

Your Ref:DC/21/0110/RM
Our Ref: SCC/CON/2342/21
Date: 25 May 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: Olivia Luckhurst - SEBC

Dear Olivia Luckhurst - 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 as amended by plans received 14.5.21 increasing number of units to 129 and amendments to access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping as summarised in covering letter dated 14.5.21

LOCATION: Land Nw Of Haverhill Anne Sucklings Lane Little Wratting Suffolk

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

COMMENTS:

Drawing 20-3072-007-P0 Parking strategy

- It is disappointing to see the applicant has relied on private drives on the periphery of the development to deliver the bulk of the visitor parking spaces. For instance 6 visitor spaces are proposed on the western edge on 2 private drives feeding 7 dwellings in total with no direct pedestrian connection to the middle of the development, while those more central plots do not have nearby visitor spaces. We are also advised that the developer covenants the drives to the dwellings they feed rather than a management company maintaining all the private drives. This makes ensuring the visitor spaces are available for all visitors very difficult. While this alone cannot constitute grounds to recommend refusal, we are very concerned that this poor distribution and protection of visitor spaces will lead to obstructive parking on the street, or worse on the footway, while spaces on private drives may be 'annexed' by the closest residents.
- We will therefore recommend a kerbing and on-street parking condition. Details to discharge this may include continual full height kerbing (such the 'Dutch' entrance kerb system), signing (to both highlight the visitor spaces on less accessible private drives and restrict on-footway parking), lining and/or strategic use of landscaping.
- We do not recommend Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) parking restrictions (yellow lines) are proposed or included on the adopted highway as risk of obstructive parking should be designed out at planning stage. Also TROs apply to adopted highway and are subject to consultation. So this cannot be agreed at planning stage.

- We note the use of covered parking to join detached houses to create a continuous 'mews' type frontage, such as plots 37 to 41. We do not recommend this configuration as it can lead to the covered area being used for household storage which can render both parking spaces unusable but we understand its appeal as a design. We recommend that the electric vehicle charging points are located to the rear of the covered area to help ensure both spaces are kept free for parking.
- We note the applicant has not provided any details of the electric vehicle charging.

Drawing 045-E-SK5 Rev / Section 38

- We note the build-outs in the shared surface roads and recommend that these are widened. The proposed width of 1.5m is very small for the trees to thrive and the remaining road is 4.0m + 1.0m hardened strip. This is sufficiently wide for 2 vehicles to pass and the build-outs are therefore unlikely to contribute to traffic calming. We recommend the build-outs are widened to 2.5m, and the service strip behind widened to 1.5m. This will give more space for the trees to grow, give space for pedestrians to walk behind the build-outs and allow the highway authority sufficient space to maintain the highway. This will also reduce the remaining carriageway to <3.0m + 1.0m service strip, giving between 3.5m and 4.0m which is not perceived as wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass or a vehicle to pass a parked car but is sufficiently wide for a refuse or delivery vehicle.
- Some private drives feed more than the recommended 5 dwellings, for instance plots 114 to 125. While we understand the restrictions to designing this area to adoptable standards we do recommend the developer discusses the options for adoption with the highway authority.
- We advise that an Advance Payment Code Notice (Section 220 of the Highways Act 1980) may be applicable to all private drives feeding more than 5 dwellings.
- We note that half of the central green space is shown to be adopted. We are happy to accept this, but advise that the the other half of the POS will maintained differently, unless it is adopted by West Suffolk Parks.
- We advise that the colour-way is incorrect. The service strips (1.0m sections either side of a shared surface road) are NOT footway and must be constructed as part of the carriageway if hardened, or grass verge where they are adjacent to significant areas of grassland such as public open space. The s38 drawing should be coloured to reflect this.
- The drawing does not show any surface water drainage infrastructure or street light locations.

For the above reasons we do not recommend this drawing is accepted as a conditioned drawing.

Drawing 045-E-SK120 Rev - Junction visibility

- We accept the visibility splays shown. We note that the visibility to the left by plot 107 (17m) relates to a design speed of 15mph, which is un-evidenced. However, while the designer has drawn the splays correctly, due to the curvature of the junction the practical inter-visibility will be closer to 25m which is acceptable.

Drawing JBA 18/351-40 Rev C - Landscape

- We note that some of the build-outs on shared space roads do not have trees (contrary to other layout drawings). We recommend all these traffic calming build-outs have trees whether designed with low walls or flush to the carriageway. See also previous points on the design of the traffic calming.
- We advise that specialist engineered tree planting solutions will be required for all trees which are in or within 2.5m of the constructed highway. At this stage we cannot assess if the proposed variety and species is acceptable, but advise that smaller fastigate varieties will be required. Tree species must be suitable for shrinkable clay soils.
- Some trees are proposed to be close to piped drainage systems which may not be acceptable.

Drawing 20-3072-004 Rev P0 - Refuse and cycles

- We note some plots have bin presentation points in the driveways. We recommend a specific area of hard standing is constructed on the frontage of these plots for bins as they are more likely to be presented and returned to the footway or carriageway causing an obstruction.

- No details have been provided for the communal cycle stores. We note the floor plans of the apartments show a room for 22 cycles but the racking and layout has not been provided.

Drawing 045-E-SK7 Rev / combined utilities

- We note that there are numerous locations where three utilities are proposed in the 1.0m service strips of the shared surface roads. We advise that there is often insufficient space for 3 services and streetlights. The applicant has not yet proposed any locations for streetlights but we advise that street lights with cabling/ducting should be shown on the utilities drawing.

Yours sincerely,

Hen Abbott

Development Management Engineer

Growth, Highways and Infrastructure