



**Minutes of a Meeting of the Development & Planning Committee
held on Monday, 1st February 2010 at 5.30 pm at the Memorial Hall, Newmarket**

Attendance :

Councillor R Fletcher, Chairman
Councillor K Bovill
Councillor G Edge
Councillor J Bailey

Councillor M Jefferys
Councillor C Turner
Councillor J Uney
Councillor W Burch

Also Present: Isabelle Barrett – Town Clerk, Rosemary Foreman – Minute Assistant, Cllr W Hirst, 2 Members of the Press, 40 Members of the Public

Minute	Action by
D/10/02/1 <u>APOLOGIES</u> There were no apologies.	
D/10/02/2 <u>DECLARATION OF MEMBERS INTERESTS & CONSIDER UPDATE OF REGISTER OF INTEREST</u> None noted.	
D/10/02/3 <u>TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18th JANUARY 2010</u> D/10/01/28 – Para 1, final sentence: Amend to read ‘Councillor Fletcher had reiterated that it was the Council’s view that the 1200 houses <i>should not be built at all in Newmarket.</i> ’ With this amendment, the Minutes of the Development & Planning Meeting held on 18 th January 2010 were agreed and signed as a true record by Councillor Fletcher.	
D/10/02/4 <u>MATTERS ARISING</u> D/10/01/23 – Councillor Fletcher advised that Town Clerk had contacted SCC regarding management control of the highway in the Guineas and a report would be made to the next meeting.	

D/10/02/5

AN INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO PUT QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS OF NOT MORE THAN 3 MINUTES DURATION RELATING TO ITEMS LISTED IN THE PUBLIC PART OF THE AGENDA ONLY

Members of the public expressed concerns regarding the proposed development at Hatchfield Farm as follows:

1 Mrs J Fanshaw, trainer's wife and resident of Snailwell Road, said residents were against the proposal as it would increase traffic, making it more hazardous for horse riders as some people had little understanding of horses. Snailwell Road was a quiet road but was increasingly being used as a short cut to avoid the A142. She had recently witnessed a dangerous situation with a speeding motorist in conflict with a string of horses and last year a van had driven through a string - a rider was thrown and the horse hit by the van. Although horses were highly-strung, the riders could control them, but they had no control over motorists, most of whom were courteous. Horses competed with motorists for road space in Snailwell Road as there was no horse walk there; the Fordham Road horse walk was too narrow for two horses to pass. With construction spread over 20 years, it was crazy to suggest traffic lights to control the junction. There would be more traffic through Snailwell, people would not cycle into town or use the railway station as it took so long to get there. There would be more cars, more jams. Industry was not compatible with the racing industry and trainers would no longer aspire to come to Newmarket or owners send their horses here. Newmarket would become a shadow of itself and it would kill the horseracing industry. Mrs Fanshaw asked that NTC join the residents and oppose this huge development.

2 Mr J George, Tattersalls, said the Local Development Plan had not allocated Hatchfield Farm for development but concentrated on re-developing existing sites which were not Greenfield. Hatchfield was a significant change – an increase of 13% on a Greenfield site. Development of horseracing was to be encouraged. North East Newmarket had been identified in the Core Strategy but this document had not yet been agreed. If the Hatchfield application was approved, it could influence this decision. The impact of the proposed development at Hatchfield would be that traffic would have an adverse effect on horses and the safety of horses and riders. There would be up to 20% extra traffic on Fordham Road and traffic would avoid the A142 by increased use of Snailwell Road and Exning Road.

Councillor Fletcher advised that the question of the development of this land was being considered by the Government Inspector who had examined the LDF Core Strategy; he would announce his decision in due course. This planning application was in parallel with that decision and would not pre-empt it. NTC could only advise FHDC of their view on the application.

3 Mr D Notley, Newmarket resident, said he had attended a meeting at FHDC with the Government Inspector where many people promoted this development and said it would not affect Newmarket, being built as a carbuncle on the side of the town. Widening Fordham Road, improving bus routes – no-one has an understanding of the changes in Newmarket – they say we have facilities to cope. There is no Police Station (just 1 policeman) –FHDC needs to make Newmarket people aware of what is going on here to accommodate this development.

4 Rachel Hood, SHNAG, supported NTC in opposition to the LDF and in their vision for Newmarket - to return Newmarket to a town to be proud of. She made the following points:

i) The focus was on a Greenfield site, not on developing other brownfield areas

ii) Brandon and Haverhill want these houses. Newmarket has no infrastructure – no hospital etc. Red Lodge was a catastrophe without infrastructure

iii) Someone was nearly killed on the A142 recently due to traffic speed and traffic regularly backed up to Turner's Transport Depot. Apart from the 1200 houses, it was also proposed there should be 27,000 sqm of industrial units, which would change the whole nature of Newmarket

iv) The planning application was premature as the site had not yet been identified for development.

5 Mrs M Breedon expressed concern at a possible decline in air quality caused by extra fumes from increased traffic, which could cause health problems in horses and affect their performance.

6 Mr R Cobb, local resident and hotel worker, said the proposal for Hatchfield included another hotel, for which there was no demand in the area. There was no infrastructure on site and guests were unlikely to come into town. The hotel economy was in decline and a further hotel would see a decline in more town centre properties.

7 Mr G Duffy, Newmarket resident, asked where the occupants of the houses would work. There was not enough employment in Newmarket or nearby, so they would probably go to Cambridge or Bury St Edmunds, travelling away from the town each day and increasing traffic and pollution, which was not eco-friendly. Houses should be built where there was work, not in Newmarket.

8 Mrs K Unwin, SHNAG, historian and resident of Moulton, said the application should be rejected on historic grounds. Newmarket had 300 years of history which should not be ignored or the town could become like Welwyn Garden City or Stevenage.

9 Mr R Sellwood, representing Lord Derby, made the following points:

i) Newmarket was a special place and horseracing was a significant part of it so must be protected. However, Newmarket was not an island and could not detach itself. Traffic would increase but the growth would be less if new homes and jobs were in Newmarket rather than the surrounding villages. At the Core Strategy meetings, Horse Racing did not object to development but agreed it should increase one-third by 2030. There would be more employees in the horseracing industry who would need housing – there were currently 850 people on the FHDC housing list.

ii) Most hostility had arisen from inaccurate information – the population of Newmarket would not increase by one-third, it would be 15% over 20 years. Traffic in Fordham Road would not rise by 60%, more like 11% or 12%, less than 1% year on year.

iii) Hatchfield was a long-term solution for Newmarket; it was not protected horseracing land and was relatively isolated, close to the A14 and next to the largest employment area in the town. There would be on-site employment, community facilities and open spaces. Lord Derby had an interest in horseracing, so who was better placed to balance the needs of the horseracing industry? Mr Sellwood guaranteed the development would not become another Red Lodge and said Lord Derby was committed to the project. He asked NTC to support the planning application to protect the long-term development of horseracing in Newmarket.

10 Mr J Gosden, Newmarket Association of Trainers & Stud Farmers, said the A14/A142 junction was an impossible crossing and putting an elevated roundabout there would be at enormous cost. The racing industry would increase by one-third, but the houses at Hatchfield were not being built for stable staff. There would not be enough surgeries, there was no hospital, no A&E Department. The project was being done for profit and it was unlikely Lord Derby would remain to see it through, but would sell to a developer and move away from the town.

Mr Sellwood said he understood local people had concerns and did not like change but he assured them that Lord Derby intended to dispose of the site in stages and retain an interest in it.

11 Councillor Fletcher read a statement from Ms S McManus, SHNAG member, taxi driver and Newmarket resident, who strongly supported the view of the racing industry in Newmarket but said it would be the people of Newmarket who would suffer most if the development went ahead. The stress of living with what would be a constant building site for the next 20 years would adversely affect the standard of living for everyone. Everyone was aware of the problems with the A14/A142 junction and she had resorted to leaving the A14 at Quy and driving into town past the race courses. With approximately 250 empty houses on Studlands, she saw no need for such a vast increase in the number of houses other than to appease the greed of the landowner and satisfy the egos of the officers of FHDC hoping to secure political brownie points. Most of the new estates being built around the country were being turned into Buy to Let ghettos and this policy would not improve the quality of life for Newmarket residents. The proposed development was for a free standing town in its own right and, if it needed to be built at all, it should be built somewhere more appropriate and not tacked on to Newmarket like a monstrous carbuncle.

Following a suggestion by Councillor Fletcher, discussion on planning application F/2009/0713/ESO was brought forward.

D/10/02/6 PLANNING APPLICATION F/2009/0713/ESO

Comprehensive mixed use development comprising up to 1200 dwellings, up to 27000 sqm of B1 employment floor-space; community facilities (up to 500 sqm) of D1 use; retail development (up to 250 sqm) of A1 use; 80 bed hotel (C1 use); restaurants, food and drink establishments (up to 1000 sqm) of A3, A4, & A5 uses; park & ride (up to 100 spaces); up to 9000 sqm of B1 employment development and D2 'Assembly & Leisure' uses; primary school reservation (2 form entry), two vehicular accesses into the site – improvement of the A142 Willie Snaith roundabout to provide a fourth (east facing) arm and a new roundabout access on the A142 north of the A142/Studlands Park Avenue roundabout and realignment of the A142; a pedestrian/cycle access on the Snailwell Road; internal footpaths, cycle routes and estate roads; playing fields and pavilion, children's play space, informal open space, allotments and landscaping; foul and surface water drainage infrastructure. (Major Development and Departure from the Development Plan) – Hatchfield Farm Fordham Road Newmarket.

All documents relating to this planning application had previously been circulated to Committee members and their comments notified to Committee Chairman Councillor Fletcher, who had summarised the application and Councillors' comments.

In the subsequent discussion, Councillors made the following points:

1 Councillor Edge: Building 1200 houses in one place would be like planting a village on the side of Newmarket which would use the town's facilities. Traffic data was out-of date and under-estimated.

Newmarket's distinctive character would be destroyed – Newmarket did not want overspill in the past and does not want this development, which would overload the town. There was no extra provision for police, doctors, or even parking spaces in the town, and it would increase the dormitory side of the town. It was unlikely the proposed bus route would be profitable.

2 Councillor Turner: Studlands Park had eventually integrated into the town – could this development do the same? No, it was too far out, too many houses, and did not equate with Studlands. It had been suggested that any change in Government would change planning policies, but this was not certain. The first phase of 200 houses would be a reasonable community, like Studlands, but Brandon and Kentford were willing to have more houses. Bus sustainability – no; Education – a community lives and dies by its primary school – under SCC development, there was no secondary education in Brandon – education establishments were needed in the community. If a primary school was built at Hatchfield, it would impact on Laureate school. The lack of infrastructure at Red Lodge means children have to be educated elsewhere. Application opposed.

3 Councillor Bailey: I agree with other Councillors. Walkable? No. Viable bus route – no, nobody will take it on. A14/A142 junction must be completely re-designed, traffic lights would not work and would cause long queues into town and affect the horses. There was a lack of infrastructure – no A&E and the hospital could close. Surgeries were already overloaded, parking in town not enough, there was not sufficient employment in the town and it would become a dormitory/commuter area.

4 Councillor Burch: The proposed development would not be good for Newmarket, it would spoil the town. The proposal includes a Post Office – Newmarket once had 5 Post Offices but now only has one. Walkable? A very long way! Newmarket needs some houses but it must be kept in perspective.

5 Councillor Uney: I agree with the other Councillors. Social housing is mentioned – what does this mean? There is a long housing list. Traffic in Fordham Road is at a maximum now and it is impossible to widen or improve the road. Employment – light industry – sites are already available for development which are better than those proposed. When the Lambton Fields are developed, there will be even more traffic in Fordham Road. Hatchfield would not be part of the town – Studlands took 30 years to become part of the town.

6 Councillor Jefferys: The LDF has identified a need for more housing but it is difficult to assess its impact on the town. Young people need housing and if this project is refused, consideration must be given to where they will live in future. There must be some way to address the problem

7 Councillor Bovill: The proposal is outside the existing settlement boundary. There are 850 on the FHDC waiting list – how many would be housed at Hatchfield? Not many. The need is for 2, 3 and 4-bedroomed properties. However the application has highlighted existing issues in the town and the Council should look at its Vision for Newmarket and plan for the future. Application opposed.

Councillor Fletcher summed up by saying the Committee opposed the application but FHDC could take a different view and allow it. He suggested that NTC should voice their objections but, in the event the application is approved by FHDC, NTC should ask for a number of essential terms and pre-conditions to be applied.

The Committee agreed the following recommendations:

D/10/02/6.01 Recommendation

That Newmarket Town Council objects to planning application F/2009/0713/ESO on the grounds that the houses are not required and that any perceived benefits to the town arising from this urban extension would be heavily out-weighted by the likely adverse impact on the fabric and unique character of the town and, particularly, on the well-being of the local equine industry, on which many of our citizens rely for their livelihood and which the Town Council is pledged to support.

Town Clerk

D/10/02/6.02 Recommendation

That Newmarket Town Council advises Forest Heath District Council that, in the event that planning application F/2009/0713/ESO is approved by them, then a number of essential terms and conditions should be applied.

Town Clerk

D/10/02/6.03 Recommendation

That Newmarket Town Council sends a letter to the Head of Planning at Forest Heath District Council, copied to the Chairman of the Planning Committee, explaining and giving further details of the recommendations above.

Town Clerk

D/10/02/6.04 Recommendation

That the Chairman, assisted by the Vice Chairman and other members as appropriate, draft such a letter for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting on 15th February and to be submitted to the Town Council for approval on 22nd February.

Town Clerk

Town Clerk, Councillor Hirst and the members of the public left the meeting. The 2 members of the Press and Mr R Sellwood remained.

D/10/02/7 TO DISCUSS PRE-APPLICATIONS

None noted.

D/10/02/8 CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Week 3

D/10/02/8/01 F/2010/0014/HOU – Construction of a front porch and erection of single storey rear extension – 494 Aureole Walk Newmarket.

D/10/02/8/01 Resolved

The Committee voiced no objections although Councillors Bovill and Jefferys had concerns that the erection of the rear extension would be un-neighbourly.

P.P.P on 02.02.10

Week 4

None noted.

D/10/02/9 TO RECEIVE RESULTS OF APPLICATIONS AS DETERMINED BY FHDC

FHDC Planning Determinations received during weeks 3 and 4 are as follows:-

Application	Description	Address	FHDC Decision	TC Decision
F/09/627/VAR	Variation of condition 5 of planning permission F/05/479/VAR to allow use of 12 bedrooms within hostel	186-188 High Street Newmarket	Approved with conditions	Objected
F/09/628/LBC	Internal alteration to create 2 additional bedrooms including replacement of obscured bathroom window glazing with clear and alterations to existing disabled wc to create shower room	186-188 High Street Newmarket	Approved with conditions	Objected
F/09/678/ADI	Resub of F/08/592/ADI – retention of internally illuminated fascia and projecting sign	76 High Street Newmarket	Refused	No objections
F/09/711/CAT	Remove Silver Birch	40 Mill Hill Newmarket	No objections	No objections
F/09/632/TPO	Fell 1 Beech tree	88 Churchill Avenue Newmarket	Approved with conditions	No objections
F/09/662/TPO	Crown lift to 4m & desucker 11 Horse Chestnuts, desucker 1 Hawthorn, trim back by off of road by 0.5m 2 Hawthorns, repollard to previous levels 3 Horse Chestnuts	Rear of 1-16 Laureate Gardens Newmarket	Approved with conditions	No objections
F/09/671/TPO	Fell 1 Corsican Pine, desucker & crown lift to 6m 1 Lime, desucker & crown lift to 4m 1 Lime, desucker & crown lift to 7m 1 Horse Chestnut	Land between Norfolk Avenue and Derby Way/Rochfort Avenue Newmarket	Approved with conditions	No objections
F/09/679/ADN	Display of non-illuminated hanging sign	52 The Guineas Newmarket	Approved	No objections
F/09/729/TPO	Pollard 6 Lime trees	12 The Hamiltons Newmarket	Approved with conditions	No objections

D/10/02/10 EAST CAMBS PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Councillor Fletcher advised of the following applications:

59 Meadow Lane Newmarket – erection of a greenhouse

Woodditton Stud – temporary (6 months) mobile unit for groom's hostel

D/10/02/11 PLANNING APPLICATION WITHDRAWALS

None noted.

D/10/02/12 PLANNING APPLICATION APPEALS

The Committee noted the following planning Appeal:

F/2009/0113/FUL - Conversion of B1 business premises to residential use comprising of 14 apartments – Waterwitch House Exeter Road Newmarket.

D/10/02/13 FEEDBACK FROM FHDC PLANNING MEETINGS

None noted.

D/10/02/14 TO DISCUSS VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE APPLICATIONS

None noted.

D/10/02/15 CORRESPONDENCE

None noted.

D/10/02/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday, 15th February 2010 at 6.000 pm.

Meeting closed at 6.55 pm.

Signed _____ Date _____