

Scanned

Cooper, Kerri

From: Dave Watson [Dave.Watson@suffolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 07 October 2010 17:56
To: 'Marcia Whitehead'; david.watson@suffolk.gov.uk
Cc: Hopkinson, Rona; Steve Amann; Waterson, Neil
Subject: RE: NW Haverhill
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Blue

Marcia

I'm very sorry but it appears that a couple of our key players will not be available on Monday after all. I think therefore that it would be best if we reschedule to avoid having to reconvene again. Can you please let me have a few dates that would be suitable for you later in the week or the week following?

Regards

Dave

From: Marcia Whitehead
Sent: 04 October 2010 17:07
To: Dave Watson; david.watson@suffolk.gov.uk
Cc: Rona.Hopkinson@stedsbc.gov.uk; Steve Amann; Waterson, Neil
Subject: NW Haverhill

Dear Dave,

Following our telephone conversation today, I confirm our meeting arrangements for 10am, Monday 11 October 2010 at your offices in Ipswich. My Transport Consultant Steve Amann will also attend.

I have provided in the remainder of this email a brief set of summary comments regarding the various transport related points you have raised which I hope you find useful as a basis for our meeting. I would also like to discuss in full the travel plan issues relevant to the proposal.

Rights of Way

- Footpaths 8-9-17 - Upgrades to footpaths 8 and 9 do not fairly or reasonably relate to the development as they are remote from the proposal and not directly connected. Where is footpath 17?
- Footpath 32 – Incorporation of signage and road markings to de-note the at-grade crossing has been agreed.
- Footpath 45 – What is the justification for works?
- Bridleway 44 – What is the justification for works?
- Withersfield footpath 1 at grade crossing – It has been agreed that no formal crossing is required to be provided.

Walk/cycle Provision

12/11/2010

- General walk/cycle improvements – there is no specific justification for this contribution and the local area has adequate walking and cycling infrastructure in place. Any specifically required infrastructure is already costed in this list.
- Chalkstone Way area conversion – The need for this cannot be fairly or reasonably linked to the development and is required to remedy an existing poorly-conceived traffic scheme. The estimated cost of this scheme would appear to be based on a total rebuild and re-design rather than a modification of the existing scheme.
- Provision of missing cycle link west of Howe Road - The works and cost needs justification and explanation.
- Cycle Parking at strategic locations – the stated cost of £45,000 could provide over 800 sheltered cycle stands, this level of provision is not justifiable in the context of either existing or aspirational cycle usage.
- Shared use cycle lane Ann Suckling Way – This could be linked to the development.

Travel Plans

- Travel Plan – Travel Plan Bond £276,000 - Typical travel plan packages cost around £100 per unit, the quoted cost is twice that amount and therefore unreasonable.
- Monitoring and Support £10,000 – Cost appears reasonable but should be included in the Travel Plan Bond.
- Contribution toward Suffolk Car Share – This should be included in the Travel Plan bond.

Public Transport

- Bus Service Contribution - £650,000 appears reasonable in the context of current operating costs.
- Bus Stops £15,000 – Clarity required on locations and facilities proposed in order to demonstrate whether they are related to the proposal.
- Bus Stop RTP1 screens - £100,000 Clarity required on locations and facilities proposed in order to demonstrate whether they are related to the proposal.
- Bus Station Improvements - £80,000 - insufficient detail has been provided to inform the cost estimated and whether the improvements are linked to the development.

The above costs do not appear to have been provided in the context of the considerable cost expended and benefit provided by the provision of the North-West Haverhill relief road. The provision of this road provides significant transport benefits for the wider area and the scope to implement sustainable transport improvements in Haverhill that would not be possible in its absence.

It is clear that the Masterplan proposals with the provision of a relief road and an improved bus service provide what will be a significant improvement to the area and moreover gives the opportunity to promote the sustainable transport improvements set out in the schedule.

Many thanks,

Marcia.

Marcia L Whitehead
Partner
Planning Division

Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge, CB2 9LD

BIDWELLS

EG Property Adviser of the Year 2009 - Eastern Region
Listed in Planning Magazine's Top 20 UK Consultancies

bidwells.co.uk

DISCLAIMER:

This message is private and confidential. Any sharing of this message or its contents is prohibited unless approved by Bidwells LLP. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and destroy the message and any attachments.

This email is sent on behalf of Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership trading as Bidwells. Bidwells LLP is a corporate body owned by its members.

Where used the term 'Partner' refers to one of the members or an employee who is a senior professional. The use of this term does not imply that Bidwells LLP is a general partnership under the Partnership Act 1890.

Bidwells LLP is registered in England & Wales (registered number OC344553). Registered head office is Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge CB2 9LD, where a list of members is available for inspection.

Bidwells LLP reserves the right to monitor all communications through its internal and external networks. Whilst all effort is made to safe guard emails and attachments through virus checking, we advise you to carry out your own checks. Bidwells LLP do not accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software virus.

Before you print, please think of the environment.

Emails sent to and from this organisation will be monitored in accordance with the law to ensure compliance with policies and to minimise any security risks.

The information contained in this email or any of its attachments may be privileged or confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your email software.