

Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Monday 21st December 2020 at 7.15pm held by Zoom



HAVERHILL
TOWN COUNCIL

Present: Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman)
Councillor A Brown (Vice Chairman)
Councillor B Davidson
Councillor D Smith
Councillor L Smith
Councillor A Stinchcombe

Apologies: Councillor J Crooks
Councillor A Luccarini

In Attendance: Councillor J Burns
Colin Poole, Town Clerk
Vicky Phillips, Assistant Clerk
Councillor P Fox
Councillor J Mason
Councillor E McManus
Alisha Jenkins
Stuart McAdam, Persimmon

There were no members of the public present.

Welcome:

Councillor P Hanlon welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that the meeting was being recorded.

ACTION

P20 Apologies for Absence

/157 The above apologies of absence were noted.

P20 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/158 Councillor J Mason, Councillor E McManus declared a non pecuniary interest in item P20/162 as residents of Boyton Hall

P20 Minutes of the Meetings held 4th November 2020

/159 Councillor L Smith proposed and Councillor B Davidson seconded that the minutes of the meeting held 24th November 2020 were approved as a true record by show of hands. All in favour

RESOLVED

P20 Matters arising from the Previous Minutes

/160 None

P20 Commercial Permitted Development Rights

/161 After some discussion on the circulated document, to enable councillors more time to look at the document, Councillor D Smith proposed to defer this item to the next Planning Committee meeting, seconded Councillor T Brown.
All in favour.

RESOLVED

Councillor Burns suggested to the committee, that the two documents that Colin Poole had submitted on the Planning for the Future white paper be circulated to local councils and M.P's. Proposed T Brown, seconded A Stinchcombe. All in favour

RESOLVED

CP

P20 Public Forum on planning matters other than applications before the committee

/162 Mr Stuart McAdam updated the committee on the Persimmon development. (Appendix ii)

P20 Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated Powers (List A attached)

/163 None

P20 Planning Applications currently before West Suffolk District Council and received by publication of agenda (List B attached)

/164 Applications determined by the Committee are shown on List B attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)

P20 Matters to Report

/165 Councillor L Smith had received an email from a Helions Bumpstead Parish Councillor requesting our view on the proposals for land South of Haverhill. The Assistant Clerk to forward our submitted responses to Councillor Smith.

VP

P20 Date of next Meeting

/166 The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be Monday 11th January 2021.

P20 Closure

/167 The meeting was closed at 8.45pm

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
03.12.20 Expires 24.12.20	1	DC/20/2021/HH	Single storey side extension (following demolition of existing conservatory and single storey rear extension) Mr Ray Fisher	14 Tiberius Close	NEUTRAL
04.12.20 Expires 25.12.20	2	DC/20/2003/FUL	a. five general industrial units following demolition of existing offices and structures b. improvements to existing vehicular access Mr A Wright	2 Piperell Way	NEUTRAL
08.12.20 Expires 29.12.20	3	DC/20/2074/HH	Conversion of garage to living space with new window to front elevation and blocking up of existing garage door Mrs Kim West	6 Kitten Close	NEUTRAL
11.12.20 Expires 01.01.21	4	DC/20/2106/HH	First floor side extension with roof light Mrs Emma Lines, JLR Design and Planning Services	12 Crispin Close	NEUTRAL
11.12.20 Expires 01.01.21	5	DC/20/2113/HH	Single storey front and rear extension Mr and Mrs I Elmer	5 Coupals Road	NEUTRAL

14.12.20 Expires 04.01.21	6	DC/20/2073/FUL	Siting of 20 storage containers for storage and distribution use (class E) Mr Jonathan Hunt, Hunt Development Groups Ltd	Maple Park, Falconer Road	NEUTRAL
15.12.20 Expires 05.01.20	7	DC/20/2132/TPO	TPO 285 (1999) Tree Preservation order – two acer (T1 and T2 on plan within A1 on order) one Walnut (T3 on plan with in A1 on order) fell Ms Tickle, Crawford and Company	Land adjacent to 14 Canon Close	NEUTRAL

Appendix ii

Stuart McAdam, Persimmon Homes

Stuart joined the meeting to relay some key points on the up and coming submission for the Southern parcel.

Phase 2a has been approved and work will be starting soon on site. After the withdrawal of the Southern parcel, the WSC planning officer Penny Mills and SM got together with her Urban Designer and Highways. There were a series of workshops where there were in depth conversations about shaping the emerging application for phase 2b. To add, they have out-sourced the application to a firm of external architects to 'wipe the slate clean' of what was submitted previously and start again with a fresh pair of eyes, which has been quite positive.

The plans for the new application were shared with the committee which outlined where the site sat in the whole development. There have been quite a few changes to the layout; the 4 storey element had received quite a few objections and these have now been reduced in number and moved to the top of the site.

The Mews courts which come off the central access road coming down from the North of the site have been revamped as there was no continuous frontage. The new architects have come up with a new design which is based around the avenue entrance from the North, leading down through the site. There are gateway apartments framing the access point leading down to an urban square which creates a central focal point, further creating two mews developments to give a formal character area within the overall development which showed continuous build frontage. The architects have linked the units together to give continuity to the frontage and have also introduced quite a few locations with rear parking courts, which was designed to get away from frontage parking to give the feel of an area which wasn't car dominated. This area would be a shared surface using different types of material on the road surfaces to create a safer area. Linked detached units would lead into the parking courts. There is a neighbourhood square, which creates a focal point containing planting in the middle of the courtyard parking area which will be a strong vista at the foot of the site. Around the boundary of the site, there is a green edge.

The current layout will be submitted is still has 127 units, a mixture of 2-5 bedroom houses and flats, which is still accessed from the same Northern point. There are some FOG (flat over ground floor) units, where the parking is at the bottom of the unit and the accommodation is over the top level which will be a 1 ½ storey element, the idea being that these will create some interest.

The design concept is for a strong contemporary style, brick render and weatherboard which will create a modern twist. There are strong central green areas and surrounding the site are a series of footpaths and cycle ways to provide connectivity. Car parking courts have been designed to be a safe area.

The design code states that 3 ½ storey developments will be acceptable along the frontage next to the road, but these have been kept to 2 and 3 storey, however it was felt that to create the strong gateway entrance the units need to be a bit higher to lead into the avenue. The 4 storey has been proposed with a flat roof design, to keep the impression of them not being so high as a 3 ½ storey with a pitch roof. There are 4 semi detached bungalows in the site.

Questions:

Councillor Hanlon thanked S McAdam for coming along and updating the committee. Councillor Brown asked if there could be some graphics to show the context of the building blocks and a run through visual of the site. SM agreed to provide this.

Councillor Smith asked if there could be a shallower pitch of the roof on the 3 ½ storey building rather than a flat roof. SM said that ½ storeys were not ideal from an accommodation view, as a ½ storey reduces the usable room and becomes a room in an attic, although he agrees that these do need looking at again to make the gateway more prominent.

SM also pointed out that all of these units are now National Space Standard compliant which is a positive step.

Councillor Burns said that he was not happy with the 4 storey units being on the highest point of the land, although that if these were to go ahead perhaps consider a lift access for the levels.

To consider i) rear parking, Police will come in to look at design standards

ii) leisure fields to the East, where are we standing with those? SM said that they form part of the infrastructure, although he is not dealing with that application himself he is aware that there are discussions taking place and they will be delivered before Phase 2 is completed.

iii) JB has been talking to Stagecoach, are you talking to bus Services? SM: Yes have been in discussion along with the Technical Director. Dovetails with infrastructure document.

Councillor Mason

Residents will welcome the move away from the 4 storey buildings from the southern part of the site as there was some infrastructure concerns that whilst those buildings had parking, that people would use Anne Suckling Road for parking, so moving the buildings further North may decrease the likelihood of this happening.

Two follow up questions: i) access to the allotments; there is no parking from the estate side so parking will be along ASR. The original application showed hedges along the road, is there any scope to have a layby so that visitors to the allotments will not park on the curb. ii) parking in the rear car parks, will there be electric charging points for the future?

SM i) the highways department have asked for dedicated parking within the allotment area for those visiting the allotment, which should negate the need for people to park along Anne Suckling Road. The car parking area does include a disabled bay and room for turning. This will be part of the infrastructure application which also includes the landscaping and is currently subject to discussions. ii) EVC – This is a RM application and is not dealt with at this point, but as previously explained, Persimmon are putting in electric charging points as part of this application for most communal parking areas and some private detached housing, but may not be in all. However, Persimmon can provide infrastructure for individual electric parking ability for the future. On previous Persimmon sites SCC Highways have stated that they cannot put charging points on adoptable land, due to future maintenance, but may have had a change of heart. CP suggested SCC Councillors take this up with SCC. Cllr T Brown said this has major implications for existing estates and does need to be addressed.