

Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING WORKING PARTY

Held remotely on Tuesday 19th October 2021 at 7.00pm



HAVERHILL
TOWN COUNCIL

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

Apologies: Councillor B Davidson

In Attendance Colin Poole, Town Clerk
Vicky Phillips, Assistant Clerk
Councillor J Burns

There were no members of the public present.

Welcome:

1. Councillor P Hanlon welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that the meeting was being recorded. **To note that this Working Party has no delegated authority and may only make recommendations to Full Council. Urgent actions may be taken under delegated authority given to the Clerk and Chair.**

P21 Apologies for Absence

/180 The above apologies of absence were noted.

P21 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/181 None

P21 Minutes of the Meetings held 5th October 2021

/182 Councillor L Smith proposed, Councillor T Brown seconded that the minutes of the meeting held 5th October 2021 were approved as a true record by show of hands. All in favour. **RESOLVED**

P21 Matters Arising from the Minutes

/183 There were no matters arising.

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

/184 There were no members of the public present.

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

/185 Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair are shown on List A attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)

P21 Planning Applications currently before West Suffolk District Council
/186 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 Matters to Report

/187 There were no matters to report

P21 Date of next Meeting

/188 The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be 2nd November 2021

P21 Closure

/189 The meeting was closed at 7.50pm.

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 Working Party

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
30.09.21 Expires 21.10.21	1	DC/21/1689/HH	Porch to front elevation	5 Old Rope Walk	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor Luccarini seconded Councillor L Smith
05.10.21 Expires 26.10.21	2	DC/21/1670/HAZ	Storage and processing of a maximum of 140 tonnes of Tertiary Amylene, P5a Flammable Liquids, Category 1 (Schedule 1 Part 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015) International Flavours and Fragrances I.F.F. (Great Britain)	IFF	Request a deferral to allow HSE recommendation to be available Proposed Councillor Brown seconded Councillor Stinchcombe
06.10.21 Expires 27.10.21	3	DC/21/1850/HH	a. removal of existing front dormer window reinstating the dwelling as a bungalow b. single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and garage	2 Beaumont Court	NEUTRAL, Town Council to highlight concerns over size of bedrooms, particularly bedroom 3. Proposed Councillor D Smith, seconded Councillor L Smith
07.10.21 Expires 21.10.21	4	DC/21/1259/FUL	One dwelling	Land East of Boyton Hall Farmhouse, Anne Sucklings Lane	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor A Stinchcombe, seconded

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
					Councillor P Hanlon
08.10.21 Expires 29.10.21	5	DC/21/1444/FUL	a. change of use from retail shop (class E) to hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) b. external extraction and ventilation to rear Papillion Pizza	56 High Street	See below:

HTC objects to this proposal on many grounds:

Access: The Accessibility statement on the portal doesn't satisfactorily address disability access – the photo provided by the applicant of the High Street entrance to the premises clearly shows a significant step-up into the property and specifically no proposal to change this is included in the application. The table arrangement is too close together making it impossible for a wheelchair user to move around, including from the door to the servery. The proposed 'customer toilet' is not large enough or laid out correctly to be wheelchair accessible, and with the doors opening inwards. The proposed fire escape to the rear is via a staircase upward, so unsuitable for non-ambulant people to use as an escape.

Extraction: The proposal does not provide for acceptable extraction of cooking smells and heat, given that there are residential units directly above the premises. The route of the ducting shown in drawing 1923714 appears to be through the adjacent unit in the building.

Fire safety: The Council requests Suffolk Fire and Rescue are asked to comment on the suitability of both the main entrance (with significant step) and the stairwell as designated fire escapes, and that the applicant provides sufficient additional information for them to be able to make an informed judgement. There is no plan provided to demonstrate where the stairwell fire exit takes people, whether this are two or four flights of stairs, what the arrangements are externally to ensure that the exit is protected from having vehicles parked across it. The car park to which the council believes the stairwell provides access to is shared by a number of business and residential addresses. If the stairwell cannot be counted as an emergency exit, then the fire and rescue service should be asked for their opinion on the number of rooms workers would have to pass through, with clear sources of ignition, and the close table layout, as to whether this meets requirements for protected escape routes.

Intention of the applicant: The application is for a hot food takeaway. The floorplan shows 30 seats at tables, which is a reasonable-sized restaurant, plus the floorplan shows a waiting bench for take-aways. Is this an application for a takeaway with a waiting area or a restaurant with hot food take-out? The application itself is missing from the portal. The description provided in the design and access statement is inadequate, muddled and contradictory. With 30 covers, one customer toilet appears to not be in accordance with best practice for a restaurant.

Parking: The parking requirements are dependent on the nature of this proposal, which has no mention of parking associated with it, despite claiming to offer an increase in the number of people working there. The site is within a short walk of car parks, so if it is a restaurant then there is sufficient paid-for parking nearby for the length of customer stay associated with a restaurant. If it is a takeaway, then HTC has concerns over a business model reliant upon bringing motor cars into an area with limited legal parking at any time of the day, and in particular restricted vehicular access between 10-4pm Mon-Fri and 6am-4pm Saturdays. We already experience motorists parking their cars on the footway and on double-yellow lines, damage to planters and bollard as drivers try and park inappropriately. The LPA should be mindful that a number of businesses in this location already rely on customers arriving by motor vehicle, including take-aways, a dry-cleaners and mini-market. These businesses already attract customers immediately after 4pm and through the evening, so this application cannot be treated as an island – it is going to add additional vehicle movements to an already busy situation.

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
<p>Retail mix: The application is to turn a retail outlet into a takeaway. Haverhill Town Council are increasingly concerned about the retail mix at this end of the High Street, to maintain vitality and viability of all businesses. As well as multiple takeaways and a dry cleaner, there is a nail bar and slot machine operation. Taking the theme of the number of non-retail business at this end of the High Street, the council asks that the LPA test this application against Vision 2031 and the Haverhill Masterplan, as to whether the maximum desirable number of non-retail businesses has been reached or exceeded, and whether the number of premises with sui-generis permission is acceptable or detrimental to maintaining diversity of the mix. As these businesses are generally shut for most of the day, and with more units being given over to take-aways, this poor mix is detracting from the vitality and sustainability of this part of the town centre.</p> <p>Overall, with so many inconsistencies and unanswered questions we think the applicant should be invited to withdraw their application, seek proper professional advice and resubmit. If the applicant is not willing to do this, then HTC recommends refusal.</p> <p>Proposed Councillor Stinchcombe, seconded Councillor L Smith</p>					