or very close to the highway.
- There are only a few bin presentation points shown on the refuse strategy drawing, these are for multiple dwellings and the space allowed does not appear sufficient for the expected number of bins. Most dwellings fronting the proposed adopted highway do not have bin presentation points shown, this is likely to lead to bins being presented on the footway or carriageway which would obstructive to pedestrians.

Conclusion on Layout & Access.

Overall the Layout and Access as shown on drawing P18-2192-06 01 Rev AT is acceptable, accepting that should the roads and footways be offered for adoption the above noted amendments will be required.

Parcel A8

- The visitor parking laybys shown on the Eastern side of the Principal Street are not included on the General Arrangement and Layout plans for the Reserved Matters application for the infrastructure - DC/19/0834/RM. We would not accept these laybys if this Principal Street is offered for adoption by the highway authority. They should be removed from this application as they conflict with the approvals given in DC/19/0834/RM.
- The arrangement and location of the visitor parking overall is unacceptable. It is heavily clustered and mainly provided on Private Drives. Of the 66 visitor spaces shown, 21 are provided in the sub-parcel of plots 229 to 264 and 10 are provided in the sub-parcel serving dwellings 62 to 90. These would not be accessible for other parts of the parcel. Twelve of the remaining spaces are provided on the extreme edges of the parcel. Most of the visitor spaces provided would not be accessible for the majority of the dwellings.
- There are a number of 4-bedroomed dwellings with 3 nose-to-tail parking spaces. This is not an acceptable configuration as it leads to obstructive on-street parking which is likely to be on the footway. Particularly in locations such as plots 186 to 200 where kerb-side parking would obstruct the driveways opposite.
- The road between plots 130 and 152 is shown as shared surface. Shared surface roads are normally suitable for small cul-de-sac's serving the pedestrians directly associated with it. However, this is a through road with no alternative pedestrian access. We accept the applicant has tried to design it with traffic calming pinch-points each end and a raised central space, but this will be a vehicle dominated space with a significant amount of driveway frontages and lack of visitor parking. This could cause vehicles to park within the shared space road which would impact on the safe passage of pedestrians. There is a 1.0m private pathway directly in front of the dwellings which is not sufficiently wide for a wheelchair and pedestrian to pass.
- The shared surface roads generally are shown as 5.5m with grass service strips. In most cases, due to the lack of accessible visitor parking, this grass service strip would be parked on. Where parking

and/or over-run from larger vehicles on the service strip may be expected and wherever street lights are to be installed, a hardened service strip would be required. This was discussed with the applicant at a Highway Authority Adoption meeting in March 2020.

- Some trees appear to be close to the proposed highway, we advise that specialist tree-crate design may be required in some locations.
- We note the submission of drawings EXA_1868_701 to 703 showing tree-pit designs and advise that depending on the species and location these may not be suitable for trees in or very close to the highway.
- There are only a few bin presentation points shown on the refuse strategy drawing, these are for multiple dwellings and the space allowed does not appear sufficient for the expected number of bins. Most dwellings fronting the proposed adopted highway do not have bin presentation points shown, this is likely to lead to bins being presented on the footway or carriageway which would be obstructive to pedestrians.

Conclusion on Layout & Access.

Overall the Layout and Access as shown on drawing P18-2192-07 01 Rev AT is **not** acceptable due to:

- The conflict with the approval for DC/19/0834/RM,
- The lack of accessible visitor parking.
- The triple parking.
- The associated safety implications of the shared surface through road.

Should the LPA be minded to approve this layout, we advise some of the roads and footways would not be suitable for adoption by the highway authority.

Should the LPA be minded to approve this application, we do not feel there are any conditions that we could recommend which are not covered by, or would conflict with, those applicable to DC/15/2151/OU.

Yours sincerely,

Hen Abbott

Development Management Engineer

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure