

Your Ref:DC/20/0615/RM
Our Ref: SCC/CON/3266/20
Date: 28 August 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/20/0615/RM

PROPOSAL: Reserved Matters Application -Submission of details under SE/09/1283 - the means of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of 41 dwellings with associated private amenity space, means of enclosure, car parking, vehicle and access arrangement and drainage together with proposed areas of landscaping and areas of open space for a residential development known as Phase 2A.

LOCATION: Land North Of Anne Sucklings Lane Little Wratting Suffolk

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:

Our previous comments of 22nd May 2020 appear to still be relevant and still apply. They have been copied below for clarity.

COMMENTS 28th August 2020

With specific reference to drawings 041-P-101, Rev A and 041-P-130 Rev A we note:

- The Private Drives do not have sufficient turning heads. We accept 2 of the drives show 'Type D turning head'. It is noted that these are not located at the end of the driveways and are designed in such a way that they are likely to be obstructed by parked cars. The Private drives to parking for plots 32 - 37 and 38-40 are most concerning as vehicles such as service, delivery and visitors will have to reverse back onto the main spine road.
- 4-bed roomed dwellings have triple (3 X nose-to-tail) parking spaces. We acknowledge these are located on Private Drives and overspill parking is unlikely to be detrimental to the adopted highway, but advise this configuration can often lead to off-plot parking.
- The refuse strategy plan should include the tracking for refuse trucks as well as bin presentation points.
- The red line includes part of the spine road already included with phase 1 and part of the spine road included with the infrastructure. If part of the spine road is to be included with this application the application should include controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing point/s.

Due to the above phase 2b specific comments and below phase 2a and 2b comments, we feel this layout has an unacceptable risk to highway safety and we therefore retain our **HOLDING OBJECTION**

COMMENTS from May 2020

Interaction with other infrastructure:

1. All submitted drawings must show the same information. There appears to be clashes with the phase 2A & B layout and the drainage designed for the relief road, existing watercourses and relief road levels (cuttings/embankments). The layout drawings for phase 2 must show all associated infrastructure.
2. Drawing 039/E/213 Rev C shows a water course which appears to be in the same location as the parking for plots 4, 5 & 6. The watercourse/s and easement/s must be shown on the layout drawing/s
3. The drainage strategy Appendix A shows a lagoon which appears to be over the private drive, parking and plots 156 to 168 (and watercourse).
4. The allotments to be delivered with the infrastructure should be shown on the phase 2 layout and marked as to be delivered with infrastructure, so the interaction between the allotments and housing can be assessed.
5. The spine road separating phases 2A & B is also shown to be delivered within the red line of the infrastructure application, DC/20/0614. This must be clarified and clearly shown on the layout drawings so what is being proposed with this application can be assessed.
6. The approved layout for DC/18/1498 (Boyton Woods) should be shown so the interaction between the 2 sites can be assessed.
7. There is a watercourse between phase 2 and Boyton Woods, this should be shown clearly on the layout plans with the correct red-line.

Layout:

8. The shared surface area through plots 50 to 68 should include at least one footway. There is a footway connection shown to phase 3 which is part of the wider pedestrian connectivity and this footway should be protected through the development. This footway connection appears to be shown as 1.0m which is an insufficient width for a footway. A 1.8m footway should be provided from the connection point with phase 3 to the main access road.
9. The service strip behind the parking laybys at the turning head by plots 55 and 71 is missing. A service strip must go all around a road without a footway.
10. The footway/service strip at the back of the turning head to plots 27 and 28 is under the red line.
11. Private drives should have a turning space at the end so vehicles can enter and exit the highway in forward gear. This is particularly important with the drives on phase 2A which are accessed directly off the spine road where no turning space is provided.
12. The footway shown to the east of phase 2B should be widened to a cycleway of at least 3.5m. We appreciate the masterplanning did not clearly define this link as a cycleway, but the current move toward providing enhanced provision for cycling must take priority and this is a key route into the development toward the sports pitches.
13. A crossing point should be included across the spine road and across Ann Suckling Way. These could be 'tiger' crossings but must be subject to a safety audit.
14. Some bin presentation points are in parking spaces. When the parking space is being used for parking this could lead to the bins being presented on the highway. The refuse strategy drawing/s should include refuse truck tracking plans.
15. The footway to the south of phase 2 cuts across the edge of the lagoon and the applicant should clarify how this will work with the proximity to the water, side slope and maintenance margin.
16. The surface water drainage should be shown on the layout drawings.
17. Please provide a drawing showing the infrastructure proposed to be offered for adoption by the highway authority.

Parking:

18. Visitor parking should be evenly spaced throughout the development and not clustered. All dwellings should be able to access visitor parking within a reasonable distance.
19. Visitor parking for 2A should not be in 2B and vice versa.
20. The internal dimensions of the integral garages (such as house type Buttermere) should be shown.
21. Parking spaces next to a fence or wall should have an additional 300mm. Please show where spaces are directly adjacent to a wall or fence and show the additional width.

Landscaping:

22. The landscaping shown on drawing 041-P101 Rev- seems to show indicative trees. We cannot find a landscape plan within the submitted documents please could the applicant inform us what these have been submitted as? We advise that trees should not be within 2.5m of a the constructed highway and specific varieties & maintenance regime will need to be selected to reduce the risk of vegetation overgrowing the highway.
23. The proposed landscaping should be clearly shown on the layout/s and 'offered for adoption' drawings.
24. If trees need to be within 2.5m of the constructed highway specific engineering solutions will be needed which will be agreed with the highway authority.

Yours sincerely,

Hen Abbott

Development Management Engineer

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure