



Waldringfield Parish Council

Parish Clerk: Jennifer Shone-Tribley
Low Farm, Ipswich Road, Waldringfield,
Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 4QU
E: pc.waldringfield@googlemail.com
T: 01473 736475
www.waldringfield.onesuffolk.net/parishcouncil

28 February 2022

Waldringfield Parish Council's response to the additional documents submitted on applications DC/21/4004/ARM & DC/21/4005/ARM

Dear Rachel

The Waldringfield Parish Council (WPC) is very concerned that the letter inviting WPC's comments on the above applications was not sent until February 14th, some 12 days after the new documents were posted on ESC's website.

The Parish Council was then given only 14 days to comment on these complex documents.

WPC highlighted a number of issues/queries in our response of October 2021 to the original documents submitted in DC/21/4004/ARM & DC/21/4005/ARM. For ease of reference, we have followed a similar structure in this current response.

1. Access

WPC previously commented on the conflicting statements made in the ARM/RMA applications regarding vehicular access points off the Ipswich Road and we sought clarification.

We do not feel that this has been addressed as the information appears still to differ depending on which document/format is presented.

The current Planning Statement Addendum is to highlight amendments to the previously submitted Planning Statement and *"is to be read alongside the Planning Statements (relating to each individual phase) submitted with the applications in August 2021."* The Addendum makes no reference to the Access points so the statement made in *"The Planning Statement relating to phase E1"*, para 5.59 appears to still apply – i.e.

"5.59 Access from Ipswich Road, will be a combination of enhanced and improved points of entry which were previously associated with the quarry activities that have since ceased on the site. Alongside new point of access which in the short term will provide a temporary exit route for construction traffic but over the lifetime of the development be converted into an emergency access point only".

We say that paragraph 5.59 requires amendment. It is misleading and appears to suggest that there will be several (i.e. more than two) vehicular access points off the Ipswich Rd. This does not conform with Outline Planning Permission DC/17/1435/OUT which included two points only of vehicular access/egress on Ipswich Rd. The first being (Ipswich Rd Eastern Access) the existing access route to the quarry and the second, a new access (Ipswich Rd Western Access). This second access was subject to Planning Condition 43, which requires *"a design strategy to reduce traffic using this access, through traffic calming or street design"* in order to *"distribute traffic across the other accesses and to calm the effect of traffic on that junction in order to maintain the rural character of Ipswich Road"*.

Furthermore, in the recent (Feb 2022) BLCF meeting, in a response to a question about construction traffic access, Taylor Wimpey reiterated that the same access point that is used for aggregates access i.e. the existing route to the quarry, will be used for access/ingress of construction traffic.

2. Street lighting

WPC previously pointed out that no external lighting plan had been submitted, contrary to condition 61 of outline permission. Such a plan has now been submitted. It includes a great deal of detail describing the different types of lighting across different locations and sensitivities. To our untrained eye this appears to be appropriate but we are not really qualified to make technical comment.

3. Car Parking

The WPC expressed concerns, in particular regarding the design of the court parking schemes, found predominately in phase W1. We are pleased to see that there are no such parking courts in E1 as off-plot parking appears to be accommodated via allocated parking spaces on the edge of green space.

4. Charging points for electric vehicles

We are very disappointed to find no reference to this topic in the new ARM documents. In the February BLCF, Taylor Wimpey detailed plans to install EV charging points. As a minimum, cables are being laid to allow their installation on all on-plot parking from the first dwelling. WPC would wish to see this commitment confirmed, possibly in a further addendum to the Planning Statement.

5. Energy efficiency

WPC commented previously that there was no mention in the ARM documents regarding energy efficient measures. Taylor Wimpey gave a great deal of information on this matter in the February BLCF, detailing the installation of air heat pumps, triple glazing, solar panels etc. Perhaps this is a building regulations matter rather than planning but nonetheless it would be good to see some reference to it in the ARM documents, again possibly in a further addendum to the Planning Statement.

6. Ecology

WPC is pleased to see the firm commitments to produce targets and associated drawings (location and box design) for nest boxes for swifts, starlings and house sparrows and roosting boxes for bats (to include two pill boxes for bat roosts) as detailed in "Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP)" within "Part 2: Environmental Action Plan".

7. Construction Method/Management Plan

The outline planning consent, condition 18, required a construction method/management statement.

WPC do not currently have the expertise of planning consultants but it appears to us that there is some confusing crossover regarding the documents relied upon under this topic.

Within the ARM/RMA application the amended "*Part 2 of The Environment Action Plan*" includes in section 4, a "*Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity)*"

This contains much detail of how the ecological features of the site will be protected during construction and is of course extremely important and welcome. But, it doesn't cover such matters as how will the building materials, lorries, diggers, etc. access the site, and how will the impact of this on Ipswich Rd and local residents be mitigated.

A separate application, DC/21/5740/DRC | Discharge of Condition(s) 18 is currently before ESC. This contains a "*Construction Environmental Management Plan Phase 1 Earthworks*", this references the *Construction Environmental Management Plan* as in the above paragraph. It is also very detailed regarding the site management, hours of working, access/ingress (former quarry entrance) etc. etc.

WPC will be responding to this DRC separately, but we do not understand why the *Construction Environmental Management Plan Phase 1 Earthworks* document is not included in the ARM/RMA, or at the very least, referenced in these applications.

8. Phasing & Timing

We have found no reference to time-frames in these ARMs – we would have thought this to be a critical element.

9. Previously submitted but undetermined ARMS

It has been explained at the BLCF of February 2022 that the ESC Planning Committee has already made a “resolution to grant” the extant ARMs but amendments put forward by Taylor Wimpey would be subject to consultation.

10. Design

A very comprehensive response to the revised documents has been made by the Principal Design and Conservation Officer– WPC has nothing to add to that.

11 Landscape & Arboriculture

WPC’s Tree Warden has provided a report which forms part of WPC’s consultation response.

Kind regards,



Jennifer Shone-Tribley, Parish Clerk – on behalf of the Waldringfield Parish Council