

Waldringfield Parish Council response to the following Planning Application:
(consultation period extended to 12/12/18)

DC/18/3623/FUL Eureka Cliff Road - Demolition of existing building and erection of 3 houses and 1 bungalow. Alterations to existing access.

Waldringfield Parish Council **objects strongly** to this application and urges SCDC to refuse this application for the following reasons:

1. Non-compliance with SCDC's Planning Policies

- i) SCDC's policy DM7 Infilling and Backland Development within Physical Limits Boundaries
- ii) Development Management Policy DM21 –

2. Non-compliance with the minimum visibility splay requirements when driveways join the public highway.

3. Non-compliance with minimum effective width requirements of shared driveways.

4. Noise or disturbance resulting from use

5. Extending the footway could cause surface water flooding on highway

1. Non-compliance with SCDC's Planning Policies

- i) SCDC's policy DM7 Infilling and Backland Development within Physical Limits Boundaries states that development would not be permitted “if it would result in a cramped form of development out of character with the area or the street scene”.
and
- ii) SCDC's policy DM21 states (a) proposals should relate well to the scale and character of their surroundings particularly in terms of their siting, height, massing and form.

This application for three detached, 4 bed houses plus 1 detached bungalow with 1 bedroom plus a study/bedroom will result in over-development and significant overcrowding of this backland plot, currently occupied by a single bungalow. The access to the rear of the individual plots is less than 1 metre wide. There is very limited parking and no provision for garaging or outside storage. The plans show oil tank provision for each plot located in each of the rear gardens, immediately next to the primary school playing area. There is no provision for access by oil delivery tankers to the rear of the properties. There is no viable visitor parking provision which will result in off- site parking will cause unacceptable levels of obstruction on Cliff Road.

2. Non-compliance with the minimum visibility splay requirements when driveways join the public highway and highway safety.

Suffolk County Council Highways, in its response dated 3rd December, recommending that the application is refused, makes it very clear that inadequate visibility splays have been evidenced and that a minimum splay of 2.4 x 43m should be shown in both directions, the NPPF para 32-35, goes further and states that the visibility splay should be drawn from a central point, setback 2.4 metres from the public road and extending 70 metres).

The planning group has assessed the visibility, from a position setback approximately 2.4 metres, and has found that it was impossible to see traffic approaching from the eastern direction and virtually impossible to see traffic from the west. Visibility is further reduced as this area of Cliff Road is frequently lined with parked cars, particular at the start and end of the school day.

Cliff Road is a busy road as it is the main access road into Waldringfield for visitors and residents and as is shown in the Parish Plan, carries a great number of vehicles.

In addition:

The application incorporates a limited extension to the footway, which the driveway will now have to cross. We understand that in “these circumstances there should normally be visibility splays between a driver’s viewpoint 2m back into the access and a distance measured along the back of the footway for 2m on each side of the viewpoint.”

This cannot be achieved by the current application. The fixed boundary walls and hedging of the adjacent properties extend to the end of the application driveway. Drivers of emerging vehicles would therefore not be able to see pedestrians and vice versa, until the vehicle has crossed the footway. Pedestrians, particularly those attending the adjacent primary school, will be placed at risk.

The extension of the footway to just beyond the adjacent school gate does not therefore increase the safety of pedestrians, in particular, children using the gate. On the contrary, the presence of the footway could create a false sense of security when children pour out of the school gate, only a few feet from where the “blind” access driveway crosses the new footway.

In addition, the extension of the footway appears to merge with the existing speed bump across Cliff Rd with little or no clear demarcation to show where the footway ends and the raised section of highway begins, thereby increasing the potential risk to the children, particularly when they are leaving the school. We understand that the school has significant concerns regarding pupil safety if this application was approved.

3. Non-compliance with minimum effective width requirements of shared driveways.

In the 3rd December response from Suffolk County Council Highways they state that the minimum effective width requirement for a shared driveway is 4.5 metres. However, the regulations go further, an additional 0.5m is required if bounded by a wall, fence, hedge, line of trees or other similar obstruction on one side, and an additional 1m if bounded on both sides.

The driveway on this application is bounded on both sides by hedges and fences, plus a large oak tree, which means that it should measure a minimum of 5.5metres. The plan for the driveway shows that even if widened to its full potential, it will only be 4.2m. Furthermore at the Cliff Road entrance there is a large, well-established oak tree (with TPO) on the side of the drive, restricting the width of the driveway to 3.2m, more than 2m below the minimum width required. Such a restricted width will not allow private vehicles to pass and just as importantly, will not allow safe ingress/egress to commercial vehicles or to the heavy plant which will be required during construction.

4. Noise or disturbance resulting from use (SCDC policy DM23)

The increase in the number of vehicles using the driveway and parking areas will cause significant disturbance to the adjacent properties, in particular, School Cottage. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed use of a shingle surface on the roadway within the development.

5. Extending the footway could cause surface water flooding on highway

The plans show an extension to the current footway. The new raised footway appears to merge with the raised speed bump, effectively creating a dam by preventing surface water to run off the road.