

Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Monday 11th June 2019 at 7.00pm at Haverhill Arts Centre, Haverhill, Suffolk, CB9 8AR



HAVERHILL
TOWN COUNCIL

Present: Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman)
Councillor A Brown
Councillor J Crooks
Councillor A Luccarini
Councillor D Smith
Councillor L Smith

Apologies: Councillor A Stinchcombe

In Attendance: Vicky Phillips, Assistant Clerk
Alisha Jenkins, Office Administrator
Mayor J Burns
Councillor J Mason

There were 18 members of public present.

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

/090 The above apologies were noted.

P19 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/091 Cllr T Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest on item P19/098, Item 2 as the applicants are known to him.

P19 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

/092 Minutes of Meeting held 20th & 21st May 2019 were approved as a true record. PH to sign after the meeting.

P19 Matters arising from the Previous Minutes

/093 There were no matters arising.

P19 Paul Bonnett, Development Manager, Havebury Housing

/094 Paul Bonnett reported that the scheme for redevelopment at Paske Avenue was designed several months ago and aims to provide more affordable housing to the area. The design and mix of housing was agreed with the local authority, a pre-app was submitted and a presentation given to the Town Council earlier in the year. A survey reported that only 5 garages were

currently let and parking around the area was minimal, the local survey reported that the garages were not in high demand and flats and housing would be a better for a derelict site.

See appendix (ii) for residents and members of the public's comments

P19 Stuart McAdam, Persimmon Homes, NW Development Update

/095 Discussion of the update for the North West Development , see attached Appendix (ii)

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

/096 NW Development:

A Slater asked whether there would be any further provision for schools and health care for the additional housing.

S. McAdam informed that a contribution had been made to the S106 had been made.

Cllr P Hanlon added that the contribution is then given to the local council, Suffolk County Council and West Suffolk CCG for them to provide these services.

Cllr J Burns added that the contribution is roughly £248 per house.

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

/097 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)

/098 Applications determined by the Committee are shown on List B attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)

P19 Matters to Report

/099 There were no matters to report.

P19 Date of next Meeting

/100 The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be on 2nd July 2019 at 7.00pm.

P19 Closure

/101 The meeting was closed at 9.30pm.

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
29.05.19 Expires 19.06.19	1	DC/19/1019/FUL	10no. dwellings (demolition of existing garages) Mr Netton, Havebury Housing Partnership	Garages, Paske Avenue	<p>The Town Council agrees the need for social housing and affordable homes in Haverhill, however the proposed site is not appropriate for this type of development.</p> <p>The Town Council proposed that the provision of bungalows would be more suitable and which would adapt to the needs of future generations.</p> <p>Therefore, the Town Council wish to OBJECT to the application on the following issues:</p> <p>Overshadowing, Overlooking and Loss of Privacy Due to the height and proximity of the proposed dwellings, residents properties in Paske Avenue and Orchard Close will be directly overlooked resulting in loss of privacy</p> <p>Layout and Density of Building Design Overdevelopment of the site. The proposal does not achieve good design and is out of character to the surrounding properties. There is no provision for recreation facilities or green space</p> <p>Highway issues Traffic generated by the new</p>

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>development would increase vehicles using Paske Avenue, where there are already parking issues for existing residents, especially in the evening and at weekends. Further development would add to this congestion and concern was raised over access for Emergency Vehicles and Refuse Collection Vehicles.</p> <p>There would not be sufficient provision for a vehicle turning circle</p> <p>Can planners please ensure that the relevant officers within SCC are consulted on these proposals and this issue in particular.</p> <p>Noise and Smells, Fumes Bin store was in close proximity to an existing property in Paske Avenue</p>
16.05.19 Expires 06.06.19	2	DC/19/0945/HH	<p>(i) single storey rear extension (ii) garage conversion to form playroom (iii) two storey side extension</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Richard Grant</p>	18 Minerva Close	No Objection
17.05.19 Expires 07.06.19	3	DC/19/0917/FUL	<p>Installation of ground source heat pump system (part retrospective)</p> <p>Miss Fran Roddy-Watts, The Renewable Design Co. Ltd</p>	Weavers Lodge, Place Court, Camps Road	No Objection
20.05.19 Expires 10.06.19	4	DC/19/0995/HH	<p>Proposed rear extensions</p> <p>Mr S Gilder</p>	5 Hopton Rise	No Objection
20.05.19 Expires 10.06.19	5	DC/19/0979/HH	<p>Single storey rear extension & porch alterations</p> <p>Mr & Mrs Wilson</p>	9 Churchill Avenue	No Objection

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
23.05.19 Expires 13.06.19	6	DC/19/1052/HH	(i) Part conversion of the existing garage to form habitable living accommodation (ii) removal of garage door and provision of infill wall and new window Mr & Mrs Russell	23 Russett Close	'OBJECT Parking space requirements for a 3 bedroom dwelling should meet the standard for the provision of 2 car parking spaces. The applicant must therefore ensure that sufficient parking standards are met due to the loss of a parking provision.'
28.05.19 Expires 18.06.19	7	DC/19/1119/HH	Single storey rear extension Mr & Mrs P Riley	3 Beaumont Court	No Objection
28.05.19 Expires 18.06.19	8	DC/19/1034/HH	1no. detached two bay cartlodge Mr & Mrs S Beer	Greenmeads, Wrattling Road	No Objection
24.05.19 Expires 14.06.19	9	DC/19/1010/RM	Submission of details under Outline Planning Permission DC/15/2424/OUT, Matters Reserved by Condition 2 (appearance, landscaping, layout, parking and scale) HE2 Haverhill 1 GP Ltd	Land adj Haverhill Business Park, Bumpstead Road	The Town Council continues to be supportive of development of this site but only in accordance with the outline application approved under reference DC/15/2424/OUT, which included a design and access statement in which 4.1 design approach and accompanying Indicative Layout Plan positioned all buildings in such a way that all vehicle movements for each unit were shielded from the nearby residential properties. This was acceptable. The revised layout in this application compromises the noise mitigation for residents and is not in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 180 a) avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life and c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity as the delivery yards will inevitably be brightly illuminated.

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					<p>The approved outline application also showed acoustic fencing to be erected along the boundary adjoining the flood park, whereas the current application refers only to security wire fencing as erected around the site at present. This would offer absolutely no protection against noise or light pollution to the nearby residential properties. It is the opinion of the Town Council that this cannot be remedied by conditions controlling times of operation and the development must be in accordance with the indicative layout plan already approved under DC/15/2424/OUT.</p> <p>Implementing Indicative layout Plan would allow the developer to easily resolve the Highways Assessment that the entrance to Unit 5 is too close to the access road opposite.</p> <p>As a condition, or as part of any S106 Agreement, off-site highways improvements are required to create a continuous footway to at least Hollands Road. This provides safe pedestrian access to the site.</p> <p>S106 funding for improvements to the Railway Walk section to the North of the site would also assist sustainable travel options.</p>

Appendix (ii) **Havebury Housing**

Comments made by the public:

G Butler thought that the usage of the garages was irrelevant and challenged the comment of minimal parking issues as the area is often filled with parked cars as there are no other forms of parking in the area. It was mentioned that the idea of the flats look nice but they are place far too close to the existing houses.

P. Bonnett assured that all houses proposed have met parking requirements

Mrs. Butler asked whether the parking requirements would be met for the existing houses.

P. Bonnett has assured that Havebury has taken advice from Traffic Safety at Suffolk County Council.

A Slater raised that he had attended the Town Council Planning meeting in February, where it was decided that overlooking would not be an issue due to existing trees, but you are able to see houses from 12 meters away through the trees. An image of what the build would look like from a resident's front room was shown on the OHP. This clearly showed that the proposed properties could be seen in their property and be overlooked in their garden.

P Bonnett informed the room that the plan was to provide affordable housing to a derelict site, the design had been taken to the local authority under pre-app and was considered an acceptable distance from surrounding properties.

A Slater queried whether Haverhill needed any more affordable housing, Persimmon Housing Group development would be meeting the 30% affordable housing criteria at the development at Boyton Place, which provided 370 affordable houses. Mr Slater suggested this would meet the current need in Haverhill.

There was a general suggestion that there was a need for properties for elderly residents in Haverhill and that the provision of bungalows would meet this need and be more in keeping on this site rather than the current plans.

P. Bonnett explained that it is West Suffolk Council housing authority that suggests the type of buildings to be built and that Havebury then have created the designs. There is also the potential to be able to provide affordable housing on a much shorter timescale.

Cllr P Hanlon reiterated the importance of more housing for an ever growing older population in the town, and agreed that bungalows would be more suitable.

M Phillips informed the meeting that Havebury had actually stopped letting / renting the garages out and that these garages and had been poorly maintained. Use of the garages would be have been higher if they were had been in better conditioned and maintained.

People have tried to apply to rent garages and have been turned down.

Also, the design of the proposed houses and flats are not in keeping with the current houses.

The plan is looking to increase the housing in the area by 40% in such a small area.

Residents are unaware of how to complain about this online.

Extra traffic would make a big impact on the current residents.

Cllr J Burns mentioned that 12 years ago the rent for the garages went up by £1 which was supposed to raise funds to repair and rebuild existing garages, but instead the money was spent on the general housing fund. The needs of residents have to be taken into account and you cannot build on areas that have current issues regarding parking.

M.O.P – Data figures given are misleading and untrue. Secondly, the new building is imposing and will tower over existing buildings. Also, the turning circle will not be big enough.

P. Bonnett explained that the road was designed to meet highway standards, incorporating enough of a turning circle to allow for large vehicles such as dustcarts. In regards to the height of the buildings, they are designed with flat roofs, to keep the height of the flats to a minimum and will not be much higher than surrounding properties.

There was general disagreement from all the members of public at this.

P. Bonnett continued that the third storey was not a full storey higher and the material design was considered acceptable.

23 Paske Avenue resident: The bin store has been placed directly next to her property. The resident also had photographs taken the night before showing parking in Paske Avenue, as opposed to the out of date picture on the portal.

M.O.P mentioned that they have experienced an Ambulance having to park on a residents driveway to avoid blocking the road, due to the overcrowded parking at Paske Avenue.

Mrs Kicks was concerned that the new residents would be looking directly into her bedroom and kitchen windows. There had also been a request to remove her existing trees, which she was extremely opposed to and had refused.

P. Bonnett again stated that the design and layout was in line with Highways and Design standards.

Mrs Kicks mentioned that when the design was shown originally, residents were told that they would be 2 stories high.

P. Bonnett agreed that the top of the top storey would be visible, but that the building would be an acceptable distance from existing properties.

23 Paske Avenue resident asked if there was provision for recreational areas, gardens or space for laundry, children and dogs to use.

P. Bonnett explained that there were facilities in the flats for laundry.

There was more general discussion around the development and the suggestion that bungalows would be a more suitable idea for the site was raised several times.

P. Bonnett said that the Havebury Tenants Association had been consulted, but members of the public and Committee members agreed that these were not a good representation and not valid for this development.

Councillor Hanlon thanked Mr Bonnett and no more questions were taken. Cllr Hanlon then explained the system for commenting on the Planning Portal and for attending to object at West Suffolk.

The planning application was then taken before the committee for discussion.

Appendix (iii)

Stuart McAdam, Persimmon Homes, NW Development Update:

Construction:

S. McAdam updated that all the main roads on the northern phase are now done and the roundabout is currently 70% completed.

255 units are being worked on with 52 of those units currently being built above ground level.

Sales:

It was noted that 2 bed housing was in high demand for Haverhill due to their affordability. The 2 beds are expected to be ready to handover in September/ October 2019.

The 3 and 4 bed detached houses are not selling as well as expected, and are currently looking at home exchange and part exchange to help push sales.

Next phases of development:

Infrastructure:

Pre-application discussions are currently taking place, with hope to submit a further planning application in August 2019.

Residential phase 2:

Pre-application discussions for the next 215 units are being arranged. Persimmon Homes will be looking to submit a further planning application for September 2019.

Roundabout:

Is currently under construction.

Relief Road:

Following on from the roundabout the next phase is likely to commence in June 2019, the current plan is to construct the whole road in one go.

Archaeology:

A post-excavation assessment had been emailed to prior to the meeting.

Cllr Burns asked what had happened to anything of interest that had been found, any artefacts could be displayed in Haverhill. S McAdam would enquire.

Allotments:

Two areas have been earmarked as allotment spaces, was looking into whether there was a demand for these within Haverhill, has approached West Suffolk Council for their input in there need. It was asked whether the Town Council would like to take responsibility for them.

Cllr J Burns:

Allotments:

It was assured that there was a high demand for allotments in Haverhill, as there is a waiting list of people looking to have a plot.

Roundabout:

Asked how long until the roundabout would be linked to the A road.

S. McAdam informed that BT cables were currently holding up the development, and it was thought that it would be used as an entrance for the building vehicles as the currently entrance is not ideal.

Cllr J Mason forwarded neighbouring residents concerns over the destruction of the ancient hedgerow, it was mentioned that a new hedgerow would be placed there and asked whether there was any further plans to remedy the situation.

S. McAdam agreed that a new hedgerow was being planted and that this had been approved by a landscape officer; the position has been agreed just awaiting sign off from West Suffolk council before planting.

Cllr J Mason asked about dropped kerb placements on the entrance of the road as they were not clear on the plans submitted.

S. McAdam believed that it was a highway agreement to have dropped kerbs and will confirm their placement.

Cllr L Smith queried what a home exchange and part exchange means.

S. McAdam said that this something that the Sales team deal with and will ask them to forward their response to VP.

Cllr L Smith mentioned her surprise at the price listed for the houses considering how small they will be.

S. McAdam informed that the house prices were based on local knowledge and that the Sales Team at Persimmon explores the local area and researches the market before settling on a price. There is a review mechanism in place if the houses don't sell as well as expected. The room sizes meet the West Suffolk Council minimum standards requirement.

Cllr D Smith mentioned the bad press that Persimmon Housing has had recently and asked what steps had been put in place to assure the quality of housing that was being built and that health and safety requirements were being met.

S. McAdam informed that a report was being put together that will be released later this year. Purchasers are retaining 5% of the cost house in case of disagreements on standards and finishes until the house is repaired. Steps are being taken by Persimmon to clear up any issues and bad press.

Cllr J Burns queried the footpath at the front of the development, trees, bushes and verges for visibility.

S. McAdam to find out the answer and then report back.