

# Haverhill Town Council

## Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

### PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Held on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 at 7.00pm held by Zoom



**Haverhill**  
TOWN COUNCIL

**Present:** Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman)  
Councillor J Crooks  
Councillor B Davidson  
Councillor A Luccarini  
Councillor D Smith  
Councillor L Smith  
Councillor A Stinchcombe

**Apologies:** Councillor A Brown (Vice Chairman)

**In Attendance:** Mayor John Burns  
Councillor Paula Fox  
Councillor Joe Mason  
Councillor Elaine McManus  
Colin Poole, Town Clerk  
Vicky Phillips, Assistant Clerk

There were 7 members of the public present.

#### **Welcome:**

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

#### **ACTION**

#### **P21 Apologies for Absence**

/046 The above apologies of absence were noted.

#### **P21 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation**

/047 Councillor J Mason declared an interest in item P21/052 – Item 8, being a resident of Boyton Hall.

Councillor E McManus declared an interest in item P21/052 – Item 8, being a resident of Boyton Hall.

Councillor J Burns declared an interest in item P21/052 – Item 1, the applicant is his business partner

#### **P20 Minutes of the Meetings held 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021**

/048 Councillor D Smith proposed and Councillor A Luccarini seconded that the minutes of the meeting held 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 were approved as a true record by show of hands. All in favour

**RESOLVED**

#### **P21 Matters arising from the Previous Minutes**

/049

Page 180, P21/039, V Phillips had liaised with West Suffolk District Council regarding the provision of names for the development at NW Haverhill. The Council have confirmed that there are a few names that could be used and that the list had not been exhausted.

Page 181, P21/043, Roundabout at The Fox Public House. Assistant Clerk has arranged a meeting with Hen Abbott, Chairman and Mayor to meet to discuss under delegated powers.

**P21 /050 Public Forum on planning matters other than applications before the committee**

Item P21/052 Item 8, DC/21/1849/FUL. Notes of objections from members of public for this application have been attached to the minutes, (appendix ii)

**P21 /051 Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated Powers (List A attached)**

None

**P21 /052 Planning Applications currently before West Suffolk District 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)

**P21 /053 Matters to Report**

- Councillor J Burns reported that the Clerk at Kedington Parish Council had contacted him over their concerns of increased traffic through the village due to the proposed road closures on A143.
- DC/21/0315/FUL, Dementia Village planning application. The Assistant Clerk to contact the Planning Officer at West Suffolk DC to request an extension to the consultee expiry date on the proposed Dementia Village application at Little Wratting to enable the application to be discussed at the following planning committee meeting.

**P21 /054 Date of next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be 6<sup>th</sup> April 2021

**P21 /045 Closure**

The meeting was closed at 8.33pm

VP

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
02.03.21 Expires 23.03.21	<b>1</b>	DC/21/0227/HH	One dormer on rear elevation  Mr Lee Button	46 Boyton Close	NEUTRAL
02.03.21 Expires 23.03.21	<b>2</b>	DC/21/0127/HH	Single storey rear extension  Mr & Mrs Gerrard	55 Atterton Road	NEUTRAL
05.03.21 Expires 26.03.21	<b>3</b>	DC/21/0327/P3OPA	Change of use from office (Class B1 (a)) to dwellinghouse(s) (Class C3) to create three dwellings  Mr R Haylock, Enableaid	1 Rookwood Way	STRONGLY OBJECT: The Town Council fully endorse comments and objections raised by Public Health and Housing. In addition, The Town Council emphasise the need of employment land in Haverhill, which has a large amount of new residential development taking place and that this is an inappropriate site for residential properties.
05.03.21 Expires 19.03.21	<b>4</b>	DC/20/2259/HH	RE-CONSULTATION (email circulated - Parking Plan submitted)  Part single storey and two storey side and rear extensions  Mr L Symonds	10 Claudian Close	

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
<p>OBJECT: The Town Council's previous comments still stand. There is very little room for vehicles of neighbouring and adjacent properties to manoeuvre, especially at times when the car parking areas are full. Any planning development cannot upset the existing status quo in terms of traffic and parking, unless there is specific agreement from the landowners. Given that the area surrounding this property is privately owned in theory anyone can park in this area, therefore there is potential for larger vehicles to use the parking areas provided which would cause obstruction.</p> <p><b>Proposed object: 4 for, 2 against</b></p>					
07.03.21 Expires 28.03.21	5	DC/21/0370/HH	Single storey rear extension (following demolition of conservatory)  Emmanuelle Astoul	8 Chainey Pieces	NEUTRAL
08.03.21 Expires 29.03.21	6	DC/21/0378/HH	a. single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing conservatory) b. partial infill of carport  Mr and Mrs Pipe	38 Manor Farm	NEUTRAL
10.03.21 Expires 31.03.21	7	DC/21/0203/FUL	a. two dwellings with vehicular access and parking b. additional parking for 19a Hamlet Road  Mr A Anderson	19a Hamlet Road	
<p>OBJECT  Amenity: Overdevelopment of the site  Parking: Whilst parking is shown to be provided for the proposed developments and 19a, parking is tight with little opportunity for manoeuvring.  Street Scene: the proposed developments would have a detrimental affect on the entrance to Elmhurst Close and will have an impact Anne of Cleves House, a Grade II* listed building opposite the site.</p>					
11.03.21 Expires 25.03.21	8	DC/20/1849/FUL	RE-CONSULTATION a. Sixty bed care home for the elderly including car park, bicycle, refuse and garden stores b. new vehicular and pedestrian access onto Anne Suckling Road (following demolition of existing house)  Mrs Maidment / LNT Care Developments	Boyton Hall, Anne Sucklings Lane	See below:

The Town Council's previous comments and objections have not been addressed and therefore the OBJECTION still stands with the following additions:

Loss of Amenity to neighbouring properties:

- i) The application does not include details of commercial vehicles visiting the property which, in addition to staff and visitor vehicle movements will have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties with air, light and noise pollution
- ii) Inadequate screening and mitigation to prevent air, light and noise pollution

Overdevelopment of this site.

Inadequate car parking for a development this size, to cater for residents, visitors and staffing.

Boyton Hall has landmark status within Haverhill and provides an important sense of identity, which should be preserved and protected.

Boyton Woods green space is biodiversity rich and the habitat should be protected.

Proposed Councillor Luccarini, seconded Councillor L Smith, all in favour

**RESOLVED**

11.03.21 Expires 01.04.21	<b>9</b>	DC/21/0433/TPO	TPO 192(1993) – One Ash tree (T1 on plan, A2 on order) remove one limb  Mr Jamie Hart	10 Atterton Road	NEUTRAL
12.03.21 Expires 02.04.21	<b>10</b>	DC/21/0454/HH	Two storey side extension (following demolition of existing single storey side extension)  Mr H Ipek	1 Burton Close	OBJECT The development is incongruous. Parking is inadequate for a 4 bedroom property.
16.03.21 Expires 06.04.21	<b>11</b>	DC/21/0483/FUL	Insertion of door and window to front elevation to create shop front  Mr I Ipek	25-27 Queen Street	

Whilst the Town Council is supportive of the applicant creating a restaurant, the Town Council OBJECT to this application, which will have a detrimental effect to the street scene in Queen Street.

This property falls under the Queen Street Shop Front Scheme and will need to conform to the design criteria guidelines.

The building is in a conservation area and the shop front should remain sympathetic to its original features.

**Appendix (ii)**  
**DC/21/0110/RM**

**Comments submitted in advance from Mr and Mrs Strachan detailing their objection:**

Objections to revised planning application DC/20/1849/FUL

Having studied the revised plans for a Care Home to the north of Anne Suckling Road, we make the following comments and objections:

Of note as part of these objections: We believe it is inappropriate for the revised plans submitted to cite 'proposed' plans for future development in parcel 2B as a justification for the type of building, scale and siting for this application. These plans (2B) are not approved.

Loss of Heritage- objection to the demolition of the hall and change of use of the land:

Boyton Hall, built approx. 120 years ago- is a building with local historical and geographical significance. The area around Boyton Hall estate gains its name and identity from this property and farm. Also, a portion of the proposed new development uses this name to give the area a sense of identity.

Demolishing a building that is a landmark with significant local interest does not seem justified when the building and surrounding grounds adds enrichment and interest in what is rapidly becoming a densely built-up environment.

The contrast of retaining an older building with heritage within this development enriches the area. The Hall and grounds give interest, balance and character to this quickly changing place. Haverhill is sadly short of older or significant buildings depicting its history which makes it even more important that buildings of local historical interest should be retained.

The change of use of this site from residential to a Care Home would also result in a loss of biodiversity. In surrounding areas, there has already been considerable removal of trees, hedges and vegetation. Further removal of trees of importance and vegetation on this site to create such a large footprint of buildings, car parks, footpaths would be very disruptive to the environment, compounding a significant loss of ecological diversity.

Objection to Design and Impact:

Although in the planning application it is claimed that a huge three storey building is in keeping with the housing development proposed for Phase 2 and other sections, there appears to be no recognition by the planners that this will be placed within an existing housing area where no domestic dwelling is more than two storeys high; this includes Grade 2 listed cottages, and the houses facing on to Ann Suckling Road. This very large building will be out of scale to this area and overshadow these established dwellings in an unacceptable and dominating way. Artist's images of the site and the positioning of the building within the site, create an illusion of the development having a generous plot size for such a building; however, when visiting the site it would appear that these images do not reflect the impact and dominance of the building on such a small plot of land.

Limitations of this site for proposed Care Home:

Previous objections to the siting of the Care Home remain valid. The revised planning application uses one of its justifications for building a Care Home on this site by referencing the proposed building of a plaza shown in the Concept Plan in Phase 6. However, apart from a proposed community centre, according to our present understanding, there do not seem to be any other facilities planned as part of the Plaza. Also, the design concept sketches for the plaza do not truly reflect the setting and scale of the proposed site for it; the sketches indicate that the plaza is in a grand centre of a city scale with lots of very large stores and amenities around it; this is very clearly only for illustrative purposes but does not bear any resemblance to what can be built there.

The Boyton Hall site remains quite isolated from the main town with its shops and services which is approximately one mile away. Transport links are still unsatisfactory to connect the areas, walking out can be difficult for some who are less firm because of steep hills in to the town as well as challenging for wheelchair use. Similarly, access to the proposed Plaza, in whatever form that takes would be challenging without transport; it is some distance away with some deceptive inclinations in the journey.

There are very other limited areas of social and environmental interest that residents could access easily without some form of transport.

The travel plan indicates the proximity of services in Haverhill town centre, to the home. It negates to mention however, the relatively steep climb from the centre of town to this location and the impact this will have on car use and therefore increased parking requirements.

Like many people, we have experience of visiting care homes in a variety of situations. They are busy places with lots of visitors coming and going. In addition, many supporting services such as delivery vans, catering services, hairdressers, chiropodists, physiotherapists, volunteers, NHS services plus working staff needing to use the parking facilities. The number of parking spaces provided is inadequate to cope with needs of the building and would likely lead to Ann Suckling Road being used as an overspill car park. There are already many well documented concerns about the road being used for parking and safety, especially as the A143 junction entrance to Ann Suckling Road is continuously compromised by cars parking in a solid line, creating blind spots for drivers leaving and entering Boyton Hall Estate. This is an increasingly busy two-way road, not designed for traffic movement and parking at the same time. Also worthy of note: again (see design and impact above) the future use of Anne Suckling Road is of serious concern to residents in the Boyton Hall estate.

**Medical and Social Services:**

These are already very stretched in Haverhill. An additional approx. 4000 houses are being or proposed to be built Bringing with them a variety of medical and social needs means that our present support services including Doctors' Surgeries, Fire Brigade, Social Services, Policing, will be stretched even further. This proposal will further strain these services. Future plans to improve this state of affairs are perhaps in the making but without any knowledge of what these are and without guaranteed timescales to build these services to cope, then extra demands on the system will be even more challenged than at present.

### **Mr Ian Shepphard**

Has visited the site and the scale of the building on the drawings does not show the actual size and scale of the site. The entire car park backs on to his property, which is less than 20ft away from his living space, which will create fumes, noise and light pollution. There is inadequate screening which will prevent overlooking his property causing a lack of privacy. The lighting proposed on the building will directly affect the rear of his property. Although not detailed in the application, there will be commercial vehicle movement to the site which will cause a potential of noise pollution to his and neighbouring properties. Looking at other residential care homes of this size, the car parking will still be too small and need an overspill onto Anne Suckling Road. Haverhill is not supported by public transport, employees will not be able to use this. Nothing in the amended application has addressed objections or holding objections raised by consultees. The size of the building fails to fit into a residential area and will have a detrimental impact.

### **Councillor Joe Mason**

Policy DM2, he has seen nothing to mitigate against noise, smell, vibration, overshadowing, loss of light. Boyton Woods green space is biodiversity rich and the habitat should be protected and the amount of terraforming presents a risk to the area.

Loss of heritage. Botyon Hall is not designated heritage status is decided by the conservation officer and we should be trying to preserve the building.

Lack of screening for the property The Willows causing light and noise pollution from ambulances and vehicles in the car park.