



# Waldringfield

## Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Rebecca Todd  
5 St. George's Terrace, Church Road  
Felixstowe, Suffolk IP11 9ND  
E: [pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com](mailto:pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com)  
T: 01394 271551  
[www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil](http://www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil)

### Variations of Conditions 32 & 34 (attached to decision notice DC/17/1435/OUT Land South and East of Adastral Park)

#### Consultation Response by Waldringfield Parish Council, March 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

#### **Waldringfield Parish Council OPPOSES the variation of condition 34.**

The following comments refer to the letter from Ms Helen Adcock, Director, CODE Development Planners to Mr Ben Woolnough, Major Projects Advisor, Suffolk Coastal District Council, dated 21st January 2019, requesting the variation.

**Erratum:** The letter has an error in the drawing numbers: "1039-HL-07 Revision C" should be "10391-HL-07 Revision C" (this is actually carried over from the original condition 34).

**p2, para 2** ("However, understandably, housebuilder B...are not prepared to proceed with any development with such a condition as fulfilment of the same is out of their control."): Surely the fact that the fulfilment of condition 34 is out of housebuilder B's control would have been known (or at least predictable) when the conditions were agreed last year. Yet CEG made no mention of this potential problem at the time.

**p2, para 5** ("Moreover, the condition itself serves no useful purpose..."): It is true that if the condition is interpreted as merely requiring the provision of the access junction and not the attached boulevard, then it would serve no useful purpose. However, that is clearly ridiculous.

"It does not require the provision of the boulevard running from the A12 access into the site as far as site B." The reason for Condition 34 is "Reason: To ensure that the **accesses and walking/cycling routes** are designed and constructed to an appropriate specification and **brought into use** before any other part of the development is commenced" (*DC/17/1435/OUT, §34, our emphasis*). Although the condition doesn't explicitly refer to the boulevard or Site B, it requires the route to be brought into use, and it is difficult to see how that could happen without the provision of the boulevard.

**p2, para 6** ("The original condition did not require the A12 access and initial completions to be served off that entrance..."): The whole point of condition 34 is that the initial completions would be served off the A12 entrance. Why else would it require the route to be brought into use before any other part of the development is commenced?

The argument that the original condition simply requires completion of the access, but no actual road, before occupation of the houses is absurd. How can the access be "brought into use" if it doesn't connect to anything? The reason the boulevard isn't shown on the plan is that the detailed design of the boulevard wasn't within the scope of the planning conditions. "...but all units could be served from the Ipswich Road": There is no mention of all units being served from the Ipswich Road in condition 34 or any of the other conditions. It is in fact precisely the opposite of what condition 34 was designed to achieve. It also contradicts what CODE said in its response to Waldringfield PC's consultation



# Waldringfield

## Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Rebecca Todd  
5 St. George's Terrace, Church Road  
Felixstowe, Suffolk IP11 9ND  
E: [pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com](mailto:pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com)  
T: 01394 271551  
[www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil](http://www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil)

comments ("Applicants' (CODE's) response: ...the majority of traffic would be expected to use the primary junction to the A12", *see below*).

In the *Parish Council Consultation Schedule, May 2017*, in response to Waldringfield PC's concerns, CODE agreed that the boulevard should be provided in phase 1:

### **Consultee (Waldringfield PC) response – main issue**

*Deliver the primary A12 junction earlier in order to set habits for residents to enter and leave the site in westerly and more direct direction.*

### **Applicants' (CODE's) response**

*Applicants prepared to include in the phasing programme to be secured through condition or planning obligation, the delivery of the A12 access **and boulevard to the school site** in phase 1 of the development. The Ipswich Road accesses will still be required but **the majority of traffic would be expected to use the primary junction to the A12.** (our emphasis).*

Throughout all the discussions between CEG, SCDC and Waldringfield PC it has been very clear that when referring to the A12 'access' or the Western Ipswich Road 'access', all parties were including the roads associated with the individual junctions: e.g. the A12 junction and the Boulevard, and the Western Ipswich Rd junction and what is now called the Western Spine Road. It was these discussions, noted in the 2017 document, that finally led to conditions being applied to the A12 'access' and the Western Ipswich Rd 'access'. It is entirely unacceptable for CEG to now be disconnecting the A12 Junction from the Boulevard, particularly in relation to Condition 34.

**p2, penultimate para** ("The following access...prior to occupation of the first dwelling within the orange area...or prior to occupation of the 201<sup>st</sup> dwelling, whichever is sooner"): This makes no sense. How could the occupation of the 201<sup>st</sup> dwelling happen before the occupation of the first dwelling? Does '201<sup>st</sup>' refer to dwellings outside site A? At the very least it is ambiguous.

**p3, para 1** – as above, except it refers to the 301<sup>st</sup> dwelling in site B instead of the 201<sup>st</sup> in site A.

The phasing of the access in relation to the occupation of the houses was made perfectly clear by Brookbanks:

*"As the assessment within this note demonstrates, the A12 access point, considered purely in modelling capacity terms, is not required until the 301<sup>st</sup> occupation. However, the Applicant considers it beneficial to provide the **A12 access prior to any occupation in order to achieve the most efficient method of on site construction and internal movement.** Therefore, the A12 access point is confirmed to be delivered prior to any occupation." (Technical Note: Response to SCC Consultation Return – dated 3rd January 2018, p8, our emphasis)*

If provision of the boulevard is delayed by this proposed variation it means that all the heavy plant used in the preparation of the land, and construction of the extension of Brightwell Barns plus circa 430 dwellings (nearly a quarter of all the dwellings on the site, and more than already exist in Waldringfield) will have to use the narrow, bendy, rural road (Ipswich Rd) and the supposedly 'secondary' Western Access off the Ipswich Rd. This road is busy enough already; the amount of traffic



# Waldringfield

## Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Rebecca Todd  
5 St. George's Terrace, Church Road  
Felixstowe, Suffolk IP11 9ND  
E: [pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com](mailto:pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com)  
T: 01394 271551  
[www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil](http://www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil)

trying exit onto the Foxhall Road roundabout is going to increase dramatically, and it is already difficult to get out in busy periods. This was one of the issues that prompted the agreement with CEG/SCDC in order to protect 'the rural nature of the Ipswich Rd'.

The letter requesting the variation, referred to at the beginning of this response, makes no mention of the main reasons Waldringfield Parish Council and others are so concerned that the boulevard is operational before the first house is occupied. One of these reasons is described in the preceding paragraph, the other reason is that without the A12 'T' junction and connecting boulevard, new residents will get into the habit of using the Ipswich Rd Western junction, and this habit will be hard to break when the boulevard arrives. We have made this point on many occasions, and were under the impression that CODE/CEG had agreed. It now seems that they have changed their minds. This not only means that (if the requested variation is approved) the problems we feared are likely to be realised, but it also undermines trust between CODE/CEG and the local community.

The real reason for these changes is obviously money. CEG want to get the income from the houses in sites A and B before they have to pay for the boulevard. Whilst the desire to save money is understandable, this situation was entirely predictable when the conditions were agreed. It is reasonable to assume that CEG had factored in the financial implications, including cash flow issues, of the phasing of the development at the time the conditions were negotiated and then agreed. If CEG weren't aware of the potential cash flow problems, then they should have been. If they were aware, but decided to keep quiet about it, knowing they would need to request a variation later, then they would be guilty of duplicity.

Yours faithfully,

Rebecca Todd, Clerk for Waldringfield Parish Council