

Save Our Country Spaces Response to WSP/SCC Technical Note

SOCS are in agreement with NORTH FRINGE PROTECTION GROUP'S POINTS.

1. Kesgrave Covenant site is being promoted (& the suggestion accepted) as an 'IGS Extension'-so should form part of SCC assessment. Their site could come on stream before the other IGS sites are completed and before the end of the plan period.

2. Debate on traffic impacts for this site during Examination as being 'challenging' and that mitigation is a 'possibility'.

SOCS disagree.

(i) The SCC modelling assumes that all necessary land for junction modifications Tuddenham/Humber DL is available. It isn't. There is a significant constraint being the wildlife site -ISPA4.1- which was 'Allocated' but now to be withdrawn. SCC said modifications will be required here (see ref page 2) as carriageway is 4.3 metres wide.

The road is very narrow and won't allow for Westerfield House Transport Strategy reserve matters solutions and proposals_ charity site has been approached for transport mitigation. This is likely precluded under the bequest outlined in the late Mr Woolf's will.

(ii) The land was erroneously included in the available sites and like withdrawn in modifications.

(iii) SCC not factored in are the significant peak numbers indicated Westerfield House Transport Report.¹

(iv) The illegal non compliant Gresham's site/ School site entrance/enforcement or rectification should be factored ?

(v) Gresham's, Club activity and events are a significant contribution to traffic.

(vi) The Hockey Club also generates traffic & hazard.

(vii) A business entrance opposite Humber Doucy Lane & Tuddenham Road is a hazard as is the lane behind vet's practice.

(viii) Constable Homes said they were having pre app discussions and suggested they would have a traffic entry point onto Tuddenham Road but that would lead to non compliance with constraints near the hump back bridge under the Manual for Highway's Design.

(ix) The SCC are entertaining shutting off adjacent roads like Chelsworth and Borrowdale loading of traffic on Tuddenham Road /Valley Road.

(x) Narrowing Colchester/Valley for bikes restricts

(xii) Sewage holding tanks may impact also between Westerfield & Tuddenham Road

(xiii) No data available from village traffic surveys (SAVID) appears to be fed into the WSP/SCC Modelling.

(xiv) Air Quality matters have been taken through the courts; the Coroner's November findings being material here.

(xv) Recent Ipswich Northern By pass proposal was only done as a desktop exercise with insufficient data and sensitivity. This exercise does not seem much better as it fails to identify and reflect the conditions, constraints and current pressures adequately. Traffic counts/surveys have not been done by WSP/SCC outside the perimeter of the Tuddenham Road Church Lane single traffic route with passing places area and through to the villages to our knowledge.

* ILLUSTRATION of Problem **page 2** Westerfield House/ Humber Doucy/Tuddenham Road is available but does not seem to be referenced? Sarah Hall Development Management Engineer Growth, Highways and Infrastructure²

¹ Ingent Consulting Engineers This transport assessment (TA (Reference no: DC/17/05571).

² TA 2.21 The peak traffic flow Automatic Traffic Count data reports that Humber Doucy Lane carried 714 vehicles during the peak am traffic flow (8am-9am) on its northern section and only 181 vehicles on its southern section. The information provided suggests that a number of vehicles travel between Tuddenham Road and Sidegate Lane/ Rushmere Road. It also reports that Humber Doucy Lane carried 588 vehicles during the peak pm traffic flow on its northern section and only 187 vehicles on its southern section. Tuddenham Road carried 1001 vehicles during the am peak traffic flow 8-9 and 920 during the pm peak traffic flow and the A1214 carried 1775 during the am peak traffic flow 7am-8am and 1693 vehicles between 8am-9am and 1915 vehicles during the pm peak traffic flow.

Illustration & REFERENCES WESTERFIELD HOUSE 14/01039/FUL/ DC/17/05571



Sarah Hall Development Management Engineer Growth, Highways and Infrastructure

1.1 Essential engineering requirements for roads acting as bus routes

- [?] A clear carriageway width of at least 6.2m must be consistently available, with any on-street parking provided off-carriageway in parallel dedicated bays (fig. 1).
- [?] Ideally bus routes should be designed with a standard minimum clear width of 6.5m.
- [?] Localised widening should be assumed on bends, in line with results of a realistic tracking exercise.
- [?] Alignment of the street must avoid needless and excessive changes in direction or priority.
- [?] Tracking should permit two buses to pass in opposing directions without the corners of vehicles, or tyres, typically needing to remain less than 200mm from the kerb for extended distances (fig. 2).
- [?] Tracking should be performed for 12.2m Scania K230UB single deck buses, for which a general arrangement is attached at Appendix A.
- [?] The front offside corner of the bus should never normally need to perform an excursion over the marked carriageway centreline. This will require localised widening on bends with tight radii. (figs. 3, 4)
- [?] Inside kerb radii of 25m represent a good minimum to avoid tracking problems along mainline carriageways.
- [?] Vertical deflection to achieve traffic calming should be avoided.

Fig. 3: Tight bends and limited visibility, combined with 6m width and uncontrolled on street parking means this road is not suitable for bus operation.



