

From: customer.services
Sent: 11 May 2020 13:26:02 +0100
To: Mills, Penelope
Subject: dc 20 0614 RM

From: Phil Prigg <phil.prigg@btinternet.com>
Sent: 11 May 2020 11:38
To: customer.services <customer.services@westsuffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: JH dc 20 0614 RM

[THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Penny Mills
Principal Planning Officer
West Suffolk Council

10th May 2020

Dear Penny

Application no: DC/20/0614/RM: reserved matters application - Submission of details under SE/09/1283 for the infrastructure for Phases 2 - 6, comprising the Internal Estate Roads, Drainage, Public Open Spaces, Landscaping, Sports Pitches and Allotments, Land NW of Haverhill, Anne Sucklings Lane, Little Wrattling.

Thank you for consulting the Ramblers on this major 'reserved matters' application 'affecting a public right of way', (in fact. both Haverhill 32/Little Wrattling 6 and Withersfield 1).

Rather than attempt to 're-invent the wheel', I attach, below, copies of my messages dated 20th November 2009 and 9th February 2017, both of which are, in part, still relevant. You will note, in particular, my comments, in the earlier message, about the future of the section of Little Wrattling 6 beyond the proposed relief road, apparently under threat of diversion and/or closure in 2009, when an underpass on the 'diverted' line was envisaged. I have magnified and studied the proposals for the relief road in the vicinity of LW fp 6, I have to say with some difficulty, but have found no reference on plan to an underpass or, indeed, any other sort of 'pedestrian crossing'. I hope that this can be clarified!

Clearly, the overall scheme covering Phases 2 - 6 will take several years to carry out and there is every likelihood that the developer may wish to temporarily close all or part of Little Wrattling 6, perhaps stage by stage, to pedestrians and riders, for prolonged periods..Such a policy should not be permitted unless the developer, first, provides acceptable alternative routes.

Yours sincerely

Phil Prigg

Group Footpath Secretary
Ramblers, Newmarket & District Group.

From: Phil Prigg [mailto:phil.prigg@btinternet.com]
Sent: 09 February 2017 17:06
To: 'planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk'
Subject: DC/16/2836/RM

Penny Mills
Senior Planning Officer

West Suffolk

9th February 2017

Dear Penny

Application no: DC/16/2836/RM: Reserved Matters Application - Submission of details under outline planning permission SE/09/1283/OUT -the appearance, layout, scale, access and landscaping for 203 dwellings, together with associated private amenity space, means of enclosure, car parking, vehicle and access arrangements together with proposed areas of landscaping and areas of open space for a phase of development known as Phase 1, Land North-West of Haverhill, (Little Wrattling parish).

Having been involved in earlier consultations on the overall development area, I attach a copy of my letter dated 20th November 2009, prepared on behalf of my predecessor, for ease of reference.

You will have realised that there are, at present, no public rights of way within the Phase 1 area although, in fairness, there is one near 'The Fox' on the other side of the A143, (Little Wrattling fp 8), heading south, and another a short distance along the A143, (Little Wrattling fp 3), heading north. Both of these footpaths are, as would be expected, unsurfaced, until reaching 'civilisation'. Nevertheless, being so far from the town centre, this situation is likely to create a feeling of isolation for the new occupiers of Phase 1. I am aware that the overall Master Plan includes linear parks, footpaths and cycle routes, providing links to town via Haverhill fp 32 and the Railway Walk, and to the Wrattlings via Little Wrattling fp 6, but it may be some years before the various phases of development reach them, Phase 1 being at the extremity of the overall development. It is hoped that there will be an interim arrangement, particularly as far as a link with the Railway Walk is concerned, otherwise the only route for a 'walk into town' will be via highway footpaths alongside the A143; not very inspiring!

In my separate response to the consultation on the related application DC/17/0048/FUL, I remarked that it appeared to be 'the intention of the developers to treat Phase 1 South as 'stand alone', and to defer any highway works beyond their newly proposed Phase 1 South entrance until such time as Phase 1 North is under way'. Something similar might be said, but more so, about footpath and cycleway links.

Yours sincerely

Phil Prigg
Local Footpath Secretary
Ramblers, Newmarket & District Group.

From: Phil Prigg [mailto:phil.prigg@btinternet.com]
Sent: 24 November 2009 18:00
To: rona.hopkinson@stedsbc.gov.uk
Cc: gmgardiner@tiscali.co.uk
Subject: SE 09 1283 RH 20 11 09

1 Edgeborough Close
Kentford
Newmarket
Suffolk
CB8 8QY
01638 751289
phil@prigg.co.uk
20th November 2009

Rona Hopkinson
Development Control Section
St Edmundsbury Borough Council

Dear Ms Hopkinson

Application No: SE/09/1283.

- 1. Planning Application: (i) construction of relief road and associated works (ii) landscape buffer;**
- 2. Outline Planning Application: (i) residential development (ii) primary school (iii) local centre including retail and community uses (iv) public open space (v) landscaping (vi) infrastructure, servicing and other associated works.**

Land at North West Haverhill.

Thank you for consulting the Ramblers' Association on this application 'affecting a public right of way', in this case Withersfield Footpath No 1 and Haverhill No 32/Little Wrattling No 6, plus a relatively recent addition to the Definitive Map, linking Haverhill No 32 to Howe Road.

A visit was made to the site a few days ago, in an attempt to assess the likely impact of the proposals on the rights of way network.

Dealing first with the relief road:

Withersfield fp 1:

It is noted that this important link path crosses the route of the relief road extension only a short distance to the east of the existing roundabout. Clearly, there are road safety implications here and it is interesting to note that Drawing No SW5100002-27 shows a 'preferred option for diversion of PROW', with a crossing closer to the roundabout. The plan is, however, to such a small scale that it is impossible to comment further on the diversion, save to say that we will respect the opinion of the SCC officers concerned. However, under no circumstances must the footpath be closed, whilst work is in progress, as happened when the earlier section of the relief road was constructed, without a reasonable temporary alternative first being made available. This might involve a route to the west and north of the roundabout and temporary pedestrian bridge/s over the stream in the vicinity.

Haverhill 32/Little Wrattling 6.

This route, known locally as Ann Suckling Lane, (or Way) crosses the line of the relief road to the west of the proposed central roundabout and appears to be old-established and well used.

The status of the route is not entirely clear from the documents available to me, but signage in vicinity of the crossing point suggests that it may be a byway; a situation that will need to be addressed by your colleagues!

Leaving the existing built up area of Haverhill, 100m or so to the east of Howe Road, the route initially follows a hedge-line and has fine views to the west, before becoming a green lane, (probably beyond the relief road line), up to the southern boundary of the waterworks. Green lanes of this nature are not particularly common

in Suffolk and are, indeed, havens for wildlife, as suggested, but their preservation, which my Association welcomes, should not be at the expense of walkers, the original users, as inferred by the note on plan, 'preferred option to close existing BOAT'. The proposed subway is a welcome feature, from a road safety viewpoint, and appears to have been positioned, not only to suit existing ground levels, but also to direct the walking public to the 'preferred option for diversion of BOAT'. Whilst we would have no objection to the creation of a route, suitable for walkers, on the line of the proposed diversion, to relieve the perceived pressure on the green lane, we would wish to see the existing green lane retained, with at least footpath status, together with the provision of a link from it to the northern end of the subway. We would, of course, not wish to encourage walkers to cross the relief road unnecessarily.

Needless to say, whatever final decision is reached, the route is considered to be of sufficient importance to warrant temporary arrangements to accommodate walkers for the duration of the works.

Moving on, now, to the outline application:

One of the most noticeable features of the site visit was the obvious use of field-edges, within the application site, by walkers, and it is pleasing to note that these are intended to continue to be available, as parts of the Linear Park network and as links with paths on adjacent developments.

Having said that, the application is in outline form, and we would welcome the opportunity to comment on details of the various phases of development in due course. It would, for example, be interesting to see what steps are to be taken to separate pedestrians from cyclists.

In conclusion, we are encouraged by the proposals to date, but must request that further consideration is given to the situation at Ann Suckling Lane, to the north of the relief road. It is our experience that attempts to exclude the public from routes that they have regularly used in the past rarely work in the long-term.

I trust that you will find these observations to be constructive.

Yours sincerely

Phil Prigg
On behalf of Geoff Gardiner
Local Footpath Secretary
Ramblers' Association, Newmarket & District Group.

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please contact the Sender. This footnote confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses and content security threats. WARNING: Although the Council has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email, the Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.

*****_W-S-