

Your Ref:DC/21/0110/RM
Our Ref: SCC/CON/0720/21
Date: 8 March 2021
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 - SEBC

Dear Penny Mills - SEBC

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 CONSULTATION RETURN: DC/21/0110/RM

PROPOSAL: Reserved matters application - submission of details under outline planning permission SE/09/1283 - the means of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of 127 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 residential development known as phase 2b

LOCATION: Land Nw Of Haverhill Anne Sucklings Lane 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:

Parking:

1. There is an over-reliance on triple nose-to-tail parking. This is not a recommended configuration due to amount of vehicle manoeuvres required to access all vehicles. It is assumed any electric vehicle charging points will be provided as one point in the garages or space nearest the dwelling which will further impact on vehicle movements. On-street parking is often a result of triple parking and as the visitor spaces are shown close to triple parking on private drives this is likely to lead to a reduction in available visitor parking.
2. Visitor spaces are concentrated on private drives leaving the centre of the development poorly served.
3. One bed-roomed flats are allocated one parking space in accordance with the Suffolk Guidance for parking, however, in block 'Corby' the one bedroom flats have a study which is suitable to be a 2nd bedroom. We understand this may not be acceptable to affordable housing providers. This must be clarified.
4. There is undercroft 'through' parking proposed. This is not a recommended configuration as the undercroft can be used for storage. Also we assume the electric vehicle charging points will be located in the undercroft making the rear space difficult to access.
5. There are no floor plans showing the undercroft parking.
6. Parking spaces 14 & 15 are incorrectly labelled as visitor spaces.

7. Parking spaces 54 to 57 are shown encroaching on existing landscaping. These spaces are also close to an existing ditch. The line of the ditch must be shown along with the existing levels of the ditch and retained landscaping and finished levels of the car parking.

Cycle stores:

8. Those shown with apartment blocks 4 shows space for 18 cycles while 11 apartments are proposed. The Suffolk Guidance for Parking recommends 2 cycle spaces per dwelling as a minimum. In addition, to fully support more sustainable modes of travel we recommend the applicant consider providing for non-standard cycles and an area for cycle maintenance.
9. No cycle storage is shown for apartment block 'Corby'.
10. There are no cycle stores shown with the dwellings, although they are shown as sheds on the landscape drawings. The Suffolk Guidance for Parking recommends private cycle stores should be at least 3sqm.

Refuse and Waste:

11. There are no refuse truck tracking (swept path analysis) drawings.
12. Some bins are shown to be presented on the FOG accesses. This will restrict the available space for vehicle access.

Roads and footways:

13. There are no drawings showing the roads and footways to be offered for adoption by the highway authority.
14. There are no drawings showing the proposed surface materials of the roads and footways
15. The mews areas have indicative footways which are less than 1.8m wide.
16. The area between 37 - 39 and POS is proposed as a 'focal junction' however it serves more than 25 dwellings and should not therefore be designed without separate footways.
17. There are no service strips/utility strips/maintenance margins shown on the shared surface 'mews' roads.

Layout:

18. We recommend the planting shown by plots 20 to 36 and 80 to 102 is redesigned so one side is flipped. (I.e have planting outside plots 20 to 22 and 31 to 33) this will create a less straight road and help reduce though traffic speeds.
19. Where planting is proposed on or close to an adopted road, specialist construction will be required. The applicant should consider combined tree & drainage planting systems.
20. There are very few proposed footway/cycleway links to the footway on the eastern boundary.
21. There are no cycleway routes through the development.
22. The footway joining the pedestrian crossing point to phase 2A joins at right angles and is not on the desire line. We recommend a diagonal path is added to link directly to the pedestrian crossing point.
23. Landscaping and other infrastructure approved with the infrastructure application, phase 1 and the Boyton Meadows application should be shown so all connections and conflicts can be assessed.

'Missing' drawings. We recommend the following drawings/details are submitted:

24. Surface water systems and watercourses, including easements, that are existing and/or conditioned with other planning approvals.
25. Areas of embankments and cuttings. This should include finished/retained levels, existing levels, cross sections and may include elevations and street scenes.
26. Visibility splays at junctions, driveways and bends. Proposed landscaping, embankments and cuttings should be included on these drawings as all can affect the visibility.
27. Proposed hard landscape (roads, footways, parking etc) surface materials.

28. Pedestrian and cycle connectivity. This should show the permeability of the development in terms of pedestrian and cycle routes through.
29. Utilities and services.
30. Proposed adopted areas, showing areas to be offered for adoption to the highway authority, district council, housing association and those to be retained by a private management company.

Until the above points have been clarified and missing information submitted we cannot fully assess this application.

Yours sincerely,

Hen Abbott
Development Management Engineer
Growth, Highways and Infrastructure