Haverhill Town Council

Minutes of a Meeting of Haverhill Town Council's

PLANNING WORKING PARTY

Held remotely on Tuesday 20th December 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 Councillor A Stinchcombe Vacancy
- Apologies: None
- In Attendance: Colin Poole, Clerk Vicky Phillips, Deputy Clerk Councillor J Burns

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. 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
- /204 None, all present.

P22 Declarations of Interest and requests for Dispensation

/205 None.

P22 Minutes of the Meetings held

/206 Councillor A Stinchcombe proposed, Councillor Tony Brown seconded that the minutes of the meeting held 6th December 2022 were approved as a true record by show of hands. All in favour.

RESOLVED

- P22 Matters Arising from the Minutes
- /207 None

P22 <u>DC/22/1888/FUL</u>

/208 Members considered the suggestion from planning officer to accept cedar cladding for the refuse compound, rather than close-board as they had previously



	suggested. This was considered a better option. The Clerk to remind the officer that we had commented on the disabled spaces as well. Proposed Councillor Luccarini, seconded Councillor L Smith All in favour RESOLVED	Clerk
P22 /209	For members of the Public to speak on Planning Matters other than applications before the Working Party Appendix (ii)	
P22 /210	Planning Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair under Delegated Powers (List A attached) Applications determined by the Clerk and Chair are shown on List A attached to the Minutes, see Appendix (i)	
P22 /211	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 /212	 Matters to Report i. DC/22/1447/RM – Councillor Brown reported that he had attended Development Control. The decision went against the Town Council. ii. DC/22/0368/OUT – Notice of Appeal – Prior to the meeting, the Clerk had circulated the notice of appeal. It was agreed that our objections remain the same, with the addition that we reinforce the Planning Officer's decision to refuse permission on Impact on Character, Impact on a Heritage Asset and Impact on Neighbouring Amenity. Proposed Councillor D Smith, seconded Councillor A Stinchcombe. All in favour. iii. Noted 	Clerk
P22 /213	Date of next Meeting The next meeting of the Planning Working Party will be 17 th January 2023	
P22 /214	Closure The meeting was closed at 7.33pm	

Signed 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
13.12.22 Expires 06.01.23	1	DC/22/2107/FUL	Creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with landscape bund, perimeter fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights and access footpath	The New Croft, Chalkstone Way	See below:
			Mr Peter Betts, Haverhill Community Sports Association		
Councillor Bur Councillor Bro There had bee hamper the ap space, which I Councillor Har their garages Councillors we Proposed Cou All in favour. F	ns comr wn com pplication had bee nlon agro during p ere mind uncillor E RESOLV	mented that he had cal mented that existing pro- bus attempts to find alt n, he has major concer n for use primarily for t eed with TB and JB an ick up and drop off tim led in general that whil Brown, seconded Coun (ED.	st they were behind the concept of this application, a cillor L Smith.	e had never been followe resident's amenity throu 70's. from neighbouring reside an OBJECTION be subm	ed up. Although he would not wish to ugh the loss of the community open ents about vehicles parking outside hitted.
space.	iilst men	nbers of the Town Cou	ncil support the concept of this application, they hav	e major concerns over p	arking and loss of open community
		or problems with parki aces is not enough to a	ng in and around the site, with vehicles parking illeg Illeviate this problem.	ally on the grass verges	and dangerously on the highway.

		PLAN NO.	PROPOSAL	LOCATION	TOWN COUNCIL DECISION	
Loss of Public Amenity The loss of the community open space, primarily used for recreational use by the residents of the Chalkstone Estate since the early 1970's, will have a major detrimental affect on local resident's health and wellbeing, access to opportunities for informal activities close to home and for play and social interaction.						
15.12.22 Expires 08.01.23	2	DC/22/2158/TCA	One Acer (T1 on plan) fell Mrs Tracy Faulkner, Preview Property Services	Manse Court, Hamlet Road	NEUTRAL Proposed Councillor Brown, seconded Councillor Luccarini	

Appendix (ii) Councillor Burns DC/22/0107/FUL – New Croft Haverhill

Amy

I would like to call this in over following concerns:

a) Parking. There are already major problems with parking in and around the site with highways and grass verges trashed because the tenant fails to manage or provide enough parking. 125 spaces is just not enough even now. They were offered more land 5+ years ago but failed to do anything despite a lot of work done by Damien Parker, Tony Brown and myself. This is subject of an open complaint I made to WSC and still awaiting to hear what will be done because WSC are the owners of the land. CPE are doing their best but having 80+ vehicles illegally parked is ridiculous and should not be something CPE should have to deal with. Let alone the inability of local residents to park.

b) Floodlighting. The existing lights shine far into the distance. Measures must be out in place to ensure they are focused on the pitch. Neighbours have complained before. Yes, there is a document about intrusive lighting but must be actioned. 15m high floodlights right next to housing may not be suitable either.

c) Noise. Neighbours have complained previously about noise from this site mostly contributed by illegal tenant's contrary to the WSC lease. Having a pitch right next door to the houses will exacerbate the problem on match and training days.

d) Major reduction in land that is supposed to be for community open space and will now be unavailable for community functions. There are actually two pitches proposed in the allocation.

e) Construction Management. 0700 start is not acceptable. With only one narrow entrance I have difficulty understanding how the conflict between HGV and cars can be avoided without removing existing parking spaces. Statement that will not lead to any local parking stress is a fallacy. See (a) above