



SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE - UPDATE SHEET

20 September 2021

DC/20/3362/FUL and DC/20/3284/FUL - Full Planning Application for the erection of 70 dwellings, including affordable dwellings, together with public open space, roads, accesses, parking, garages, drainage and associated infrastructure. Land West of Chapel Road, Grundisburgh.

APPENDIX A - Chapel Road, Grundisburgh - Transport Assessment Peer Review

	The report of the independent transport consultant Brookbanks (Appendix A) has been received and is attached as Appendix A to this update. The report identifies a number of deficiencies within the submitted Transport Assessment which is stated as necessary to allow an informed judgement to be made. It concludes that "Only when all the necessary facts have been presented, can a 'sound' judgement be made."
	<p>Recommendation</p> <p><u>In respect of Item 4 DC/20/3284/FUL the application has been deferred from this committee to allow for the preparation and receipt of a revised Transport Assessment to include/address all deficiencies identified by the independent consultant.</u></p> <p>In respect of Item 5 DC/20/3362/FUL a decision will need to be made and it is now recommended that the Council seeks to defend the Appeal (only) on basis that there are deficiencies within the submitted Transport Assessment which do not allow appropriate judgement on the safety of the development and its compliance with Policy SCLP7.1</p>
4.7	One representation has been received objecting to the development on behalf of the residents to the north of the site. The representation considers that the plan provided with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and footpath alignment are incorrect and that the definitive alignment of footpath 20 does not abut the site and therefore it will not be possible for the site to be connected without landowner permission.
7.17	The applicant has agreed to the requested financial contribution of £9,000 to cover SCC's legal costs in widening FP20 and this can be secured by s106 agreement. This financial

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT
DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ
DX: 41220 Lowestoft

	<p>contribution will enable SCC to address any necessary improvements to alignment/re-routing to be achieved through a section 25 creation agreement or section 26 creation order, this may include formalising any existing walked deviations from the definitive route.</p>
7.86-7.88	<p>A report has been received from the independent transport consultant which identifies a number of deficiencies with the submitted Transport Assessment. The deficiencies have been identified and would benefit from additional consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that no evidence was presented within the TA to demonstrate SCC agreement to the assessment methodology • The distances between the site and local amenities cannot be verified. The route followed should be confirmed. • No consideration has been given towards safe routes to schools. • The TA does not identify that Park Road and Chapel Road does not have any footways. • No improvement to bus services has been recommended. • The accident data is outdated. • January is not considered a neutral month and as such the traffic flows are not considered representative. • Surveys were carried out when COVID-19 travel restrictions were in operation and therefore not representative. • No traffic data was presented for any local roads to indicate traffic levels. • Some of Policy documentation is out of date and there is no attempt to identify policy compliance. • No information has been provided to confirm the 85th percentile speeds at the location of the site access. Therefore, the design cannot be approved. • A road safety audit has not been provided and on this basis, it is considered that the access arrangements should be considered further. • That TA does not include any infrastructure schemes to encourage cycling. • The report does not include any evidence to corroborate the suggestion that service vehicles can safely negotiate the development. • The provision of a single passing bay is insufficient. • The visibility splays need further clarification. • Details of the traffic calming scheme have not been provided. • The report does not include any qualitative assessment of the road network. <p>The report recommends a number of actions to address the deficiencies (see Appendix). Given these are necessary to allow a sound judgement to be made on Highway matters, it is considered necessary for the applicant to be given opportunity to prepare additional information to address these actions and once re-submitted to be subject of re-consultation/assessment.</p>
7.92	<p>The deficiencies identified by the consultant have put into question the safety and sustainability of the development in terms of highway safety and sustainability and it cannot be concluded at this stage that the development will be in compliance with Policy SCLP7.1 and paragraph 111 of the NPPF.</p>
8.3	<p>The objections received to the application, including those by the Parish Council and third parties, are acknowledged, however whilst these were previously not considered to counter the benefits of the scheme or raise matters of such significance that would render the development unacceptable or be able to be appropriately mitigated by condition; the report of independent transport consultant is a clear material</p>

	consideration that raises concerns over the ability to form a sound judgement on highways matters and compliance with policy SCLP7.1.
8.4	Without a sound judgement being possible on highways matters, it is not possible at this stage to conclude that the proposal represents sustainable development in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the adopted Local Plan. The proposal must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the highways evidence needs to be sound and without this, it cannot be concluded that the development is in full accordance with the recently adopted development plan and in particular Policy SCLP7.1 and that there is no unacceptable or severe impact based on paragraph 111 of the NPPF.
9.1	Recommendation – DC/20/3362/FUL That the Council seeks to defend the Appeal (only) on basis that there are deficiencies within the submitted Transport Assessment which do not allow appropriate judgement on the safety of the development and its compliance with Policy SCLP7.1 and paragraph 111 of the NPPF.