

#### PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on

Monday 24<sup>TH</sup> September at 10am

Halesworth Town Council Day Centre Waveney Local Office London Road, Halesworth

Present: Councillors;

T Allen, P Dutton, A Fleming, K Forster, M Took

In Attendance: N Rees (Town Clerk).

# **Minutes**

Cllr A Fleming (Vice Chair) acted as Chair in Cllr Greenberg's absence.

- 1. Apologies: Cllr K Greenberg Cllr K Prime, Cllr D Thomas
- 2. **Declarations of interest:** Non-pecuniary interests: Cllr M Took for 5(b).
- 3. **Minutes**: The minutes of the meeting held on the 29th August, 2018 was accepted as a true record.
- 4. **Matters arising from the minutes.** SuDS: the Clerk reported that he had spoken to the Morton Partnership but they did not have a specialist for water management on the team but had helpfully suggested another company that may offer training and advice. It was noted that calculations submitted by developers should include a Geotechnical survey and if this was not present it was possible the calculations might be inaccurate. It was RESOLVED that the Clerk would request a copy of the Geotechnical surveys for the following sites; Old Station Rd, Chediston Street/Roman Way and Hill Farm Road.
- 5. **Planning Applications**: To consider the following:
  - DC/18/3524/LBC and DC/18/3523/FUL Listed Building Consent -Construction of a single-story rear extension and internal alterations – 15 Rectory Street, Halesworth. It was RESOLVED that the Committee recommended approval.
  - DC/17/1012/OUT Outline Planning Permission submission of 1) reserved matters and 2) discharge of conditions information regarding only the affordable housing element of residential scheme - Fairview/Norwich Rd, Halesworth (Plots 1-16) (Plus conditions 15 & 23 requirements re culvert & surface water management strategy respectfully) It was RESOLVED that the Committee recommended approval but had the following suggestions that it hoped would be noted by the developer and WDC;

## Footpaths and Cycleways:-

The Committee felt that the cycleway and footpath should be on the perimeter of the site and not set back. There was currently a footpath adjacent to the Norwich Rd but this tapered out, so only part if it was usable and it also finished at the crossing rather than extending along the front of the site.

- ii Cycleway access points need reviewing, the North access point stopped at the pavement near the junction and the South Access point was on to a very narrow road but it was not clear what the alternatives were in this respect. Extending the current cycleway from the site all the way down to the Town would be the ideal solution.
- iii Cycle security; the Committee would suggest that the cycle racks are positioned further into the site rather than being on the roadside.
- iv Pedestrian Crossing; the Committee would like to see a controlled crossing at the position indicated on the plan. This site added to any further applications at the same location and added to the site South of Fairview Road (22 dwellings) would mean there will be a significant number of pedestrians wishing to cross the busy Norwich Road. Many of these pedestrians are likely to be children, toddlers and parents with push chairs.

### Parking;-

- v Most of the parking spaces that are marked on the landscape plans appear to be undersized, it is assumed that the developer will provide at least the outdated minimum size but more realistic sized parking spaces would have been beneficial.
- vi The spaces available would not allow for any visitor parking if the assumption is made for two cars per household. Unless more spaces can be accommodated the Committee would suggest introducing allocated parking spaces.
- vii The Landscape plan shows two blocks of four parking spaces comprising two x two spaces in tandem which would effectively mean that any vehicles occupying the two furthest spaces would be blocked in.

#### Vehicular access;

- viii The access to the Private Road would be safer if it was moved further away from the junction with Norwich Road, with some repositioning of the buildings there would appear to be room on site to allow for this.
- 6. **Correspondence:** There was no correspondence to consider.

The meeting was closed at 10.45am