

Membership as from May 2023

Councillor Berry
Councillor Clover
Councillor Drummond (Vice Chair)
Councillor Harvey
Councillor Hood (Chair)
Councillor Hulbert
Councillor Kavanagh
Councillor Nobbs
Councillor Perry

Members = 9

Quorum = 3



Newmarket
T O W N C O U N C I L

The Memorial Hall, High Street, Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8JP

TEL: 01638 667227

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the
Development and Planning committee
to be held at

Memorial Hall, High Street, Newmarket, CB8 8JP

Monday 3rd July 2023 at 6.15pm

A G E N D A

The meeting is held in public and the public are encouraged to attend and participate. Just occasionally matters such as contractual or staffing matters do have to be held in the confidential part of the meeting.

Members of the public and press may not orally report or comment about a meeting as it takes place if present at a meeting of the Council, but otherwise may:

- a. film, photograph or make an audio recording of the meeting;
- b. use any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later;
- c. Report or comment on the proceedings in writing, during or after a meeting or orally after the meeting.

The Council will where possible facilitate such recording unless it is being disruptive. It will also take steps to ensure that children, the vulnerable and members of the public who object to being filmed are protected without undermining the broader purpose of the meeting

1. **Chair to read** fire safety notice and announce that proceedings may be filmed or recorded.
2. **Apologies** - To receive and accept apologies for absence
3. **Declaration of interests**
 - a) Councillors are invited to raise any declarations of interest concerning items on the agenda
 - b) To consider any requests for dispensation
4. **Minutes of previous meeting held 19th June 2023**
 - a) To consider and adopt the minutes, as a true record of the proceedings
 - b) To consider any matters arising
5. **Public participation** – an invitation to members of the public to make representations to Councillors. Resolutions can only be made on items on the agenda
Rules of public participation: no person may speak for longer than 3 minutes in total. The maximum time permitted for this item is 15 minutes. This is the only opportunity during the meeting for members of the public to address Councillors
6. **Brickfield** – ECF/Mintridge Strategic Land to attend to discuss proposals for development of Brickfield Stud
7. **To consider if Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan policies impact on planning applications for consideration**
8. **Planning applications** – West Suffolk Council, weeks commencing 12/06/2023 & 19/06/2023
9. **Planning applications** – Amended and Deferred Plans
10. **Planning Appeals** – to discuss any notified appeals
11. **Planning applications** – East Cambs
12. **Planning decisions and plans withdrawn** – West Suffolk Council-week commencing 12/06/2023 & 19/06/2023
13. **Delegation Panel decisions** - To discuss any decisions by Delegation Panel
14. **Licensing** – To discuss any Licensing applications
15. **Feedback regarding Highways Engineer visits**
 - a) Freshfields and Adastral
 - b) Severals and the Clock Tower roundabout area
16. **Parking on grass verges** – to receive information from Highways
17. **Correspondence**
18. **Date of next meeting** – 17th July 2023

Signed: *CE Whitaker* Cathy Whitaker, Town Clerk

Date: 27th June 2023

To: Chair & Members of D&P Committee, Other Council Members, Press & the Public

Material Planning Considerations	
Site specific issues	• adequacy for turning, loading • availability/capacity of local infrastructure (eg public drainage or water systems) • car parking • deficiencies in community/social facilities (eg spaces in schools) • design, appearance and materials • layout and density of building(s) • road access • traffic generation
Environmental effects	• effect on street scene • hazardous materials, contaminated land • landscaping • light (including overshadowing) • loss of trees • nature conservation & biodiversity issues • noise & disturbance resulting from use • overlooking/loss of privacy • smells and fumes • visual amenity
Listed buildings/conservation areas	• The need to preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of designated conservation areas and protect listed buildings • Effect on archaeological interest
Usage	• Incompatible or unacceptable uses • Desire to retain and promote certain uses e.g. stables in Newmarket.
Previous decisions	• Previous planning decisions, including appeal decisions
Policies	• Statutory provisions contained in planning acts, statutory regulations & planning case law • Central Government planning policy and advice • National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) • Supplementary planning guidance/documents eg. Affordable Housing SPD, Master plans, development briefs • WSC Local Plan policies • Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan • Newmarket Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted September 2009)
Key principle of the NPPF – presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means granting permission unless: • the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or • <i>any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits</i>	
Matters which are not material planning considerations	
<i>Greater weight is attached to issues raised which are supported by evidence rather than solely by assertion.</i>	
Competition (unless in relation to adverse effects on a town centre as a whole)	Moral and religious issues
Breach of private covenants or other private property or access rights, including boundary disputes	Council interests (eg land ownership or contractual matters)
Devaluation of property	Identity or motives of an applicant or occupier
Protection of a private view	Private disputes between neighbours
Impact of construction work	

Parking Guidance for Use Classes C3 and C4: Dwelling houses and houses in multiple occupation

Family houses, or house occupied by up to six residents living together as a single household, or Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)¹³, including a household where care is provided for residents.

Standard: Flats and Houses are to be treated the same.

Use	Vehicle	Cycle	PTW	Disabled
	Minimum*	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum
1 bedroom	1 space per dwelling	2 secure covered spaces per dwelling. (Satisfied if garage or secure area is provided within curtilage of dwelling to minimum dimensions)	N/A	N/A if parking is in curtilage of dwelling, otherwise as Visitor/unallocated
2 bedrooms	2 spaces per dwelling**			
3 bedrooms	2 spaces per dwelling			
4+ bedrooms	3 spaces per dwelling			
Retirement developments (e.g., warden assisted independent living accommodation)	1 space per dwelling	2 spaces per 8 units (visitors)	2 PTW spaces and 1 space per 2 dwellings for mobility scooters	
Visitor/unallocated	0.25 spaces per dwelling (unallocated)	If no garage or secure area is provided within curtilage of dwelling, then 2 covered & secure spaces per dwelling in a communal area for residents plus 2 spaces^ per 8 dwellings for visitors	1 space + 1 per 20 car spaces (for 1 st 100 car spaces), then 1 space per 30 car spaces (over 100 car spaces)	

¹³ Houses in multiple occupation (Class C4) are defined in The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) as 'small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom'.

Informative notes:

*Standards exclude garages under 6m x 3m (internal dimension) as a parking space but can include undercroft parking and car ports providing, they have no other current or potential use.

**Reduction in this figure may be considered with robust and agreed highway mitigation

^Mobility vehicle spaces should be secure and covered with charging facilities.

Visitor/unallocated vehicle parking can, subject to appropriate design, be located on street.

Unallocated cycle parking for residents to be secure and covered, located in easily accessible locations throughout the development. These guidelines will be applied to all development (including infill developments, extension applications and change of use).

Where grouped, unassigned parking is proposed, more flexible and efficient use of the parking may be achieved than with allocated parking. Subject to discussion with the Highway Authority this may potentially reduce the nominal on-street parking provision standards required by up to 25%.

Where an individual dwelling may require more than two spaces these additional spaces may be provided as part of unallocated on street parking, providing this is designed in.

An allowance will be required for visitor cycle and car parking, refer para 3.2 and 4.5.

Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 {excerpt}

Car clubs should be promoted in low provision/car free residential developments and car club spaces provided. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure should also be provided in new developments.

Research was undertaken to derive the residential parking guidance for Suffolk. The research included a questionnaire survey to approximately 9000 dwellings. The results of the survey and the 2001 and 2011 Census data for Suffolk car ownership can be found in Appendix 1.

Electric Vehicle recharging points to be provided to support the use of low emission vehicles. See EV Parking Guidance table within this document for further guidance.

Reductions to the minimum parking guidance

This advisory residential parking guidance is the minimum required; however a range of factors will be taken into account. For main urban areas a reduction to the parking guidance may be considered where a proposal has been designed to be exceptionally sustainable in transport terms and which effectively promotes an overall reduction in the use of high emission vehicles and avoids the provision of car parking adjacent or close to dwellings within the main layout.

Main urban areas are defined as those having frequent and extensive opportunities for public transport and cycling and walking links; close proximity to local services (including accessing education, healthcare, food shopping and employment); and on street parking controls at all times e.g. double yellow lines. Where there is evidence that these factors are in place, local planning authorities may, after consultation with the Highway Authority, bring forward local parking policies to limit the scale of parking in specific areas.

When making their recommendation to local planning authorities considering reduced parking proposals for residential development, the Highway Authority must be:

- able to recommend a condition for suitable cycle storage and secure parking facilities;
- satisfied that servicing vehicles would be able to operate efficiently i.e. not restricted by loading restrictions or road layout;
- able to determine how highly sustainable the location is in terms of proximity to services, shops etc. and public transport (high frequency and wide ranging) and suitable cycling and walking routes;
- made aware of the likelihood of a viable Car Club (the provision of a car club would need to be secured through a Planning Obligation on Condition);
- able to determine the possible impact that a single application may have in setting a precedent in an area;
- satisfied by the availability of visitor parking (off street public car parks may be acceptable for visitor use); and
- satisfied that the likely impact of additional road parking in the vicinity would not cause inconsiderate and unsafe obstructions to the surrounding road or footpath network or add pressure onto an already densely utilised parking network.

If all the above criteria are satisfied on a site by site basis then the Highways Authority would be more likely to approve of reduced parking proposals.

However, it is not possible to make the assumption that occupiers will be car free; although it may be possible to accept this to some degree where the units are single bed. Furthermore, if the neighbouring streets are controlled by Residents Parking then any new development is prohibited from joining the scheme.

The presumption that occupiers are required to use off road public car parks for parking of their vehicles is not generally supported. The Highways Authority will only consider any identified use of off-road public car parks as a means of resident parking in exceptionally sustainable developments that are located in main urban areas (as defined above). In such cases, the Highway Authority must first be satisfied that the car park/s in question are viable long-term parking options for affected residents and that the development has been designed to be extremely sustainable in transport terms.

To summarise, the key questions the Highways Authority will seek to address when considering proposals for reduced parking are:

- Where might residents park?
- What real harm would these vehicles cause?
- Are the roads heavily regulated in terms of prohibition of parking?
- Are the streets already under significant pressure?



Newmarket

TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Development & Planning Committee Held on Monday 19th June 2023 at 6.15pm

Attendance:

Councillor J Harvey (Chairman)
Councillor P Hulbert

Councillor R Nobbs
Councillor S Perry

Also Present: C Whitaker – Town Clerk, T Symonds – Deputy Town Clerk, J Ashton – Minute Assistant, Cllrs Jarvis, Kavanagh, McHugh and Winter as observers and 1 Member of the Press.

Minute	Action by
D/23/06/24 <u>To Elect and Chairman</u> As apologies were received from the Chairman and Vice Chairman, the Town Clerk asked for nominations for a Chairman to chair the meeting tonight. Cllr Nobbs nominated Cllr Harvey and the following was agreed: <u>D/23/24.01 Resolved</u> That Cllr Harvey be elected to chair the meeting of the D&P Committee for 19th June 2023. <i>Cllr Harvey took the Chair.</i>	
D/23/06/25 <u>Chairman to Read the Fire Safety Notice and Announce that Proceedings May be Filmed or Recorded</u> Chairman opened the meeting and read out the Fire Notice and announced that proceedings were being recorded.	
D/23/06/26 <u>Apologies</u> Apologies were received from Cllrs Berry, Drummond and Hood.	
D/23/06/27 <u>Declaration of Members Interests & to Remind Councillors of the need to keep up to date their Register of Member's Interests and to Consider any Requests Received for Member's Dispensation</u> Cllr Nobbs declared an interest in applications D/23/06/30/7 NMA(A)/22/1099 and DC/23/0355/HH. There were no requests for dispensation.	
D/23/06/28 <u>To Confirm the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 5th June 2023 and any Matters Arising</u> The Chairman presented the minutes of the Development & Planning Committee held on 5th June 2023 and the following was agreed: <u>D/23/06/28/01 Resolved</u> That the minutes of the Development & Planning Committee held on 5th June 2023 be adopted and signed as a true record by the Chairman of the Development & Planning Committee.	

Matters arising:

D/23/06/6 – It was confirmed that a Highways Officer had attended site visits at Adastral Close and Freshfields and a report will be presented to D&P meeting on 3rd July.

D/23/6/17 – The Developers of Brickfields have accepted an invitation to attend the D&P meeting on 3rd July

D/23/06/20 – The letter to WSC regarding the Laureate footpath was still to be sent.

D/23/06/29 Public Open Session

No members of the public were present.

D/23/06/30 Impact of Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan Policies on Applications Being Considered

Policy 14 – Trees.

D/23/06/31 Planning Applications

Week Commencing 29/05/2023 & 05/06/2023

D/23/06/31/1 DC/23/0844/TCA - Trees in a conservation area notification - one Oak (red on plan) overall crown reduction by three metres - 6 Bury Road Newmarket Suffolk.

D/23/06/31.01 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the work being carried out, outside of the bird nesting season.

Cllr Winter joined the meeting

D/23/06/31/2 DC/23/0843/HH - Householder planning application - single storey rear extension Bury Lodge 56 Bury Road Newmarket Suffolk.

D/23/06/31.02 Resolved

The Committee voiced no objections.

D/23/06/31/3 DC/23/0785/HH - Householder planning application - second floor extension and loft conversion with replacement roof - 80 Weston Way Newmarket.

D/23/06/31.03 Resolved

The Committee objected on it being an overdevelopment of the site, design, appearance and material used, neighbours right to light (overshadowing) and privacy and it being out of character for the area.

D/23/06/31/4 DCON(D)/22/0478 - Application to discharge condition 15 (construction deliveries management plan) of application DC/22/0478/FUL - Unit 6 Newmarket Retail Park Oaks Drive Newmarket Suffolk.

D/23/06/31.04 Resolved

No comment was required by the Committee.

D/23/06/31/5 DC/23/0773/FUL - Planning application - one dwelling Garage At Nowell Lodge Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk.

D/23/06/31.05 Resolved

The Committee voiced no objections, subject to no effect on the neighbour's right to light (overshadowing) and the potential of it becoming an overdevelopment of the site.

D/23/06/31/6 NMA(A)/20/1025 - Non material amendment to DC/20/1025/FUL - a. changes to window configuration to overhanging section of building by omitting Juliet balconies and installing windows; b. omission of roof terrace and installation of solar panels to this space - Plot 1 Police Station Vicarage Road Newmarket Suffolk.

D/23/06/31.06 Resolved

The Committee objected and requested an extension to receive new documentation on the amended plans.

Cllr Nobbs declared an interest in the following application and left the meeting

D/23/06/31/7 NMA(A)/22/1099 - Non material amendment to DC/22/1099/HH - two new rooflights to front elevation - Sefton Cottage Snailwell Road Newmarket Suffolk.

D/23/06/31.07 Resolved

No comment was required by the Committee.

Cllr Nobbs returned to the meeting

D/23/06/32 Amended and Deferred Planning Applications

None noted.

D/23/06/33 Planning Appeals

None noted.

D/23/06/34 East Cambs Planning Applications

The East Cambs District Council Weekly List of Planning Applications for 9th June was noted.

D/23/06/35 To Receive Results of Applications as Determined by West Suffolk and Plans Withdrawn

West Suffolk Planning Determinations received during week commencing 29/05/2023 & 05/06/2023

Applications	Description	Address	WS Decision	NTC Decision
DC/23/0675/TCA	Trees in a conservation are notification - one Cypress (Tone Cypress T2 on plan) fell, three Sycamores (T5-T7 on plan) cut back overhanging branches on eastern side by 4 metres, one Sycamore (T8 on plan) remove 3 dead branches on eastern aspect, one Sycamore (T10 on plan) remove single branch on south east aspect, one Sycamore (T11 on plan) cut back overhanging branch	Long Cottage Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	Objected

	on eastern aspect by 4 metres, one Sycamore (T16 on plan) cut back overhanging branches on northern aspect by 4 metres, one Sycamore (T17 on plan) remove single branch on northern aspect				
DC/23/0041/FUL	Planning Application - two dwellings with associated access	Land Adjoining Church Exeter Road Newmarket Suffolk	Withdrawn		
DC/23/0505/HH	Householder planning application - single storey side and rear extensions (following demolition of existing conservatory)	84 Drinkwater Close Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	No objections	
DCON(A)/20/0174	Application to discharge condition 14 (travel information pack) and condition 29 (operational waste management strategy) of DC/20/0174/VAR	Development Site Adj South Drive Exning Road Newmarket Suffolk	Discharged	Comments not invited	
DCON(A)/22/0420	Application to discharge conditions 1 and 2 (Highway Phasing Plan) of DC/22/0420/RM	Hatchfield Farm Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	Comments not invited	

Cllr Nobbs declared an interest in the following application and left the meeting

D/23/06/36 Delegation Panel Decisions

DC/23/0355/HH - Householder planning application - a. pitched roof to rear extension b. insertion of windows to side elevation c. alterations to windows and doors to rear elevation d. two roof lights to rear elevation - 27 Exning Road, Newmarket.

It was noted that the Officer was minded to grant the application. The Town Clerk was asked to check that the request to refer it to Building Control had been complied with.

Cllr Nobbs returned to the meeting

D/23/06/37 Licensing

Premises Licence – Hairkandi 127 All Saints Road Newmarket Suffolk.

Application to sell alcohol on premises:

Tuesday and Wednesday 09:00 – 20:30

Thursday 09:00 – 18:30

Friday 09:00 – 17:30

Saturday 08:30 – 16:30

D/23/06/37.01 Resolved

The Committee voiced no objections in principle and gave delegated powers to the Town Clerk to put comments to WSC regarding concerns on general health grounds, health & safety and to consider restricting the time for the sale of alcohol and to emphasise for sale and consumption ONLY on premises.

D/23/06/38 Cumulative Impact Assessment Consultation

A response to the consultation was considered and the following was agreed:

D/23/06/38.01 Resolved

That delegated powers be given to the Town Clerk to respond to the consultation regarding the PSPO and Dog exclusion zones. To seek clarity on the CIA policy before responding in full.

D/23/06/39 Working Groups

The membership of the D&P Working Groups was considered and the following was agreed:

D/23/06/39.01 Resolved

That the D&P Affordable Housing Working Group be made obsolete; it being a matter falling under the NNP working group.

D/23/06/39.02 Resolved

That Cllrs Harvey, Hood, Hulbert, Perry, Winter; S Beckett, R Wood, M Jefferys and Town Clerk be appointed as members of the D&P Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Chaired by M Jefferys.

D/23/06/39.03 Resolved

That Cllr Hood and the Town Clerk be appointed as members of the D&P Parish Alliance – Sunnica Working Group Chaired by Cllr Hood.

D/23/06/39.04 Resolved

That Cllr Drummond and S Beckett be appointed as members of the D&P PROW Working Group Chaired by Cllr Drummond. That additional members be requested to join at full Council.

D/23/06/39.05 Resolved

That Cllrs Borda, Drummond, Harvey, Hood and Hulbert be appointed as members of the D&P Transport & Parking Working Group Chaired by Cllr Harvey.

D/23/06/40 Correspondence

None noted.

D/23/06/41 Date of Next Meeting

Monday 3rd July 2023 at the Memorial Hall.

Meeting closed at 7:12pm.

Signed _____ Date _____

Summary of Resolutions/Recommendations

Resolution/Recommendation	Resolution/Recommendation Wording
<u>D/23/06/24.01 Resolved</u>	That Cllr Harvey be elected to chair the meeting of the D&P

	Committee for 19th June 2023.
<u>D/23/06/31.01 Resolved</u>	The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the work being carried out, outside of the bird nesting season.
<u>D/23/06/31.02 Resolved</u>	The Committee voiced no objections.
<u>D/23/06/31.03 Resolved</u>	The Committee objected on it being an overdevelopment of the site, design, appearance and material used, neighbours right to light (overshadowing) and privacy and it being out of character for the area.
<u>D/23/06/31.04 Resolved</u>	No comment was required by the Committee.
<u>D/23/06/31.05 Resolved</u>	The Committee voiced no objections, subject to no effect on the neighbour's right to light (overshadowing) and the potential of it becoming an overdevelopment of the site.
<u>D/23/06/31.06 Resolved</u>	The Committee objected and requested an extension so that documentation can be provided on the amended plans.
<u>D/23/06/31.07 Resolved</u>	No comment was required by the Committee.
<u>D/23/06/36.01 Resolved</u>	The Committee voiced no objections.
<u>D/23/06/37.01 Resolved</u>	The Committee voiced no objections in principle and gave delegated powers to the Town Clerk to put comments to WSC regarding concerns on health & safety and to consider restricting the time for the sale of alcohol.
<u>D/23/06/38.01 Resolved</u>	That delegated powers be given to the Town Clerk to respond to the consultation regarding the PSPO and Dog exclusion zone. To seek clarity on the CIA policy before responding in full.
<u>D/23/06/39.01 Resolved</u>	That the D&P Affordable Housing Working Group be made obsolete; it being a matter falling under the NNP working group.
<u>D/23/06/39.02 Resolved</u>	That Cllrs Harvey, Hood, Hulbert, Perry, Winter; S Beckett, R Wood, M Jefferys and Town Clerk be appointed as members of the D&P Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Chaired by M Jefferys.
<u>D/23/06/39.03 Resolved</u>	That Cllr Hood and the Town Clerk be appointed as members of the D&P Parish Alliance – Sunnica Working Group Chaired by Cllr Hood.
<u>D/23/06/36.04 Resolved</u>	That Cllr Drummond and S Beckett be appointed as members of the D&P PROW Working Group Chaired by Cllr Drummond. That additional members be requested to join at full Council.
<u>D/23/06/36.05 Resolved</u>	That Cllrs Borda, Drummond, Harvey, Hood and Hulbert be appointed as members of the D&P Transport & Parking Working Group Chaired by Cllr Harvey.

Application	Constraints	Case Officer	Applicant name	Ward Member	Consultation expiry date	Neighbour comment at time of printing
Weeks beginning 12 th June & 19 th June						
DC/23/0935/VAR <u>Planning application - variation of condition 2 of DC/22/0714/FUL to allow for use of amended plan for change of use of dwelling to hotel accommodation, to be occupied in conjunction with Kings Hotel</u> 87A High Street Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8UG	Conservation Area	Savannah Cobbold	Mr Paul Brodel	Councillor Rachel Hood Councillor Susan Jane Perry	Fri 07 Jul 2023	no
DC/23/0928/HH <u>Householder planning application - single storey side extension (following demolition of existing conservatory)</u> 2 Stamford Street Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8JB		Clare Oliver	Mrs M. Delevingne	Councillor Rachel Hood Councillor Sue Perry	Thu 06 Jul 2023	no
DC/23/0924/TPO <u>TPO/013(2023) - Tree preservation order - one Horse Chestnut tree (as identified on plan and T5 on order) re-pollard, reducing new growth to approximately 150 mm above point of previous pollarding</u> 61 Edinburgh Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0QD		Clare Oliver	Mr James Price	Councillor Charles Peter Lynch Councillor Robert Kevin Yarrow	Fri 07 Jul 2023	no

Development and Planning Committee

Planning Applications – West Suffolk Council

DC/23/0864/FUL <u>Planning application - a. 50 dwellings, garages, associated infrastructure including substation and foul water pumping station and public open space (following demolition of existing building and hard standing) b. new vehicular access onto Fordham Road following closure of existing southbound access c. re-location of tennis courts</u> Land At Former St Felix School Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk		Gary Hancox		Councillor Janne Nicholas Jarvis Councillor Michael Anderson	Thu 13 Jul 2023	no
DC/23/0990/HH <u>Householder planning application - single storey front extension</u> 442 Nimbus Way Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7BW		Adam Yancy	Mr And Mrs Luke And Fay Raymont	Councillor Janne Nicholas Jarvis Councillor Michael Anderson	Mon 17 Jul 2023	no
DC/23/0993/TCA <u>Trees in a conservation area notification - a. one Plum (Hedge 1 on plan) - reduce height to three metres above ground level and reduce sides by up to one metre b. one Plum (T1 on plan) - crown reduction by up to four metres c. one Sycamore (T3 on plan) cut bank four lower branches over driveway by up to three metres</u> 50A Bury Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7BT	Conservation Area	Daniel Gospel	Mrs Sarah Esler	Councillor Rachel Hood Councillor Susan Jane Perry	Fri 14 Jul 2023	no

Development and Planning Committee

Planning Applications – West Suffolk Council

DC/23/0967/FUL Planning application - single storey side extension Caps Cases Studlands Park Industrial Estate Studlands Park Avenue Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7AU		Tamara Benford-Brown	Mr Nick Dewy	Councillor Janne Nicholas Jarvis Councillor Michael Anderson	Thu 13 Jul 2023	no
DC/23/0980/FUL planning application - new passageway and shopfront 53 High Street Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8NF	Conservation Area	Savannah Cobbold	Mr David Snaith	Councillor Rachel Hood Councillor Susan Jane Perry	Mon 17 Jul 2023	no
DC/23/0968/CLP Application for lawful development certificate for proposed use or development - change of use of land for the temporary siting of a caravan until building works have been completed in respect of dwelling being constructed La Grange House Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7AA	Conservation Area	Ed Fosker	Mr Charles Smith	Councillor Rachel Hood Councillor Susan Jane Perry		no

Blank

Parish Re-Consultation

Newmarket Town Council
King Edward VII Memorial Hall
High Street
Newmarket
Suffolk
CB8 8JP

Please ask for: Debbie Cooper

Direct Line: 01638 719437

Application No. DC/23/0644/FUL

Consultation Period

Expires: 6 July 2023

22 June 2023

RE-CONSULTATION IN RESPECT OF A PLANNING PROPOSAL

PROPOSAL Planning application - removal of signage on front and rear elevations, including removal of ATM and night safes and making good with matching brickwork

LOCATION 58 - 60 High Street, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 8LB

APPLICANT Barclays Bank Plc

AGENT Mr. Patrick Chiu

You have been consulted previously in respect of the application noted above. The following amendments by the applicant/agent have been received:

Amended plans received 22nd June 2023 to retain the night safes

The changes are available to view in the planning section of our website for your consideration.

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RTGYJTPIQ500>

Would you please let me know in writing by 6 July 2023 if you have any observations to make regarding this proposal. Please email your response to planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk. Any response should include the application number, the name of the Case Officer and the site location address. All responses will be posted on our website and made available for viewing by the general public. If I do not hear from you it will be assumed that you do not wish to make any representations. You will be notified details of the decision electronically.

Parish Re-Consultation

Newmarket Town Council
King Edward VII Memorial Hall
High Street
Newmarket
Suffolk
CB8 8JP

Please ask for: Debbie Cooper

Direct Line: 01638 719437

Application No. DC/23/0645/LB

Consultation Period

Expires: 6 July 2023

22 June 2023

RE-CONSULTATION IN RESPECT OF A PLANNING PROPOSAL

PROPOSAL Application for listed building consent - a. removal of signage on front and rear elevations, including removal of ATM and night safes and making good with matching brickwork; b. internal alterations including removal of counter, furniture, equipment, stud partitions / glazed screens and doors

LOCATION 58 - 60 High Street, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 8LB

APPLICANT Barclays Bank Plc

AGENT Mr Patrick Chiu

You have been consulted previously in respect of the application noted above. The following amendments by the applicant/agent have been received:

Amended plans received 22nd June 2023 to retain the night safes

The changes are available to view in the planning section of our website for your consideration.

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=RTGYJVPDIQ600>

Would you please let me know in writing by 6 July 2023 if you have any observations to make regarding this proposal. Please email your response to planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk. Any response should include the application number, the name of the Case Officer and the site location address. All responses will be posted on our website and made available for viewing by the general public. If I do not hear from you it will be assumed that you do not wish to make any representations. You will be notified details of the decision electronically.

PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE FORM

Planning and Regulatory Services
West Suffolk House
Western Way
Bury St Edmunds
Suffolk
IP33 3YU
22 June 2023

Case Officer: Debbie Cooper
Direct Line: 01638 719437
Application No: DC/23/0645/LB
Consultation Period
Expires: 6 July 2023

CONSULTATION ON APPLICATION RECEIVED BY LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

PROPOSAL Application for listed building consent - a. removal of signage on front and rear elevations, including removal of ATM and night safes and making good with matching brickwork; b. internal alterations including removal of counter, furniture, equipment, stud partitions / glazed screens and doors

LOCATION 58 - 60 High Street, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 8LB

APPLICANT Barclays Bank Plc

AGENT Mr Patrick Chiu

Name of Town/Parish:

Signature of Chairman/Clerk:

Parish Council response to this application:

No Comment ☐

Object ☐

Support ☐

Parish Council Observations:

Blank

Decision List

Weeks commencing 12 th June & 19 th June	NTC Comments
DC/23/0752/TPO <u>TPO (1990) tree preservation order - one Lime (on plan) prune the root of the tree (6 metres from the tree)</u> 23 Leaders Way Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0DP	 NTC actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application.
DC/23/0707/TCA <u>Trees in a conservation area notification - one Lime (T1 on plan) reduce branch over roof by up to two metres; one Cherry (T2 on plan) reduce branches over roof to create a clearance of up to two metres; one London plane (T3 on plan) reduce branches over roof of house to create clearance of up to 2.5 metres; one Walnut (T4 on plan) remove lowest branch over roof, reduce branch over roof to create a clearance of two metres; 12 Sycamores (G1 on plan) reduce crown to provide up to 2.5 metre clearance of building</u> Piers House Rayes Lane Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7AB	 NTC actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application.
DC/23/0705/TCA <u>Trees in a conservation area notification - one Indian bean tree (T1 on plan) remove two branches growing over roof and nursery back to large upright growth point; remove lowest large branch growing over nursery and reduce lower branch growing over lawn by up to three metres, one Indian bean tree (T2 on plan) reduce lower large branch over nursery back to growth point near wall, one Indian bean tree (T3 on plan) remove lower branch growing over wall behind Holly, one Indian bean tree (T5 on plan) remove lowest branch growing over gate</u> Saville House 14 St Marys Square Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0HZ	 The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application.
DC/23/0355/HH <u>Householder planning application - a. pitched roof to rear extension b. insertion of windows to side elevation c. alterations to windows and doors to rear elevation d. two roof lights to rear elevation</u> 27 Exning Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0EA	 The Committee objected on the grounds of a possible breach of building regulations and requested that the application be referred to WSC building control.

Decision List

DC/22/1977/FUL <u>Planning application - two substations and one foul water pumping station and associated works</u> Hatchfield Farm Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7XL	 The Committee voiced no objection.
DC/23/0741/TCA <u>Trees in a conservation area notification - one Sycamore (T1 on plan) - fell</u> Goldolphin Managment Highfield 15 Bury Road Newmarket Suffolk	 The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and objects to the felling of healthy trees. The Committee objected to this application and requested that the application be submitted to the Tree Officer for consideration. If the tree is to be felled, that it be felled outside of the bird nesting season and the Committee requests that a suitable replacement be planted. However, the Committee is aware that sycamore seeds are poisonous to horses.

Decision List

DC/23/0641/TPO <u>TPO 002 (1998) tree preservation order - One Corsican pine (indicated on plan and T1 on order) fell</u> 106 George Lambton Avenue Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0BQ	 The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and objects to the felling of healthy trees. However, in this instance the Committee did not object to this application due to the issues it was causing with neighbouring properties and subject to a replacement being planted before the tree is felled in accordance with the Tree Officers very thorough report.
DC/23/0617/HH <u>Householder planning application - single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing conservatory)</u> 9 Elizabeth Avenue Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0DJ	 The Committee voiced no objections subject to no objections from the neighbours due to diminishing of right to light.
DC/23/0627/LB <u>Application for listed building consent - new access ramp from morning room onto southern terrace with rails</u> Jockey Club Chambers 101 High Street Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8JL	 The Committee voiced no objections subject to the approval of the WSC Listed Buildings Officer.

Blank

From: Matthew Fox

Sent: 19 June 2023 15:16

To: Cathy Whitaker >

Subject: Newmarket site meeting follow-up.

Speeding traffic, Adastral Close and Freshfields:

Our advice in the first instance is to always report speeding traffic to Suffolk Police as they are responsible for enforcing the posted speed limits.

If there are serious residents concerns over speeding traffic, the next step is to consider funding speed surveys in these locations – this is to give clear data as to the extent of the problem (in some locations, the problems are more perceived than actual). This data is used to determine what measures might be considered appropriate - if any.

In the vast majority of locations, this data is more useful to use as support in requests for a stronger police presence, rather than to use for change in speed limit requests or traffic calming measure. Generally speaking the majority of our speed limits are appropriate for their location and we only approve physical traffic calming or a change in speed limits as a last resort.

With regard to the 'Sleeping Policeman' or speed bump requests for Freshfield, these are only approved in locations where there is a clear and persistent record of speeding/dangerous traffic or in locations where there have been collisions between vehicles and pedestrians. This type of traffic calming is very popular with residents who do not live near them – but due to the traffic noise these cause, the vibrations and loss of parking in the area, they are very unpopular with any nearby resident (the ones in Fordham are a good example of this: they are extremely effective but very unpopular with neighbouring residents. They are also relatively maintenance heavy). These would only be considered should the survey show a need for them. We will not consider these simply at a residents request.

Speed surveys can be funded by Town/Parish Councils – or by the County Councillors using their LHB funding.

Cathy Whitaker

Subject: FW: Newmarket site meeting follow-up.
Attachments: Sandpit Lane, Thurston - Zebra Crossing Feasibility Rev01.pdf; Newmarket Clocktower roundabout.PNG

From: Matthew Fox <
Sent: 19 June 2023 15:16
To: Cathy Whitaker <
Subject: Newmarket site meeting follow-up.

Pedestrian crossings/refuge islands – Clocktower roundabout and approaches.

This is by far the most complex request made during our meeting and also the most costly to provide by a considerable margin:

Whenever we receive a request for a designated pedestrian crossing (either a traffic light controlled one or Zebra crossing), there are numerous factors that have to be taken into account – the main factors I'll list below, but this list is by no means exhaustive.

Need versus desire:

- We have to balance the request for a crossing with the actual physical need for a crossing – how many pedestrians cross in a given location - both frequency and total number and how many would be reasonably expected in an average day (special occasions or events on the Severalls would not be taken into account for this as they could be addressed with temporary traffic management).
- What is the conflict between vehicles and pedestrian traffic (in it's simplest form, how long does it take for pedestrians to cross the road at this location).
- Has there been any recorded incidents between pedestrians and vehicles in the specific location?

Site restrictions:

- Is there the physical highway space to permit a fully controlled crossing in the location? A crossing must be in a safe location and be installed so as not to impede visibility or access to other road users or private accesses etc. A certain amount of line of site is also required for traffic light controlled crossings.
- In locations where a controlled crossing cannot be provided, a pedestrian refuge island is an alternative suggestion that requires far less road space.
- Any change must be positive and in turn, not cause detriment to any of the highway users be they foot or vehicle traffic.

Impact to traffic.

- Traffic Flow must be taken into account. Particularly in towns such as Newmarket that already have established and long standing problems with traffic movement through town.
- Any form of controlled crossing can massively impact traffic flow – in some cases to the point the crossing becomes more of a problem than the issues it was installed to relieve.
- This is the main reason why Zebra Crossings are no longer commonly installed – as they cause massive disruption to traffic flow that cannot be mitigated.
- Any crossings would have to have the flow of traffic factored into their phasing – particularly when looking at all four approaches to the roundabout and would likely have to be programmed to work with each other – so that flow of vehicles can be maximised against the crossing priorities.

Cost.

- A controlled crossing point is extremely expensive: The cheapest I have seen was circa £90'000 – and I have seen schemes estimated at over £250'000 – each site is different and each can vary hugely depending on the

level of construction needed, but also if Third Party utilities are present etc (for example, Anglian Water will charge over £10'000 to move a water pipe for any form of construction or highways engineering – and fibre optics far more).

- Zebra crossings are cheaper – but have a far higher impact to traffic flow (beginning at circa £40'000) and are unlikely to meet approval here.
- Pedestrian refuge islands are cheaper still – and require the least space and do not effect traffic flow particularly, but do not offer priority to pedestrians. (These are anything from £30'000+)
- Pelican and Puffin crossings are essentially the same (both are traffic light controlled crossings that prioritise pedestrians. The main difference between them is where the signals for pedestrians are located. For Pelican crossings, they are on the opposite side of the road, for Puffins, they are on the same side. Pelican crossings are seen as the safer, if more expensive option (15% or so costlier than Puffins due to the extra infrastructure needed).

The crossing on Fordham Road will likely be the simplest and cheapest – as this is in essence upgrading a normal traffic light to a Pelican or Puffin Crossing light and improving the road crossing point itself. The additional infrastructure required will be minimal to installing an entirely new traffic lighting setup and the phasing of the crossing can be introduced relatively simply into the existing light phases (in essence turning the 3 way lights into 4 way lights – the current priorities would remain the same with an 'as and when' system for the crossing itself). A pedestrian refuge island would not be appropriate here – but could likely be sited closer to the roundabout.

Bury Road will likely be the next simplest location. There are clear lines of site available to install a Pelican Crossing here, subject to approval etc. I believe that the site identified approximately 50 yards further away than the current 'dimple slab' crossing point would be the most likely to receive approval. This is also a site where a refuge island would be a practical (if not as popular) alternative.

The 'courtesy crossing' on the High Street side of the roundabout is not ideal as – in my opinion, it is rather too close to the roundabout itself. The only alternative suggestion for this is to install a crossing further back to increase line of site. The courtesy crossing would have to be removed (and there would be a loss of parking in the bays to the left as traveling down High Street. Moving back would only be allowed if there was sufficient space between the roundabout and the Rous Road junction (I believe this is marginal as to whether there is space). I do not think the road width is sufficient here to allow for a refuge island without reconstructing areas of the footway to widen the road space available.

Old Station Road is the most tricky of the approaches: This has the most restricted lines of site for traffic leaving the roundabout and pedestrian attempting to cross. This has also got the closest adjoining junction of all the sites (the Moulton Road junction). I find it unlikely that there would be sufficient space to permit a controlled crossing to be installed between the roundabout and the Moulton Road junction. This is the one approach where I suspect that only a pedestrian refuge island would be considered.

As explained during our site meeting, I can offer advice or suggestions as to the location of potential crossings – or alternatives where possible, but the final authority lies with our Safety and Speed Team and our Asset Management Team for Carriageways.

The next step is to consider a feasibility study and the source of funding required: Suffolk Highways does not have any funding to support these applications from either our Reactive or Capital budgets. Such installations have to be provided at a more local level – usually with a combination of different grants and funding streams (such as CIL, section 106, Strategic works, Local Highways budgets etc). We cannot consider an application until it can be reasonably expected that the scheme can be funded (unless under exceptional circumstances).

A full feasibility study is required in each location where a crossing is requested. This can be a study for the entire roundabout and all approaches – but I suggest breaking this down into the order of preference. From our meeting, I would take that to be:

1. Fordham Road.
2. Bury Road.
3. High Street.
4. Old Station Road.

I have attached a feasibility study that was undertaken in Thurston following a request to turn a courtesy crossing point into either a Zebra or Pelican crossing – so that you can see the level of investigation that is required for each site in the first instance:

This cost of the feasibility report includes for:

- Site visits
- Vehicle survey
- Pedestrian survey
- Design considerations
- Utility requests
- Designer hazard identification
- Design and construction estimate
- Feasibility Report

This report cost £3530.77 (although this was in 2022 and our prices have increased since then). These feasibility studies are often funded by the respective County Councillors from their LHB budget.

I have also attached a very rough site plan above:

Red lines show the approximate locations of the existing dropped kerb/dimple slab crossing points – including the courtesy crossing on the Highstreet.

The Green lines show the suggested ‘best fit’ locations for a traffic light controlled crossing point – these locations are subject to approval, but I believe they are the most likely sites for each of the approaches given the comments on the day.

The Yellow lines show the approximate are where a pedestrian refuge island may be considered as a secondary alternative to a full crossing.

I appreciate there is an awful lot of information in this follow-up. I’m afraid there is no way of reducing the amount and still giving you a reasonably comprehensive update. I’m more than happy to arrange another meeting or to answer any additional questions you might have – I’m also available on Microsoft Teams or over the phone if you wish to discuss any matters. As we hinted on during our meeting – I can go a fair way into the process before any costs are involved for any particular issue.

Kind regards.

Matthew Fox,

Community Liaison Engineer.

Suffolk Highways | Rougham Service Delivery Centre, Rougham Industrial Estate, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP30 9ND

Tel: 0345 606 6171 www.suffolk.gov.uk/highways



Proposed Zebra Crossing Sandpit Lane, Thurston – Feasibility Report





Document Control

Issue	Date	Change Summary	Author	Checker	Approver
Rev00	08/06/2022	First Draft	DS	JC	MK
Rev01	05/08/2022	Revised following comments from Asset Managers	DS	-	MK



Contents

Background	3
Zebra Crossings	3
Methodology.....	4
Accident Data.....	4
Traffic Speed Survey	5
Quantitative Crossing Assessment.....	5
Modified Quantitative Crossing Assessment	6
Community, Connectivity and Desire Line	8
Road Geometry and Visibility	8
Engineering Measures.....	9
Road Network Implications	10
Comments from Road Safety and Speed Management Team.....	11
Comments from Asset Maintenance Manager	11
Comments from the Street Lighting Manager.....	11
Indicative Cost to Construct a Zebra Crossing.....	12
Conclusion.....	12

Appendix A – Photographs of Northbound and Southbound Approaches



Background

Thurston parish council has commissioned Suffolk Highways to assess the suitability of a Zebra Crossing on Sandpit Lane, Thurston. Sandpit Lane is an unclassified road (U4920) which links the north and east of Thurston, to the south of Thurston and further afield junction 46 of the A14.

At the proposed Zebra Crossing location there is an existing raised speed table which also acts as an uncontrolled crossing point. There is a junction with School Road approximately 10m south of the crossing point, a formal northbound bus stop approximately 30m to the north, and an informal southbound bus stop immediately adjacent to the crossing point.

Along this section of Sandpit Lane, there is a footpath on the west side, but no footpath on the east side. The speed limit is 30mph by virtue of street lighting, and the road width at the crossing point is 5.6m.

Zebra Crossings

Zebra Crossings give pedestrians and cyclists a right of way over vehicles and rely upon motorists identifying pedestrians waiting to cross (rather than being signalled to stop). Zebra Crossings can allow pedestrians to cross on busy roads with a continuous vehicle traffic flow, and can be installed when pedestrian numbers and vehicle flows are moderate.

The provision of formal crossings should be targeted at groups who experience most difficulty. Sometimes, drivers do not stop when a pedestrian is waiting to cross whilst the pedestrian assumes that a driver will stop. Subsequently, Zebra Crossings can be unsuitable for young, vulnerable, or inexperienced pedestrians. The elderly benefit more from Zebra Crossings, because the traffic on a busy road might require them to move quickly to cross. Blind or partially blind people find Zebra Crossings harder to use than signal-controlled crossings.

Any formal crossing must be seen within the wider context of the street in which it sits. A new Zebra Crossing would include street lighting and beacons to the latest specification, and be clearly delineated with Zebra and zig-zag road markings. Installing a new Zebra Crossing depends upon having the necessary resources to initially design and construct the scheme, and then to maintain the crossing over time to the required highways standards.



Methodology

To assess the need for a Zebra Crossing, the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles needed to be quantified with robust data. To measure the degree of conflict between pedestrians wanting to cross the road, and the two-way traffic flow, Suffolk Highways commissioned a 3-day CCTV survey between Thursday 13th January – Saturday 15th January. A 3-day survey period was chosen so the peak periods could be identified, and the weekday and weekend data could be compared.

The daytime weather conditions were good for the time of year – sunny with a high of 9 degrees Celsius (Thursday), sunny with a high of 7 degrees Celsius (Friday), sunny intervals with a high of 8 degrees Celsius (Saturday). The CCTV survey was taken between 7am–7pm, during term-time. Despite the good weather conditions for the time of year, it can be safely assumed that the pedestrian demand would increase in spring/summer/autumn months. The time of year does need to be considered when making assumptions about the survey data.

A CCTV survey can classify the type of vehicle travelling past the crossing point and differentiate between cars, heavy goods vehicles, buses, motorcycles, and pedal cycles. The survey can also differentiate between the type of pedestrian, and classify them by their age and ability. Once the peak periods were identified, the raw data was then manipulated by Suffolk Highways (by applying multiplying factors), to take into consideration the classification of vehicles and the type of pedestrians. Please refer to the section on the Modified Quantitative Crossing Assessment for more information.

A 7-day vehicle speed assessment was also undertaken by Suffolk Highways - this will ultimately be required as Zebra Crossings can only be installed on roads where the 85th percentile speed is below 35mph.

Accident Data

If a formal crossing is being considered, then the existing accident records for the proposed location must be investigated to identify any patterns. Accident data was obtained from 'AccsMap' over a 10-year period between 1st Jan 2011 - 30th Nov 2021. There were no reported accidents during this 10-year period.

However, Thurston Parish Council have reported near misses at the existing crossing point. The crossing point is located on a raised speed table which is causing indecision between pedestrians and vehicles, and who has the right of way.

Traffic Speed Survey

Traffic speeds were recorded on Sandpit Lane during a 7-day period between 27th January - 2nd February 2022. The speeds were recorded in both directions, at roughly 50m before the crossing site. The data collected during the traffic speed survey has been summarised below.

Zebra Crossings should not be installed on roads with an 85th percentile speed of 35mph or above. If average speeds are too high, then other traffic calming measures are needed. The speed data reveals that the average 85th percentile speed for both 7-day and 5-day period were below 35mph, therefore, the existing traffic speeds meet the criteria for proposing a Zebra Crossing.

	Sandpit Lane – South bound Approach	Thedwastre Road – Northbound Approach
Mean Speed	26mph	26mph
85th Percentile Speed	30mph	31mph

Quantitative Crossing Assessment

The quantitative crossing assessment is a calculation used by highway authorities to assess the need for a particular type of pedestrian crossing facility. The assessment factor measures the degree of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles at the busiest times, and then compares the results to intervention levels dictated by the Department for Transport (DfT).

The calculation factor is calculated as PV^2 , where V is the 2-way total hourly flow of vehicles, and P is the 2-way total hourly flow of pedestrians crossing the road (within 50m on either side of proposed location). Generally, the intervention level for providing a central refuge is if the average PV^2 value is above 0.4×10^8 . To justify a Zebra Crossing, the average PV^2 should exceed 0.6×10^8 . A signal-controlled crossing would be appropriate if the average PV^2 value exceeded 0.9×10^8 .



Modified Quantitative Crossing Assessment

Pedestrians with good mobility are free to cross a road anywhere, as long as traffic speeds are reasonably low and there are sufficient gaps in the traffic. Many people can cross a carriageway without the need for a specific crossing point, however, as traffic speeds and vehicle flows increase, vulnerable people may find it harder, and are more likely to need a dedicated facility in order to safely cross the carriageway.

Crossings are important for all road users, but are a key part of enabling some groups, particularly mobility and visually impaired people, to navigate independently. The Equality Act 2010 places a duty on public sector authorities to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty when carrying out their functions. This includes making reasonable adjustments to the existing built environment to ensure infrastructure is accessible to all.

The advice previously stipulated by the DfT has now been superseded - now the crossing assessment data should be modified to make it more robust and informative for a given location. Now pedestrian surveys should also record the type of pedestrian - as these groups are particularly significant when assessing the crossing difficulty at a particular site. These may include:

- Visually impaired people,
- Mobility impaired people,
- Children,
- Older people,
- People with pushchairs.

The advice from the DfT also stated that the types of vehicles during the peak periods should also be quantified. A classified count can give an accurate breakdown of a particular class of vehicles using a particular road, these may include:

- Cars
- Light Goods Vehicles
- Heavy Goods Vehicles
- Buses
- Cyclists
- Motorcyclists

To better reflect the composition of pedestrian and vehicle conflict during the peak periods, Suffolk Highways applied multiplying factors to each type of pedestrian, and each classification of vehicle, please refer to the summary table on page 7.



	Thursday 13 th Jan	Friday 14 th Jan	Saturday 15 th Jan
Peak Traffic Flow per Hour	96	87	58
Modified Peak Traffic Flow per Hour	126	109	67
Peak Pedestrian Flow per Hour	85	86	36
Modified Peak Pedestrian Flow per Hour	97	98	38
Modified PV2	0.015x10 ⁸	0.012x10 ⁸	0.0017x10 ⁸
Zebra Crossing Intervention Level	0.6x10 ⁸	0.6x10 ⁸	0.6x10 ⁸

The modified quantitative crossing assessment factor showed that there was insufficient conflict between the number of vehicles and number of pedestrians to justify a Zebra Crossing (when compared to the intervention levels set out by the DfT).

There could be a latent demand if a Zebra Crossing was installed, we define 'latent demand' as the additional number of pedestrian journeys generated as a consequence of a crossing being provided.

Community, Connectivity and Desire Line

The proposed Zebra Crossing location will match the existing crossing point, and the desire line for pedestrians accessing the village centre, railway station and New Green Community Centre, from the School Road area.

There is no footpath on the east side of the carriageway down the majority of Sandpit Lane and Thedwastre Road. Therefore, the Zebra Crossing would also be used by pedestrians travelling to and from the north and south of the village. In recent years, a new housing development has been built to the east of Sandpit Lane (Meadow Brown Way), and there are a several potential new housing developments to the north of the village.

Recently, 2no. Zebra Crossings have been constructed outside the primary school on Nowton Road at the top of Sandpit Lane. A Zebra Crossing on Sandpit Lane may help promote walking to school and throughout the wider community.

Road Geometry and Visibility

Zebra Crossings require good visibility and a lack of other distractions to maximise the chances of motorists seeing pedestrians. Yellow beacons indicate the presence of a Zebra Crossing and must be provided at each end of the crossing. The guiding principle should be to make sure vehicles can see them in time to react. There are no set locations, but they are normally placed on the nearside, closest to approaching traffic. For Sandpit Lane, the yellow beacons may be more suitable on the offside to the approaching traffic – particularly on the northbound approach where there is a bend in the carriageway, please refer to Appendix A.

The visibility of approaching vehicles or waiting pedestrian should not be obscured or restricted by factors such as parked vehicles, trees, or street furniture. There must be no obstacles on the pavement and a reasonably straight road geometry. On Sandpit Lane, the Zebra Crossing beacons may be partially obscured by the mature trees (as well as pedestrian visibility, and illumination of the crossing point). These trees may need to be cut back significantly (if not protected by a Tree Protection Order) and maintained over time - this may attract objections from residents. The Zebra Crossing design may opt for yellow beacons to be situated on the offside for both the northbound and south bound approaches to avoid these mature trees.

There are not many distractions close to this crossing facility, but the concentration of motorists may be affected by manoeuvres at the School Road junction, or manoeuvres associated with the bus stop. The sight lines and how these are affected by parked buses would need to be investigated. This may be an issue if the southbound yellow beacon is situated on the offside approach, and northbound buses are waiting at the



bus stop. Please refer to the section Road Network Implications for the southbound bus stop. Fortunately, parked cars and street furniture are not an issue at this location.

The footpath width will have to be widened on the west side, so pedestrians can safely pass any pedestrians waiting at the crossing point. If the footpath needs to be widened, there could potentially be complications acquiring the adjacent private land. Building out the footway into the carriageway is not possible due to the narrow width of the carriageway.

Fortunately, the proposed Zebra Crossing is located at an existing dropped crossing which is of adequate width, so there is no need to make alterations to the kerb line. The carriageway level is suitable for mobility impaired people as the raised speed table reduces the kerb upstand. There are also existing tactile paving on both side of the crossing for visually impaired pedestrians.

The controlled area of Zebra Crossings is defined by zig-zags markings, these make Zebra Crossings more conspicuous, and keep the approaches clear from parked vehicles. The number of zig-zag markings will need to be reduced at the Sandpit Lane location due to the proximity of the junction to School Road. The regulations allow for the number of zig-zag marks to be reduced to a minimum of two - where the local authority is satisfied that the layout or character of the road makes it impractical to provide eight. However, reducing the number of zig-zag marks also impact on visibility. The approaches to the Zebra Crossing will need to be resurfaced to provide adequate skid resistance. This will make the new crossings more conspicuous (before the entire road is resurfaced), but also add to the cost.

The proposed Zebra Crossing is adjacent to the Sandpit Lane junction with School Road. The associated vehicle manoeuvres may affect the concentration of drivers and their ability to recognise the beacons and react to waiting pedestrians. It is not envisaged that the tracking of large vehicle will be affected by the presence of the Zebra Crossing, but the new stop line will have to be positioned accordingly.

The potential issues detailed above will be scrutinised by an independent stage 2 Road Safety Audit after the Zebra Crossing has been designed.

Engineering Measures

As the yellow beacons to the Zebra Crossing are illuminated there would need to be an electrical design to this scheme. A desk-top study of the underground services has shown that there are numerous services within the highway. These services may affect the ability to duct electrical equipment and situate foundations during construction. Trial holes may be needed during the design phase to ascertain the exact alignment and depth of the underground services - this may lead to a significant increase in the construction costs. Locating a yellow beacon on the nearside southbound approach may be difficult due to the B.T. underground service in the verge (as well as the



impeded tree), subsequently, the beacon may have to be located on the offside instead. There are no overhead power lines that would make constructing and maintaining the Zebra Crossing a hazard.

It is unlikely that the kerb alignment will be altered as part of the design. However, the surface water drainage in the vicinity would require investigating. There is currently a single kerb offset adjacent to the crossing on the western kerb line.

A Zebra Crossing would include street lighting and beacons to the latest specification, and be clearly delineated with Zebra and zig-zag road markings (and to begin with) a change in the road surface on each approach. Suitable measures would be put in place to reduce the environmental impact - the regulations allow for a shroud to be fitted to the beacons to reduce the amount of light entering neighbouring properties.

Road Network Implications

It is not anticipated that traffic movements in the local area would be adversely affected if a Zebra Crossing was constructed. The bus routes and vehicle movements would encounter insignificant delays. Delays would be minimal due to the crossing frequency at this location. Vehicle delays are typically 5 seconds for a single person crossing but may increase when irregular streams of people are crossing. It is not envisaged that any delays will overly affect the junction with School Road.

Importantly, a Zebra Crossing location will prevent passengers from alighting at the informal southbound bus stop. The southbound bus stop will have to be relocated, possibly further north, adjacent to Meadow Brown Way. Currently, the informal bus stop may already be creating a hazard by obscuring the crossing point when buses are alighting passengers. A Zebra Crossing could be safely situated without affecting any off-street accesses, and there would be no significant removal of on-street parking.

Construction a new Zebra Crossing would require a road closure (with a minor diversion) for approximately 2-weeks. This would be undertaken during the school holidays due to the proximity to the primary school. Passenger Transport would be consulted during the design stage to ensure that the delays to bus services would be minimised. The emergency services would be notified as part of the statutory legal noticing and when the road closure is booked.

Comments from Road Safety and Speed Management Team

The principle of upgrading the existing crossing point to a Zebra appears to be a feasible scheme, subject to any issues raised by the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit being addressed.

Comments from Asset Maintenance Manager

Consideration of the future maintenance burden associated with new infrastructure is essential, along with the ongoing power requirements associated with the electrical elements of this proposal, however, the Street Lighting Team are best placed to comment on this aspect. Maintenance of the road surface (where a higher specification would be required) would add cost and complexity to future maintenance activities. The costs and resource requirements associated with the future maintenance of the road markings, street furniture, consumption of electricity and the need to maintain vegetation would all be factors when considering the proposal as a whole.

To justify the increased asset and future maintenance burden associated this type of new facility, there must be tangible evidence of a problem and data that supports the requirement for such a proposal. From the data gathered as part of this feasibility assessment it appears that there is no crash history, nor a significant lack of speed limit compliance. Most importantly, the analysis of the volume of pedestrian movements in conflict with the volume of vehicle movements is significantly lower than the DfT threshold to recommend the need for a crossing facility of this sort. I appreciate that the data is merely a snapshot in time and that numbers may vary, but it appears that the timing and duration of the surveys seem appropriate to be representative of the typical conditions at this location. If the score was closer to the threshold one may consider that local and season variation, or latent demand, may justify the need for a crossing, however, given the disparity of the score to the required threshold, I can only conclude that there is not sufficient evidence to support the need for this type of facility given the future asset / maintenance burden this would create at a time when budgets are significantly stretched.

Comments from Street Lighting Manager

The installation of additional assets obviously will incur ongoing revenue costs. Should a Zebra Crossing be installed in this location, the existing lighting may need to be revised and potentially new units installed to comply with requirements of lighting such a crossing; a contrast in lighting is required to illuminate any users during the hours of darkness.

Indicative Cost to Construct a Zebra Crossing

The total cost of installing the Zebra Crossing is estimated below (excluding on-going maintenance costs). The estimate includes the professional services fee to design the scheme, and the civil, electrical and road marking work to construct the scheme. An independent Stage 2 Road Safety Audit would be undertaken between the professional services and construction phases.

If the scheme is being funded by an external source, Suffolk Highways would need to provide a fixed fee for both the professional services and construction phases, these fees would include a third party overhead charge and VAT.

	Estimated Design Cost	Estimated Construction Cost	Safety Audit	Legal Advertising Cost	Third Party Overhead Charge	VAT	Total (Inc. VAT)
Zebra Crossing	£8,000	£40,000 - £50,000	£1,500	£500	£9000	£11,800	£70,000 - £80,000

Conclusion

The survey data showed that the existing crossing is being regularly used by adults and children during the periods immediately before and after school. From the data it looks like the majority of the children were accompanied by an adult during these periods. Zebra Crossings are not entirely suitable for young pedestrians as they can assume motorists have seen them waiting and will stop accordingly. It would be prudent for the local schools to educate their pupils on road safety issues when they are not accompanied by an adult. Highways schemes are subject to independent road safety audits, but the safety audits cannot account for pedestrian/driver error.

Despite the risks associated with Zebra Crossings, there is already a similar situation at the existing crossing point, with the raised speed table causing indecision between pedestrians and vehicles. Fortunately, there have been no reported accidents during the past 10 years, but near-misses have been highlighted as a concern by Thurston Parish Council. If the indecision caused by the raised speed table is deemed a significant safety hazard, the most cost-effective solution would be to relocate the speed table to another location, or to install an alternative traffic calming measure. The



existing informal crossing point is performing well and is on the pedestrian desire line between the School Road housing estate and the communal facilities in the village. The existing crossing point is of adequate width, has a level surface, and tactile paving for visually impaired pedestrians.

Although a new pedestrian crossing facility would be welcomed by the local community, there may be frustrations from residents who object to the part-removal of the mature trees (so adequate sight lines can be achieved). Also, the footpath may have to be widened on the west side, so pedestrians can safely pass pedestrians waiting at the crossing point. If the footpath needs to be widened, there could be complications acquiring the adjacent private land to the west.

The CCTV survey showed that the existing crossing point is being used regularly throughout the day. This is particularly significant when considering the need for a Zebra Crossing - as motorists familiar with the area will be expecting pedestrians at the crossing point. However, the quantitative crossing assessment factor also showed that there was an insufficient conflict between the number of pedestrians and the number of vehicles to justify a Zebra Crossing. This is mainly due to the frequency of vehicles along Sandpit Lane - it appears that traffic flows are not delaying pedestrians a safe passage across the carriageway, and pedestrians would rarely have to wait for a significant period. Therefore, the quantitative crossing assessment has shown that a Zebra Crossing is not required at this location.

The demand for new crossings far exceeds the County Council's ability to provide funding for each request. Therefore, the need for new formal crossing facilities needs to be carefully assessed at each site so the best value can be obtained from the available resources. Suffolk County Council also needs to consider the lifespan and maintenance costs when considering new infrastructure. Unfortunately, the evidence compiled within this report shows that a Zebra Crossing would not be a cost-effective crossing facility at this location.

Blank

Townclerk

From: noreply@suffolk.gov.uk
Sent: 21 June 2023 10:51
To: Townclerk
Subject: Re: [~225508] SCC Highways ref 390898 - Mill Hill, Newmarket

Dear Cathy Whitaker,

Thank you for contacting us regarding Mill Hill, Newmarket reported under reference number **390898**. Please quote this reference number in any future correspondence that relates to this issue.

We can now provide you with the following update from the Safety and Speed team:

Unfortunately, the Safety and Speed Management Team do not introduce by-laws to restrict parking. The elimination of parking would be achieved by the installation of waiting restrictions with an associated Traffic Regulation Order, however, it is noted from the e-mail correspondence within this report that this is not an option that the Town Council wish to pursue.

Information about how Suffolk's highways are managed can be found on our website here:

www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/.

If you wish to track progress of your report, please use the following link:

<https://highwaysreporting.suffolk.gov.uk/?id=00277452>

If you did not report this problem online, please be aware that you can make payments, report problems and find information about Council services by visiting our website www.suffolk.gov.uk

Please do not use the reply function of this message. This mailbox is not monitored and therefore your email will not be seen.

If you'd like to contact us then you can do so in a number of ways - full details are available on our website at the link below:

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/about/contact-us/>

Kind regards,

Liz
Customer Service
Suffolk County Council

Join us online!

Avoid the telephone queues and help us save a little money by going online, there's lots of information which may answer your question about the council or our services on our website www.suffolk.gov.uk

Got a question? Then why not contact us on social media

From: Matthew Fox <

Sent: 19 June 2023 15:16

To: Cathy Whitaker <

Subject: Newmarket site meeting follow-up.

Parking restrictions/Bylaws, Exning Road.

Suffolk Highways do not make Bylaws themselves – these can only usually be raised at a County level. However, there are no specific Bylaws to prevent parking on verges. This is not a specific offence and since the devolution of parking enforcement to the District Councils, it is extremely unlikely that Suffolk County Council would consider applying for one here.

As mentioned during our meeting the only enforceable restriction here would be to consider double-yellow lines as these prohibit parking on the full width of the highway (carriageway, footway, verge etc). As these require a Traffic Regulation Order, this type of application can be extremely expensive – and give no guarantee that restrictions would be approved.

An alternative to this and one that has been previously suggested (and also one that has been used in other areas with great success) is for Newmarket TC to install planters/knee rail type fencing along the verges in question as a physical barrier to prevent parked vehicles damaging verges – particularly in areas with planted bulbs etc.

As well as giving a considerably quicker resolution than an application for Double-Yellow lines – which take upwards of 18 months, these are also a vastly cheaper option and offer an aesthetic benefit that road markings do not.

I've attached a copy of our street-furniture license application above. These works have to be funded by the Parish/Town Council. The County Councillors can contribute towards this from their LHB fund – but this has to be arranged retrospectively, after the works have been completed.

Townclerk

From: Richard Smith (SCC Councillor) <richard.smith@suffolk.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 June 2023 12:03
To: Townclerk; Matthew Hicks (SCC Councillor); Paul West (SCC Councillor)
Cc: Andy Drummond (SCC Councillor); Rachel Hood (SCC Councillor)
Subject: RE: 20's Plenty for Suffolk motion

Dear Cathy Whitaker

Thank you for sending me the views of Newmarket Town Council concerning 20mph speed limits.

Many would disagree with the views expressed by members of your Town Council, and the County Council has no plans to implement blanket 20mph speed limits, except on a detailed case-by-case basis through the well-established Traffic Regulation Orders, where special local circumstances apply, proven by data and surveys. I am thus not willing to write to the Secretary of State for Transport, but this, of course, does not preclude your Town Council from doing so.

I am sorry that this reply will disappoint your members.

Yours sincerely

Richard Smith
Richard Smith, MVO
Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Transport Strategy and Waste
County Councillor for the Blything Division

From: Townclerk <Townclerk@newmarket.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2023 1:51 PM
To: Matthew Hicks (SCC Councillor) <Matthew.Hicks@suffolk.gov.uk>; Richard Smith (SCC Councillor) <richard.smith@suffolk.gov.uk>; Paul West (SCC Councillor) <Paul.West@suffolk.gov.uk>
Cc: Andy Drummond (SCC Councillor) <Andy.Drummond@suffolk.gov.uk>; Rachel Hood (SCC Councillor) <Rachel.Hood@suffolk.gov.uk>
Subject: 20's Plenty for Suffolk motion

 **EXTERNAL EMAIL: Don't click any links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe. Click [here](#) for more information or help from Suffolk IT**

Dear Councillors,
Please find attached a motion letter from Newmarket Town Council.

Regards,

Cathy Whitaker

Clerk to Newmarket Town Council

I am working flexibly so may send emails outside of normal office hours.

There is no expectation that you will respond outside of your normal working hours.



Townclerk

From: WestSuffolk <westsuffolk@notifications.service.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 June 2023 14:38
To: Townclerk
Subject: Update to West Suffolk Local Plan timeline



Dear Consultee

Thank you for your interest to date in the West Suffolk Local Plan.

As you may be aware the council has undergone a change in administration and councillors are currently working through a number of priorities, one of those being the emerging West Suffolk Local Plan.

West Suffolk have reviewed the timetable for preparing the local plan and remain committed to progressing the West Suffolk Local Plan with a very small adjustment.

The programme has been slightly amended to consult on the final draft (Regulation 19 proposed submission) local plan in January 2024 rather than November and December to avoid consulting during the holiday period. Available at https://www.westsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/Planning_Policies/upload/Local-Development-Scheme-web-June-2023.pdf

Significant progress has been made to date and West Suffolk through its officers and a working group comprising a cross party mix of councillors, will continue to make progress in reviewing the submissions submitted from the preferred options consultation which took place in May 2022.

We have looked at the various evidence, and we have had ongoing conversations with infrastructure providers and stakeholders to help test the deliverability of sites within the plan period and understand any barriers that would at first need to be overcome.

This has informed the ongoing work in the drafting of planning policies and the selection of sites for housing and employment. All of this has been in readiness for consulting on the draft West Suffolk Local Plan (Proposed Submission, Regulation 19).

As you are registered on our consultation database, you will be informed of the consultation dates of the submission plan later this year.

Kind Regards

Marie Smith
Strategic Planning Service Manager
West Suffolk Council

Deputy Town Clerk

From: Greater Cambridge Partnership <greatercambridge@public.govdelivery.com>
Sent: 19 June 2023 18:28
To: Deputy Town Clerk
Subject: Making Connections update

[View as a webpage](#)



Making Connections update

Following the publication of the Making Connections public consultation report and discussion at the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) Joint Assembly, the GCP Executive Board is now getting the chance to discuss the findings of the survey.

The consultation which took place in late 2022, set out to transform the bus network alongside better walking and cycling infrastructure that would be funded by the phased introduction of a road-user charge.

The five members of the board will meet on Thursday 29 June to be presented with the public's feedback on the proposals as well as scrutiny

from the recent Joint Assembly. You will be able to view the meeting live at www.youtube.com/GreaterCambridgePartnership

Assembly members agreed something had to change on the original proposals to balance the public's support for better buses and enhanced walking and cycling links, with survey respondents concerns about the introduction of a Sustainable Travel Zone.

The Board is being presented with a range of scenarios for modifying the scheme, which include potential changes such as peak hour only charges, exemptions for patients and visitors to the NHS hospitals, the idea of 'free days', or reducing the charge.

Finally, the Board will be asked whether they support further technical assessments required for an Outline Business Case to be presented to the GCP and Cambridgeshire County Council meetings in the autumn 2023.

As well as the Executive Board, there will also be a unique Joint Assembly and Executive Board meeting on Monday 26 June which was requested for the presentation of additional material to be scrutinised.

For more information about the GCP's transport projects visit: www.greatercambridge.org.uk.

This email address isn't monitored, if you'd like to get in touch, please email: contactus@greatercambridge.org.uk. We're on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [Instagram](#): @GreaterCambs.

Update your subscriptions, modify your password or email address, or stop subscriptions at any time on your [subscriber preferences page](#). You will need to use your email address to log in. If you have questions or problems with the subscription service, please visit subscriberhelp.govdelivery.com.

This email was sent to dtc@newmarket.gov.uk using GovDelivery Communications Cloud on behalf of: Greater Cambridge Partnership · PO Box 1493, 4 Regent Street · Cambridge, CB1 0YR



Blank