

Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Tuesday 7th February 2017 at 7.00pm at Haverhill Arts Centre, Haverhill, Suffolk, CB9 8AR



HAVERHILL
TOWN COUNCIL

Present: Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman)
Councillor B McLatchy (Vice Chairman)
Councillor J Crooks
Councillor Q Fox
Councillor I McLatchy
Councillor D Roach
Councillor A Williams

Apologies: Councillor B Robbins

In Attendance: Councillor T Brown
Councillor J Burns

Colin Poole, Town Clerk
Vicky Phillips, Assistant Town Clerk

8 members of the public were present.

Welcome:

Councillor Hanlon welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised members of the public attending that the meeting was being recorded.

ACTION

- P17 /023** **Apologies for Absence**
The above apologies were noted.
- P17 /024** **Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation**
No declarations were made and no requests for dispensation had been received.
- P17 /025** **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**
Minutes of Meeting held 31st January 2017 were signed as a true record.
- P17 /026** **Matters arising from the Minutes**
None.
- P17 /027** **Public Forum on planning matters other than applications before the committee**
No member of public wished to speak on other matters.

P17 David Mosely, Persimmon Homes

/028 Mr Mosely gave a detailed presentation to the committee on the two planning applications before the committee. DC/16/2836/RM is a reserved matters application, the Outline Planning application having already been granted at Borough level. The application is for the first phase of a possible five phase development, this phase being for 203 residential homes, car parking, vehicle and access arrangements and landscaping.
The second application, DC/17/0048/FUL, is a change of use of land to highway use, due to changes in vehicular access from the original plans.

P17 Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated Powers (List A attached)

/029 No applications had been determined under delegated powers.

P17 Planning Applications currently before St. Edmundsbury Borough Council and received by publication of agenda (List B attached)

/030 Applications determined by the Committee are shown on List B attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)

P17 Matters to Report

/031 Cllr Burns reported that he and Cllr Tony Brown were attending a meeting with Suffolk County Council Highways regarding North East development transport.

P17 Date of next Meeting

/032 The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on Monday 20th February 2017.

Cllr Fox left the meeting at 8.50pm

P17 Closure

/033 The meeting was closed at 8.55pm.

Signed
Chairman

Date.....

Appendix (i)

List A – Approved by Chairman and Clerk under delegated powers

NONE

List B – Considered at the Committee Meeting

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
26.01.17 Expires 16.02.17	1	DC/16/2836/RM	<p>Submission of details under outline planning permission SE/09/1283/OUT – The appearance, layout, scale, access and landscaping for 203 dwellings, together with associated private amenity space, means of enclosure, car parking, vehicle and access arrangements together with proposed areas of landscaping and areas of open space for a phase of residential development know as Phase 1.</p> <p>The outline planning application was an environmental impact assessment application and an environment statement was submitted at that time.</p> <p>Mr David Moseley, Persimmon Homes</p>	Land NW of Haverhill, Ann Suckling Lane, Little Wratting	<p>Haverhill Town Council, whilst remaining supportive of the NW Haverhill Development, has a number of concerns about the detailed plans in this application. It therefore OBJECTS to this application on the following grounds:</p> <p>Density and Parking – the Developer has labelled various first floor rooms as ‘offices’ rather than bedrooms. Some of these offices are as big as other bedrooms in the property and across the whole range, the smallest ‘office’ is still bigger than the smallest room labelled as a bedroom. We believe this arbitrary re-labelling of rooms is intended to reduce the number of parking spaces required per plot, when following the Suffolk Parking Guidance. We have examined the plans and, whilst they are very complicated, the evidence appears to bear this out. In addition, some plots have parking three-deep (plot 110) which is not acceptable or practical. Our measurements also called into question the width of the internal garages on some house types. These did not meet the 7x3m requirement under the parking</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>guide.</p> <p>We are concerned about the risk of on-road parallel parking blocking nose-in spaces and potentially causing difficulties for emergency and service vehicles as well as being a potential cause of ongoing neighbour disputes. We believe that under-provision of parking in order to pack in houses is a false economy. We note the proposal by Persimmon for residents permit parking. Such schemes are normally associated with a lack of parking spaces in areas of Victorian terraces. To propose this as a solution to any parking difficulties before the estate is even built is a tacit admission of failure of intent to provide sufficient parking in the first place.</p> <p>We are pleased that Persimmon's representative at our meeting agreed to go away and check that all the plots have acceptable parking provision with the offices counted as bedrooms and undertook to ensure the development conforms fully with the Suffolk Parking Guide.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Points – We understand that the Great Wilsey development in NE Haverhill has a requirement upon it to provide charging points. The same obligation does not appear to be placed upon this development</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>Surface Drainage - We are disappointed to be consulted on this application ahead of the submission by SCC Flood Officers on the SUDS proposals required for this development. Flooding is an issue and in the absence of a report stating otherwise, we take the view that the necessary flood mitigation measures are insufficient for this development and object on the grounds of insufficient flood mitigation for surface run-off and treatment of existing watercourses on the site.</p> <p>Highways – We would like Persimmon, as a goodwill gesture, to bring forward the commencement of the relief road. Whilst this will be an excellent stance from a PR viewpoint, it will also resolve issues around construction traffic management, even if the new road is not given its final surface and just used for construction traffic alone.</p> <p>Conditions - Notwithstanding our above objections, we request that conditions are set in respect on the construction phase. These should be to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - prevent unnecessary disturbance to residents in Ann Suckling Way; 2 - avoid deliveries during times of peak school traffic (Wratting Road/Chalkstone Way junction is a problem already, without lorries adding

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>to the risk of poor air quality).</p> <p>3 – Provide a wheel wash well inside the site boundary so that no mud is brought onto the road, as this is a very heavy clay area.</p> <p>To conclude, we do not feel that resolving any of these objections should prove insurmountable for Persimmon to achieve. We would also add that the general design of the proposed buildings and layout (bar the density and parking) are welcomed. We anticipate being able to withdraw our objections following amendments and reassurances being received.</p>
24.01.17 Expires 14.02.17	2	DC/17/0048/FUL	<p>Change of use of land to highway use for 2 no. points of vehicular access / egress to public highway – Haverhill Road and Hard-standing for foot / cycle way – following planning application – SE/09/1283</p> <p>Persimmon Homes</p>	Access to land off Haverhill Road, Little Wrattling	<p>The Council OBJECTS to this planning application for change of use to form 2 access points onto the Wrattling Road/Haverhill Road. The objection is on the following grounds:</p> <p>Highways – Concern over the safety of the arrangement outside plots 193/4 where a shared driveway from a number of homes crosses the pavement. This pavement being the footway from the new development to Samuel Ward Academy, it is dangerous to have emerging traffic on what is a non-protected crossing. These houses should have an access which joins the highway inside the development.</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>Highways – Concern over the safety of traffic emerging from the proposed new access road onto the Haverhill Road opposite Wratting Croft. Traffic leaving the new roundabout heading south will be accelerating towards this point and therefore drivers of vehicles emerging from the new access road will find it very difficult to accurately judge the speed of approach of these oncoming vehicles. There will also be issues about southbound traffic wishing to turn right into the new access road causing delays potentially backing up to the roundabout. This may be exacerbated by the proximity of this proposed access road to Ann Suckling Road, so two sets of cars waiting to turn right will cause issues.</p> <p>Highways – Concern over the additional vehicles joining the Haverhill Road. Original plans had these joining at the new roundabout so that traffic heading West would turn immediately onto the relief road. This alternative proposal means this traffic will join the northbound queue of vehicles at the new roundabout. This needs to be modelled. The original plan to have a minor link road from the Southern estate to the main spine crossing the new linear park would be relatively quiet as far as traffic volume and speed would be concerned presenting little difficulty in providing pedestrian crossing servicing the park.</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>Given the minor inconvenience this original proposal offers it seems a better a far better option than this amended proposal. It would also resolve the issue of the driveway crossing as there would be no need for houses fronting the Haverhill Road to access directly onto it.</p> <p>Highways – Concern over the vision splays provided for the new access road. This needs to be suitable for the actual speed of traffic on this road, which we believe is significantly higher than the legal limit. The new tree planting shown on the Haverhill Road would impinge on the vision of emerging traffic.</p> <p>Highways – Ann Suckling Road junction’s vision splay and entrance need revision to slow down traffic turning into it and to ensure maximum safety. Whilst on the edge of the development, the proposals for the development impact the safety of this.</p> <p>The Council would like to express its disappointment that we were required to comment on this application before the highways report, vital to the consideration of the application, was available.</p>

Appendix (ii) – P17/030 Report of contributions made by Councillors, the public and David Mosely (DM)

Mrs Goodwin, raised concerns regarding traffic leaving Ann Suckling Road at the junction onto Haverhill Road. As the relief road will not be built before the development commences, this will add pressure onto an already dangerous and congested road. Traffic builds up on Wratting Road / Haverhill Road at several times of the day which makes it very difficult to get out.

DM had given a presentation to the public last week and a lot of residents had raised access concerns. The relief road will be built within 5 years, or the occupation of the first 500 homes, as part of a legal binding bond laid down at the Outline Planning Permission stage. The proposed roundabout will be a deflection to slow down traffic before reaching the proposed 2 points of access to the development.

Mrs Goodwin pointed out that this would not slow down traffic approaching Ann Suckling Road from the Cangle side of Haverhill.

Mrs V Phillips had concerns about cars parked along Ann Suckling Road obstructing traffic entering Ann Suckling Road. This meant that vehicles often need to drive on the wrong side of the road. This was also near a greens space where children often play and she felt this was extremely dangerous. Mrs Phillips suggested traffic lights should be put in at the junction of Ann Suckling Road and Wratting Road/Haverhill Road.

Cllr B McLatchy was concerned about construction vehicles during the building stage. DM explained that these would need to follow conditions of the Outline Planning Application, although there would be an influx at the start of construction, but then they would stay on site.

Cllr Q Fox was concerned about the small private access drive on to Haverhill Road, DM suggested that this could be taken back to the Architects to be designed out.

Cllr Q Fox asked about the funding for Healthcare Provision. DM confirmed that Persimmon are obliged to contribute towards capital projects but are not responsible for exactly how or where this is spent. This would be the same for the Education provision. There would be an audit trail at the Borough.

Cllr Burns mentioned that Nitrogen dioxide levels were already at the limited on Withersfield Road. Construction vehicles would add to this problem. He suggested that Persimmon build the by-pass first as a goodwill gesture, this would help relieve congestion and make access easier for construction traffic. DM could not commit to this, but would report back.

Cllr Roach reiterated residents and councillors concerns regarding traffic management concerns and agreed that the earlier delivery of the relief road would be a fantastic thing for Haverhill.

Cllr Hanlon raised the point that on the plans, office space was being shown rather than bedrooms and this would affect the parking provision. DM will clarify to the Town Council. CP mentioned that other estates in Haverhill had parking issues and was it necessary to pack in housing so tightly.

Cllr Hanlon questioned the distance that some people would need to take out a wheelie bin to the collection point.

Cllr Q Fox asked who would be responsible for any parking permits put in place. DM clarified that this would be through a minimal level service charge and tenants and homeowners would be made aware of this at time of renting/purchase.

Cllr Brown asked for provision of electric car charging points to be considered.

Cllr Burns asked that the roads be adopted as soon as possible. DM confirmed that all roads would be of adoptable standard.

Cllr Hanlon raised the issue of water lying on the road by the old Fox public house, DM confirmed that water is held 'on-site' and drainage provision is made at the design stage for swales and attenuation ponds. This will be for Suffolk County Council experts to scrutinise.

Cllr Crooks was pleased to see that the historic track had been kept.

Cllr Brown asked who would be responsible for management the wooded area, DM confirmed that this would be a private management company.