

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal by Barratt David Wilson and Hopkins Homes concerning Land North-East Of Humber Doucy Lane Ipswich Suffolk. Appeal against Ipswich Borough Council's and East Suffolk Council's refusal of – Outline Application (With All Matters Reserved) - Hybrid Application – Full Planning Permission for the means of external access/egress to and from the site. Outline planning application (all matters reserved) for a mixed use development for up to 660 dwellings (Use Class C3), up to 400 sq m (net) of non-residential floorspace falling within Use Class E and/or Use Class F2(b), an Early Years facility, and associated vehicular access and highway works, formal and informal open spaces, play areas, provision of infrastructure (including internal highways, parking, servicing, cycle and pedestrian routes, utilities and sustainable drainage systems), and all associated landscaping and engineering works.

LPA Reference (Ipswich Borough Council): IP/24/00172/OUTFL PINS Reference: APP/R3515/W/24/3350674

LPA Reference (East Suffolk Council): DC/24/0771/OUT PINS Reference: APP/X3540/W/24/3350673

Joint response by SCC & Appellant to Inquiry Document (Ref ID34) submitted by Save Our Countryside Spaces on Highways Modelling Matters.

The submitted document has been reviewed by Suffolk County Council Highways Officer, Mr Luke Cantwell Forbes and the Appellant's Highways Witness, Mr Jon Hassel. Following consideration of the submitted document the following response has been prepared for consideration by the Appeal Inspector, Ms Deborah Board

1. Tuddenham Road is an existing road – of which is classified as C road, as per Suffolk County Council's list of streets – <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/highway-maintenance/road-adoption/highways-and-private-roads>.
2. If the classification were higher – for instance, the road was classified as an A or B road – it does not mean that the width of the bridge would be unacceptable on this basis alone. In this scenario, as with the existing scenario, consideration would need to be given to number of trips which would use the route and whether mitigation was required in response.
3. It should be noted that the design guidance referred to was developed for HS2 and is not a document typically observed by the Local Highway Authority. Manual for Streets (1 and 2) and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges are the design standards commonly used. While Manual for Streets (1 and 2, with 2 being a better document for more rural roads such as this) may outline that 5.5m is the minimum required road width to allow cars and HGV's to pass, there are many instances on rural roads where this minimum is not met, and there is good forward visibility at the bridge to ensure motorists can negotiate the movement.
4. The design guidance referred to discusses the design for new roads – outlining the minimum width requirements for such roads to be used as a diversion route. These are useful considerations; however, a width lower than this on an existing rural carriageway does not mean that the development would present an unacceptable impact on highway safety, in line with the tests of the NPPF (Para 116).
5. The SCTM modelling does not show significant increases in flows on the bridge resultant of the development proposal.
6. In the event that works are needed to the bridge which could reduce the width further, consideration will need to be given to the form of traffic management required, like anywhere on the network. This is not development related, it is a maintenance issue.

7. The 6.5 metres carriageway width referred to within RSK's Proof does not impact the information inputted within the Suffolk County Transport Model – meaning that this does not impact on the modelling.
8. The 6.5 metres carriageway width referred to within RSK's Proof does not reflect the road width presented within the submitted Tuddenham Road access plan – meaning that the visibility splays associated with the Tuddenham Road access have been drawn with a bridge which reflects the lower road width referred to. Therefore, the fact that 6.5m has been referenced within the Proof does not change the conclusion that the access on Tuddenham Road is acceptable (if they were to suggest that it did).