

Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Tuesday 12th March at 7.00pm at Haverhill Arts Centre, Haverhill, Suffolk, CB9 8AR



HAVERHILL
TOWN COUNCIL

Present: Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman)
Mayor A Brown
Councillor Q Fox (Vice Chair)
Councillor B Robbins
Councillor L Smith

Apologies: Councillor J Crooks
Councillor M Byrne

In Attendance: Colin Poole, Clerk
Vicky Phillips, Assistant Clerk
Councillor J Burns
Chris Gatland, Redrow
Andy Ross, Royal Haskoning, Engineers

1 member of public attended

Welcome:

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

ACTION

P19 Apologies for Absence

/043 The above apologies were noted.

P19 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/044 No declarations of interest were made and no requests for dispensation had been received.

P19 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

/045 Minutes of Meeting held 26th February 2019 were signed as a true record.

P19 Matters arising from the Previous Minutes

/046 There were no matters arising from the previous minutes

P19 Public Forum on planning matters other than applications before the committee

Chris Gatland and Andrew Ross spoke on the two applications before the committee, a question and answer session then took place, see appendix ii

P19 Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated Powers (List A attached)

Applications determined under delegated powers, are shown in list A attached to the minutes, see Appendix (i)

P19 Planning Applications currently before St. Edmundsbury Borough Council and received by publication of agenda (List B attached)

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

P19 Matters to Report

/050 There were no matters to report.

P19 Date of next Meeting

/051 The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be on 2nd April 2019 at 7.00pm.

P19 Closure

/052 The meeting was closed at 8.50pm.

Signed
Chairman

Date.....

Appendix (i)

List A – Approved by Chairman and Clerk under delegated powers

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION

List B – Considered at the Committee Meeting

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
	1	DC/19/0224/FUL	– Temporary Holding Area		<p>STRONGLY OBJECT – The Town Council objects on the grounds of:</p> <p>Highways safety – The applicant fails to justify that the creation of a construction entrance onto the A143 and the dangers of that access to and from the highway for slow-moving HGV traffic and significant numbers of independent tradespeople. In particular,</p> <p>No provision of wheel washing on the site plans so failure to demonstrate a satisfactory distance from the public highway to ensure mud and water are not tracked onto the highway.</p> <p>The access point is close to an existing established access to the Persimmon site on the same road, meaning two road cleaning vehicles operating too close together, which would cause unnecessary delays leading to frustration of other drivers, leading to dangerous passing manoeuvres. In addition, this proposal unnecessarily adds HGV movement to that generated by Persimmon, on the same stretch of A143.</p> <p>The access arrangement does not</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>provide for a protected right turn into the site.</p> <p>The transport plan proposes to put several vehicles at a time out onto the public highway. These are unnecessary vehicle movements as the developer could transfer almost all vehicle movements to be internal to the main Great Wilsey site.</p> <p>Disturbance to Neighbours: The Council support concerns raised by the neighbouring property owners at Jessamine Cottage. "Temporary" is in fact 10 years+ and this property will be blighted by this proposal.</p> <p>Alternative safer access to the Highway can easily be created: The applicant is constructing a roundabout on the A143 adjacent to this proposed holding area, to provide access to the main Great Wilsey site. This would provide significantly safer access for construction vehicles onto the A143 and by definition ensure that problems with vehicles bringing mud onto the road happen on the private development access road and not the public highway.</p> <p>Damage to the public highway and disturbance to neighbours: Intrinsic to and indivisible from this proposal is the transport plan to send HGV vehicles via Wratting Road, Haverhill Road and Chalkstone Way to the proposed second access point for the development, rather than on an internal haul road or via the internal estate roads the applicant is proposing to construct. The applicant</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>has made it clear that this is specifically to avoid damaging their roadways and disturbing the residents of the new housing they are building. It follows that the applicant intends that 10 years' worth of wear and tear and disturbance, is in their opinion better suffered by the Highways authority and the existing residents. Chalkstone Way is a concrete carriageway covered with a layer of tarmac. It is suffering under normal use by estate traffic. It will not withstand HGVs being sent along it for 10 years+. Chalkstone Way has residential property backing onto it. In addition there is a secondary school, primary school and community sports ground on Chalkstone Way, generating pedestrian foot traffic alongside and across the public highway and a large amount of residential traffic.</p> <p>To conclude, the Town Council recommends refusal on the grounds that a safer access can be easily be achieved by the applicant via their own proposed roundabout and restricting as much HGV movement as possible to being entirely within the main site rather than via the public highway. The blight, disturbance and damage this proposal will cause are all avoidable.</p>
	2	DC/19/0225/FUL	Temporary construction access off Chalkstone Way associated with wider work at Great Wilsey Park	Land NE Haverhill, Wilsey Road, Little Wrattling	<p>Note, the location appears to be out of date and important features such the adjacent primary school and proposed new roundabout at Millfields Way are missing.</p> <p>STRONGLY OBJECT – The Town Council objects on the grounds of:</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>Highways safety – The applicant fails to justify that the creation of a construction entrance onto Chalkstone Way and the dangers of that access to and from the highway for slow-moving HGV traffic and significant numbers of independent tradespeople. In particular,</p> <p>No provision of wheel washing on the site plans so failure to demonstrate a satisfactory distance from the public highway to ensure mud and water are not tracked onto the highway.</p> <p>Disturbance to Neighbours: The access point is close to residential properties causing noise and dust disturbance.</p> <p>The access arrangement does not provide for a protected right turn into the site.</p> <p>The transport plan proposes to put several vehicles at a time out onto the public highway. These are unnecessary vehicle movements as the developer could transfer almost all vehicle movements to be internal to the main Great Wilsey site.</p> <p>Alternative safer access to the Highway can easily be created using the roundabout off the A143 being constructed by the applicant to serve the Gt Wilsey development. This would provide significantly safer access for construction vehicles to and from the site and by definition ensure that problems with vehicles bringing mud onto the road happen on the private</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>development access road and not the public highway.</p> <p>If the planning authority is minded to approve this application, then the access point off Chalkstone Way should be the new main access to the site opposite Millfields Way, which the Town Council fought hard to implement and not opposite Gannet Close. A Condition should be set requiring all traffic movements to be recorded at both sites to demonstrate any planning permission is not being exceeded.</p> <p>Damage to the public highway and disturbance to neighbours: Intrinsic to and indivisible from this proposal is the transport plan to send HGV vehicles via Wratting Road, Haverhill Road and Chalkstone Way between the two proposed access points for the development, rather than on an internal haul road or via the internal estate roads the applicant is proposing to construct. The applicant has made it clear that this is specifically to avoid damaging their roadways and disturbing the residents of the new housing they are building. It follows that the applicant intends that 10 years' worth of wear and tear and disturbance, is in their opinion better suffered by the Highways authority and the existing residents. Chalkstone Way is a concrete carriageway covered with a layer of tarmac. It is suffering under normal use by estate traffic. It will not withstand HGVs being sent along it for 10 years+. Chalkstone Way has residential property backing onto it. In addition there is a secondary school,</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>primary school and community sports ground on Chalkstone Way, generating pedestrian foot traffic alongside and across the public highway and a large amount of residential traffic.</p> <p>To conclude, the Town Council recommends refusal on the grounds that a safer access can be easily be achieved by the applicant via their own proposed roundabout and restricting as much HGV movement as possible to being entirely within the main site rather than via the public highway. The blight, disturbance and damage this proposal will cause are all avoidable.</p>

Appendix ii

DC/19/0224/FUL – Temporary Holding Area and DC/19/0225/FUL Temporary Construction Access

Christ Gatland (CG), Redrow and Andrew Ross (AR), Royal Haskoning Engineers

CG thanked the Town Council for inviting him and AR to tonight's meeting. The two applications submitted for the temporary construction access off Chalkstone Way and the temporary holding area off the A143, Wrattling Road are to regulate construction traffic and to manage transport to an acceptable level for neighbouring residents.

CG explained that Redrow are bringing forward building of 900 homes out of the 2,500 planned for the site. Redrow will commence the Northern Phase in a series of residential plots at the Northern end of the site, access being off the arm of the proposed roundabout on the A143 and development parcels at the Southern end of the site, off Chalkstone Way. This year will bring forward 500 of the 900 units. In the next 2 weeks applications will be submitted relating to the strategic site infrastructure; the spine road linking Haverhill Road and Chalkstone Way, green infrastructure, green open spaces, drainage attenuation and woodland. Reserved Matters applications will then be submitted for the first residential units for delivery of parcels A1, A2 and A8.

DC/19/0224/FUL

Members were then shown the site layout for the temporary holding area which showed the haul road which will feed into the site. CG explained that this area will contain construction traffic within the site, rather than on the public highway and to store construction materials, plant and welfare facilities. Satellite compounds will also be built within the development for the duration of time on site.

TB: Has spoken to a lot of residents and can't understand why the access for the temporary holding area needs to be where it is, TB suggested that a better solution would be to build the proposed roundabout first, then access to the holding area can come off of that roundabout and avoid the need for traffic to cross the A143. This particular access was never envisaged at the outline planning stage and coming off the roundabout would alleviate a lot of concerns that local residents have.

CG: There are a number of considerations that need to be looked at. Infrastructure will depend on the 300th occupation, roads will need to be adopted before construction traffic can use them, it is not ideal for construction traffic to share the road with the residents within the site. The best solution is to have a dedicated access.

CG wanted to clarify if the Town Council's concerns were mainly road safety and vehicles entering and exiting the site?

Members agreed that there were safety concerns with turning into site from the North and the South. The speed limit is currently 60mph and traffic coming along this road and meeting construction traffic turning across the road is extremely dangerous. Visibility is poor, the road bends near this point and there is an old pub which obscures the view from certain points. Also, from previous experience with an on-going development site nearby, mud on the road will be a problem. Fast moving vehicles meeting traffic exiting and entering the site, with mud on the road will cause major problems. Cllr Burns shared some statistics on the amount of traffic that uses the A143, there is a minimum of 300 vehicles an hour each way at midday and this

increased to 500 at rush-hour, the new housing development nearby will then add to these numbers.

CP made the point that the access point is close to an existing established access to the Persimmon site on the same road, meaning two road cleaning vehicles operating too close together, which would cause unnecessary delays leading to frustration of other drivers, leading to dangerous passing manoeuvres. In addition, this proposal unnecessarily adds HGV movement to that generated by Persimmon, on the same stretch of A143.

AS wanted to clarify that the access was Standard Compliant and met Standard UK Parameters. The design will be subject to a road safety audit as part of the design process.

CG explained that vehicles would be marshalled and would not be released at times of heavy traffic. Members looked at the transport assessment and discussed traffic movement for the site. AS and CG explained that traffic movements would depend on the build Phases. There would also be a cost implication for Redrow to overlap an early construction of the roundabout and the building of houses.

JB asked if there was any thought in mind to build the roundabout earlier, or if this was simply just not going to happen.

CG explained that this was not currently an option, the roundabout was subject to Section 278 and committing to building the roundabout first would delay the spine road and delivery of houses.

TB: the holding area is described as temporary, residents have commented that 10 years was not temporary and that the affect that this would have on the lives of those living opposite this site was not acceptable.

CP/JB asked to see exactly where the Wheel Wash facility would be situated in the holding area, as the map submitted in the planning application did not indicate this; they suggested that the wheel wash be sited as far back from the exit as possible, to help alleviate mud on the road. CG will follow this up.

JB also questioned where the water supply would come from for the wheel wash and welfare facilities, as Anglian Water had commented on the planning application that the 'developer is not proposing to connect to Anglian Water network'.

CG will look into this.

DC/19/0225/FUL

PH had several concerns over the access off Chalkstone Way i) construction vehicles using the access would need to pass by 2 schools and a football /community centre along Chalkstone Way ii) the damage that would be caused to the speed humps along Chalkstone Way and to the road itself from use by heavy construction traffic and iii) he had serious concerns that cars parked along the Chalkstone Way, which are there at all times, but especially at school pick-up /drop off times would be a problem.

AS explained that the holding area at the North of the site would have precise controls in place to avoid sensitive periods, HGV's would need to report in to the holding area first before being released.

JB commented that the Outline Application never actually showed a construction access at this

point and suggested that construction traffic could use an internal haul road, also realistically, construction vehicles, vans and cars may not report into the holding area first and arrive at the Chalkstone Way access.

CG explained that satellite compounds within the development plot were waiting for planning consent. CTNP set framework and West Suffolk Planning Authority can enforce compliance, it will be made clear to contractors to use the holding area.

JB has submitted comments on this application and these can be viewed on the Borough's Planning Portal, he highlighted some of his concerns; the need for a wheel washing facility, the requirement for an assessment of the condition of Chalkstone Way and the issue of vehicles parked along Chalkstone Way obstructing the visibility at the exit.

JB also requested that the spine road be used as the haul road initially.

CG answered that the majority of building would be at the North of the site, construction access would primarily be there to build the houses, there is a need to keep construction traffic and new residential traffic separate on the site.

JB asked CG to clarify; Redrow want to keep construction vehicles away from Redrow residents, but will allow for them to run alongside Chalkstone Way residents?

CG explained that infrastructure for Phase I spine road and drainage upfront costs are offset by bringing 2 sales outlets forward, to build two locations at once would be too expensive, Redrow are not able to build the spine road as a metal haul road to link up to Chalkstone Way as construction vehicles will be using it and therefore it can't be adopted by Highways. The road would need to up to a certain condition. CP pointed out construction vehicles will be using the A143 and Chalkstone Way, which will cause damage to those.

JB mentioned his concern that future developers would want to use Redrow's access, which would then become a major access road to the site. At Outline Planning stage, the Town Council fought hard for a roundabout and that there would not be an access opposite Gannet close, this temporary access was not shown, another reason to use the spine road, as originally agreed.

CG explained that Redrow were seeking permission for a temporary access, which could be time limited. Future developers would need to put forward their own plans and seek to access at that point or make other arrangements.

TB suggested that there needs to be a whole joint transport strategy.

PH thanked Chris Gatland and Andy Ross for attending the meeting and asked if they would like to stay for the remainder of the meeting, they decided that they would stay for the outcome of the decision.