Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING WORKING PARTY

Held remotely on Tuesday 25th July 2022 at 7.00pm

Present: Councillor P Hanlon (Chairman

Councillor A Brown (Vice Chairman

Councillor B Davidson Councillor A Luccarini Councillor D Smith Councillor L Smith

Apologies: Councillor E McManus

Councillor A Stinchcombe

In Attendance: Colin Poole, Town Clerk

Vicky Phillips, Assistant Town Clerk

Councillor J Burns

There were 4 members of the public present.

Welcome:

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.

P22 Apologies for Absence

/114 The above apologies were noted

P22 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/115 No declarations of interest were made and no dispensation had been received.

P22 Minutes of the Meetings held

/116 Councillor L Smith proposed, Councillor T Brown seconded that the minutes of the meeting held 12th July 2022 were approved as a true record by show of hands. All in favour.

RESOLVED

P22 Matters Arising from the Minutes

/117 None

P22 For members of the Public to speak on Planning Matters other than

/118 applications before the Working Party

Appendix (ii)

P22 Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated

/119 Powers (List A attached)



	Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair are sho the Minutes, see Appendix (i)	wn on List A attached to			
P22 /120	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)				
P22 /121	Matters to Report None				
P22 /122	<u>Date of next Meeting</u> The next meeting of the Planning Working Party will be 9 th August 2022				
P22 /123	Closure The meeting was closed at 7.31pm				
Signed Date Chairman		Date			

Appendix (i)

List A – Approved by Chairman and Clerk under delegated powers

	PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION

List B – To be considered at the Working Party Meeting

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION
05.07.22 Expires 26.07.22	1	DC/22/1088/TPO	TPO 111a(1991) - Tree preservation order - one Beech (13 on plan, T13 on order) crown reduction by 6-8 metres; lateral branches reduced by 4-5 metres and crown lift to approximately 5 metres	6 Manse Court	NETURAL Proposed Councillor Davidson, seconded Councillor Luccarini
11.07.22 Expires 01.08.22	2	DC/22/1140/HH	a. front porch b. two storey side extension c. first floor extension over garage d. single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing conservatory) e. cladding to first floor front, side and rear elevations.	31 Arrendene Road	NETURAL Proposed Councillor Luccarini, seconded Councillor L Smith
15.07.22 Expires 05.08.22	3	DC/22/1075/TPO	TPO 529 (2011) tree preservation order - one Ash (T2 on plan and order) reduce crown (orange area on plan) overhanging neighbouring properties by up to three metres	Heazeworth House, 17-19 Hamlet Road	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor Davidson, seconded Councillor Luccarini
20.07.22 Expires 10.08.22	4	DC/22/1219/HH	a. two storey rear extension (following demolition of existing conservatory) b. roof raised in line with existing roof c. two new windows on existing side elevation	2 Castle Lane	NETURAL Proposed Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor L Smith

Appendix (ii) Mr Strachan, Mr and Mrs Ford and Mrs Stockwell

Persimmon Infrastructure Plan for NW Development

Mr Ford had attended Development Control at West Suffolk Council. Matters were resolved but the WSC portal had not been updated. Mr Ford outlined that Persimmon have not accepted the committee's decision and he was at a loss as to what would happen now. They have also produced another plan which he believes will taken to the next DC meeting and that he has not received papers for this meeting yet. He would appreciate the Town Council's comments on this.

Councillor Burns explained that the Resolution at Development Control still needs to be ratified by the Director of Planning who makes the final decision based on the recommendations of the DC committee members. The suggestion for Phase 6 is that it is not conditional on the internal road being built first and connected to the relief road. He confirmed Phase 6 will be coming back to DC, however the papers will not have been released yet, they are published for the committee the same day as the public. JB / DS are members of the committee so they cannot make any pre judgement.

Mr Ford mentioned that he had watched the previous HTC Planning meeting's discussions around dropped kerbs. He has received a notification of a discharge of conditions at Boyton Meadows, however, although a dropped kerb has been provided on one side, the opposite side has been missed. He is concerned that where conditions are put in place they are not followed up.

JB has spoken to SCC Strategic Highways and has offered to visit the Persimmon and Gt Wilsey sites to ensure that the street lights are working, particularly at the roundabouts where he has received complaints that they are out. He will also be noting where there should be a dropped kerb and if they are wide enough.

Mr Strachan explained that Persimmon have proposed that Phase 6 use the 'haul' road, however that is actually where the road would be that has been suggested kept in. However they have been told that it would not possible due to the need to remove a hedgerow. Mr Strachan pointed out that the hedgerow does not exist. He wants a reason why the traffic cannot be pushed out onto the relief road. He is bemused by the process and can't understand why they have to keep pointing out requirements to Persimmon rather than, as a nationwide developer, that these requirements should already be known.

J Burns – the relief road will be built by the end of March. There is a subtle difference between a 'haul' road and an adopted road, which may be the reason.

D Smith explained that members of the public should send comments to the Local Plan.