

Your Ref: DC/21/0315/FUL  
Our Ref: SCC/CON/1157/21  
Date: 28 July 2021  
Highways Enquiries to:  
Highways.DevelopmentControl@suffolk.gov.uk

**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**

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,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/21/0315/FUL**

**PROPOSAL:** Planning Application - Specialist dementia care village for up to 120 residents, including: 20 x 6 bedroom apartments provided within five buildings; central amenity building containing shop, restaurant, pub, communal hall, offices and staff accommodation; club/hobby rooms; treatment/counselling rooms; vehicle and cycle parking; landscaping proposals and associated works

**LOCATION:** Little Court Haverhill Road, Little Wrattling, CB9 7UD

**ROAD CLASS:** 'A' Road

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the reasons contained herein.

***Previous Recommendation Summary***

SCC's recommendation dated 6 April 2021 provided initial comments which formed a holding objection on the grounds of highway safety.

The original recommendation to object highlighted the following key issues:

- 1) Parking – concerns were raised that the proposed car parking provision was severely below the recommended provisions in line with parking standards for a care home.
- 2) Travel plan assumptions re: mode of travel was not accepted.
- 3) Bus service improvements were suggested but not reliable. The officer recommended new bus stops adjacent to the site to make the use of bus more attractive/accessible.
- 4) Travel Plan monitoring by SCC will be required for a Travel Plan and a fee to cover this will be required.
- 5) Accessibility of the site by walking and cycling is poor.
- 6) Access:
  - a. An existing access to the west of the proposed access is stated as 'to be retained'. As shown, this is unacceptable because it is not designed to join the new access at a suitable angle, is not sufficiently wide for 2 vehicles to pass and the path of exiting vehicles will cross the proposed pedestrian crossing point.
  - b. Proposed cycleway is not proposed to an adoptable standard. PRoW should be consulted.
  - c. A Road Safety Audit is required.

***Assessment of Amended Information***

The applicant has submitted a Transport Technical Note (TTN) which seeks to address the issues raised in SCC's initial recommendation to the planning application.

### *Parking*

The applicant addresses the issue around parking in section 2 of the TTN. A summary of key parameters in determining the car parking provision is provided and are summarised as follows:

- 1) 165 staff will be employed at the Care Home. It will be staffed 24 hours a day with several shifts. Approximately 55 staff will be on site at any time.
- 2) Residents will not own vehicles.
- 3) Care home car parking standards deemed to be in excess of what is required at a site of this nature (i.e. 1 space per employee and 1 per 3 – beds).
- 4) Visitors will not be restricted to certain times of the day. Visits by hairdressers, etc, will be regular but not daily.
- 5) Dedicated minibus will be provided and can be used to transport staff and residents for appointments.

The applicant has since revisited the site layout and has increased the car parking provision from 65 to 73 spaces (an increase in 8 vehicles) and has included 6 motorcycle parking spaces. Therefore, the new parking arrangement would be 73 car parking spaces, 6 motorcycle parking spaces and 20 covered, secure cycle parking spaces.

The applicant's TTN provides additional evidence to support the proposed car parking provision. The TTN refers to a study which covers car parking at other similar facilities.

SCC were concerned about the potential for overspill car parking onto the A143. The expectation is that visitors arriving at the site would first report to reception where no car parking is available. They suggest that a layby within the public highway could be safely used for parking in the event of overspill. This is not appropriate and should not be relied upon.

The applicant suggests the use of flexible verge markers to prevent parking up on the verges near the site. This could work to prevent on street parking.

It is stated in the TTN that 24 of the 73 spaces would be allocated as visitor parking (equivalent to 20% of residents having visitors) and the remaining 49 spaces would be allocated for staff. This means that of the 55 staff expected on site at any one time, 6 are expected to arrive by other means than a private car.

SCC suggest that a car parking management plan is provided to demonstrate how the car parking can be managed appropriately. The car parking management plan should include how visitor parking will be managed (i.e. could they implement a car parking space reservation slots for visitors). Similarly, car parking for staff should be managed to ensure that car parking is available for overlapping staff shifts and that staff can arrive with confidence of having a space.

The Travel Plan should incorporate measures for car sharing and information for how staff collection and drop off would occur with the mini bus. The Travel Plan also needs to be amended with the increased car parking provision. The Travel Plan and site should ensure that incentives for car sharing are clear – including allocated car sharing parking spaces which are closer to the entrances.

### *Access Arrangements*

The TTN does not address SCC concerns related to the retention of the existing access to the neighbouring site and the safety of maintaining this with the current arrangements. Concerns relating to this access were identified as follows:

- *An existing access to the west of the proposed access is stated as 'to be retained'. As shown this is unacceptable because it is not designed to join the new access at a suitable angle, is not sufficiently wide for 2 vehicles to pass and the path of exiting vehicles will cross the proposed pedestrian crossing point.*

- *The use of this 'existing access' is not clearly shown on the Traffic Impacts part of the TA. The additional vehicle movements must be fully understood.*

These points need to be addressed to satisfy SCC concerns over the safety of the access proposals.

The original response requested that a Road Safety Audit is undertaken and that the arrangements should pass this. Therefore, this should be provided.

*PRoW Improvements*

The applicant envisages PRoW No. 5 being upgraded to allow for cycling. At the moment SCC is not confident that the status of the PRoW as a footpath can be changed to a shared cycle/foot path. Previous comments need to be considered in future submissions.

***Recommendation Summary***

The application should be refused until further information is provided and the concerns above are suitably addressed.

Yours sincerely,

**Lindsay McCauley**

**Development Management**

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure