

Membership as from May 2024

Councillor Berry
Councillor Drummond
Councillor Harvey (Vice)
Councillor Hood (Chair)
Councillor Hulbert
Councillor Jarvis
Councillor Jones
Councillor McHugh
Councillor Nobbs
Councillor Perry

Members = 10

Quorum = 3



Newmarket
TOWN COUNCIL

The Memorial Hall, High Street, Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8JP

TEL: 01638 667227

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the
Development and Planning Committee
to be held at

Memorial Hall, High Street, Newmarket, CB8 8JP

Monday 5th August 2024 at 6.15pm

A G E N D A

The meeting is held in public and the public are encouraged to attend and participate. Just occasionally matters such as contractual or staffing matters do have to be held in the confidential part of the meeting.

Members of the public and press may not orally report or comment about a meeting as it takes place if present at a meeting of the Council, but otherwise may:

- film, photograph or make an audio recording of the meeting;
- use any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later;
- Report or comment on the proceedings in writing, during or after a meeting or orally after the meeting.

The Council will where possible facilitate such recording unless it is being disruptive. It will also take steps to ensure that children, the vulnerable and members of the public who object to being filmed are protected without undermining the broader purpose of the meeting

- 1. Chair to read** fire safety notice and announce that proceedings may be filmed or recorded and ask if anyone present intends to record the meeting.
- 2. Apologies** - To receive and accept apologies for absence
- 3. Declaration of interests**
 - Councillors are invited to raise any declarations of interest concerning items on the agenda
 - To consider any requests for dispensation
- 4. Minutes of previous meeting held 15th July 2024**
 - To consider and adopt the minutes, as a true record of the proceedings
 - To consider any matters arising
- 5. Public participation** – an invitation to members of the public to make representations to Councillors. Resolutions can only be made on items on the agenda
Rules of public participation: no person may speak for longer than 3 minutes in total. The maximum time permitted for this item is 15 minutes. This is the only opportunity during the meeting for members of the public to address Councillors
- 6. To consider if Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan policies impact on planning applications for consideration**
- 7. Planning applications** – West Suffolk Council, weeks commencing 8/7/24, 15/7/24
- 8. Planning applications** – Amended and Deferred Plans
 - DC/24/0720/OUT – Hatchfield Farm, Fordham Road** (SANSOVINO business unit application) – to receive and approve the Town Council response
- 9. Planning Appeals** – to discuss any notified appeals and receive any appeal updates or results
 - AP/24/0019/STAND Garage at Nowell Lodge, Fordham Road** – appeal in progress
 - AP/24/0008/STAND Chels, 51A Bury Road** – appeal in progress
- 10. Planning applications** – East Cambs
- 11. Planning decisions and plans withdrawn** – West Suffolk Council-week 8/7/24, 15/7/24, 22/7/24
- 12. Delegation Panel decisions** - To discuss any decisions by Delegation Panel
- 13. Licensing**
 - To discuss any Licensing applications, including pavement licence applications
- 14. Enforcement** – to discuss any enforcement issues
- 15. Listed Buildings** – to discuss the former McColls property
- 16. Litter** – to discuss the increase in littering and the possibility of a campaign
- 17. Trees** – to discuss the Town Council Tree Policy
 - Draft Policy**
 - Audit of Trees**
 - Any other tree matters**
- 18. Oakfield Road/Vicarage Road** – to receive resident concerns regarding road safety
- 19. Correspondence**

20. Date of next meeting – 19th August 2024

Signed: *CE Whitaker* Cathy Whitaker, Town Clerk

Date: 30th July 2024

To: Chair & Members of D&P Committee, Other Council Members, Press & the Public

Material Planning Considerations	
Site specific issues	- adequacy for turning, loading - availability/capacity of local infrastructure (eg public drainage or water systems) - car parking - deficiencies in community/social facilities (eg spaces in schools) - design, appearance and materials - layout and density of building(s) - road access - traffic generation
Environmental effects	- effect on street scene - hazardous materials, contaminated land - landscaping - light (including overshadowing) - loss of trees - nature conservation & biodiversity issues - noise & disturbance resulting from use - overlooking/loss of privacy - smells and fumes - visual amenity
Listed buildings/conservation areas	- The need to preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of designated conservation areas and protect listed buildings - Effect on archaeological interest
Usage	- Incompatible or unacceptable uses - Desire to retain and promote certain uses e.g. stables in Newmarket.
Previous decisions	Previous planning decisions, including appeal decisions
Policies	- Statutory provisions contained in planning acts, statutory regulations & planning case law - Central Government planning policy and advice - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - Supplementary planning guidance/documents eg Affordable Housing SPD, Master plans, development briefs - WSC Local Plan policies - Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan - Newmarket Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted September 2009)
Key principle of the NPPF – presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means granting permission unless: - the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or <i>any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits</i>	
Matters which are not material planning considerations	
Greater weight is attached to issues raised which are supported by evidence rather than solely by assertion.	
Competition (unless in relation to adverse effects on a town centre as a whole)	Moral and religious issues
Breach of private covenants or other private property or access rights, including boundary disputes	Council interests (eg land ownership or contractual matters)
Devaluation of property	Identity or motives of an applicant or occupier
Protection of a private view	Private disputes between neighbours
Impact of construction work	

Parking Guidance for Use Classes C3 and C4: Dwelling houses and houses in multiple occupation

Family houses, or house occupied by up to six residents living together as a single household, or Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)¹³, including a household where care is provided for residents.

Standard: Flats and Houses are to be treated the same.

Use	Vehicle	Cycle	PTW	Disabled
	Minimum*	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum
1 bedroom	1 space per dwelling	2 secure covered spaces per dwelling. (Satisfied if garage or secure area is provided within curtilage of dwelling to minimum dimensions)	N/A	N/A if parking is in curtilage of dwelling, otherwise as Visitor/unallocated
2 bedrooms	2 spaces per dwelling**			
3 bedrooms	2 spaces per dwelling			
4+ bedrooms	3 spaces per dwelling			
Retirement developments (e.g., warden assisted independent living accommodation)	1 space per dwelling	2 spaces per 8 units (visitors)	2 PTW spaces and 1 space per 2 dwellings for mobility scooters	
Visitor/unallocated	0.25 spaces per dwelling (unallocated)	If no garage or secure area is provided within curtilage of dwelling, then 2 covered & secure spaces per dwelling in a communal area for residents plus 2 spaces^ per 8 dwellings for visitors	1 space + 1 per 20 car spaces (for 1 st 100 car spaces), then 1 space per 30 car spaces (over 100 car spaces)	

¹³ Houses in multiple occupation (Class C4) are defined in The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) as 'small shared houses occupied by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, who share basic amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom'.

Informative notes:

*Standards exclude garages under 6m x 3m (internal dimension) as a parking space but can include undercroft parking and car ports providing, they have no other current or potential use.

**Reduction in this figure may be considered with robust and agreed highway mitigation

^Mobility vehicle spaces should be secure and covered with charging facilities.

Visitor/unallocated vehicle parking can, subject to appropriate design, be located on street.

Unallocated cycle parking for residents to be secure and covered, located in easily accessible locations throughout the development. These guidelines will be applied to all development (including infill developments, extension applications and change of use).

Where grouped, unassigned parking is proposed, more flexible and efficient use of the parking may be achieved than with allocated parking. Subject to discussion with the Highway Authority this may potentially reduce the nominal on-street parking provision standards required by up to 25%.

Where an individual dwelling may require more than two spaces these additional spaces may be provided as part of unallocated on street parking, providing this is designed in.

An allowance will be required for visitor cycle and car parking, refer para 3.2 and 4.5.

Suffolk Guidance for Parking 2019 {excerpt}

Car clubs should be promoted in low provision/car free residential developments and car club spaces provided. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure should also be provided in new developments.

Research was undertaken to derive the residential parking guidance for Suffolk. The research included a questionnaire survey to approximately 9000 dwellings. The results of the survey and the 2001 and 2011 Census data for Suffolk car ownership can be found in Appendix 1.

Electric Vehicle recharging points to be provided to support the use of low emission vehicles. See EV Parking Guidance table within this document for further guidance.

Reductions to the minimum parking guidance

This advisory residential parking guidance is the minimum required; however a range of factors will be taken into account. For main urban areas a reduction to the parking guidance may be considered where a proposal has been designed to be exceptionally sustainable in transport terms and which effectively promotes an overall reduction in the use of high emission vehicles and avoids the provision of car parking adjacent or close to dwellings within the main layout.

Main urban areas are defined as those having frequent and extensive opportunities for public transport and cycling and walking links; close proximity to local services (including accessing education, healthcare, food shopping and employment); and on street parking controls at all times e.g. double yellow lines. Where there is evidence that these factors are in place, local planning authorities may, after consultation with the Highway Authority, bring forward local parking policies to limit the scale of parking in specific areas.

When making their recommendation to local planning authorities considering reduced parking proposals for residential development, the Highway Authority must be:

- able to recommend a condition for suitable cycle storage and secure parking facilities;
- satisfied that servicing vehicles would be able to operate efficiently i.e. not restricted by loading restrictions or road layout;
- able to determine how highly sustainable the location is in terms of proximity to services, shops etc. and public transport (high frequency and wide ranging) and suitable cycling and walking routes;
- made aware of the likelihood of a viable Car Club (the provision of a car club would need to be secured through a Planning Obligation on Condition);
- able to determine the possible impact that a single application may have in setting a precedent in an area;
- satisfied by the availability of visitor parking (off street public car parks may be acceptable for visitor use); and
- satisfied that the likely impact of additional road parking in the vicinity would not cause inconsiderate and unsafe obstructions to the surrounding road or footpath network or add pressure onto an already densely utilised parking network.

If all the above criteria are satisfied on a site by site basis then the Highways Authority would be more likely to approve of reduced parking proposals.

However, it is not possible to make the assumption that occupiers will be car free; although it may be possible to accept this to some degree where the units are single bed. Furthermore, if the neighbouring streets are controlled by Residents Parking then any new development is prohibited from joining the scheme.

The presumption that occupiers are required to use off road public car parks for parking of their vehicles is not generally supported. The Highways Authority will only consider any identified use of off-road public car parks as a means of resident parking in exceptionally sustainable developments that are located in main urban areas (as defined above). In such cases, the Highway Authority must first be satisfied that the car park/s in question are viable long-term parking options for affected residents and that the development has been designed to be extremely sustainable in transport terms.

To summarise, the key questions the Highways Authority will seek to address when considering proposals for reduced parking are:

- Where might residents park?
- What real harm would these vehicles cause?
- Are the roads heavily regulated in terms of prohibition of parking?
- Are the streets already under significant pressure?

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



Newmarket

TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Development & Planning Committee Held on Monday 15th July 2024 at 6.15pm

Attendance:

Councillor R Hood (Chair)
Councillor A Drummond
Councillor J Harvey
Councillor J Jarvis

Councillor R Jones
Councillor J McHugh
Councillor R Nobbs
Councillor S Perry

Also Present: C Whitaker – Town Clerk (via Teams), J Ashton – Minute Assistant, 1 Member of the Press and 1 Member of the Public.

	Minute	Action by
D/24/07/27 <u>Chairman to Read the Fire Safety Notice and Announce that Proceedings May be Filmed or Recorded</u> The Chairman welcomed everyone, opened the meeting, and read out the Fire Notice and announced that proceedings were being recorded by the Minute Assistant and asked if anyone intended to record the meeting.		
D/24/07/28 <u>Apologies</u> Apologies were received from Cllrs Berry and Hulbert.		
D/24/07/29 <u>Declaration of Members Interests & to Remind Councillors of the need to keep up to date their Register of Member's Interests and to Consider any Requests Received for Member's Dispensation</u> None noted. There were no requests for dispensation.		
D/24/07/30 <u>To Confirm the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 8th July 2024 and any Matters Arising</u> The Chairman presented the minutes of the Development & Planning Committee held on 8th July 2024 and the following amendment was made: Page 2 - D/24/07/24 – the following was added to the last sentence “A site visit to a similar development built by the Vistry Group will be arranged”. Subject to the amendment being made, the following was agreed: <u>D/24/07/30.01 Resolved</u> That the minutes of the Development & Planning Committee held on 8th July 2024 be adopted and were signed as a true record by the Chairman of the Development & Planning Committee. There were no matters arising.		
D/24/07/31 <u>Public Open Session</u> No members of the public wished to speak.		

Book Number 43 2024 - 2025

The Chair proposed that item 15 be brought forward, and the following was agreed:

D/24/07/31.01 Resolved

That the item for Rights of Way be brought forward.

D/24/07/32 Rights of Way

Laureate School Road/Willie Snaith Road footpath – WSC has confirmed that reinstating the path is a condition of the sale of the property and they and the selling Agents have made clear to a prospective buyer. The path is not a PROW, however, a covenant has existed on the path since 18/08/2005. Closing the path was a breach of planning regulations and no enforcement action was taken by WSC. Jockey's Walk is a PROW, which runs parallel to the path; SCC and the Jockey Club are looking to upgrade and maintain Jockey's Walk with Section 106 monies from the Hatchfield development and contributions from SCC highway's locality budget will be used to make short-term improvements. The following was agreed:

D/24/07/32.01 Resolved

That the Town Clerk sends all relevant information to SCC PROW and to request that Laureate School Road/Willie Snaith Road footpath is the definitive map as a PROW.

D/24/07/32.02 Resolved

That Delegated Powers be given to the Town Clerk, Chair and Cllr Yarrow to compose a letter to be sent to WSC and SCC PROW to ensure that the path is reinstated when the property is sold and that this is imperative.

D/24/07/32.03 Resolved

That Cllr Jones contacts Laureate School to collate information regarding the use of the path.

A member of the public left the meeting.

D/24/07/33 Impact of Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan Policies on Applications Being Considered

Policy 14 – Trees and Policy 1 – Conservation Area and large development.

D/24/07/34 Planning Applications

Week Commencing 24/06/2024 & 01/07/2024.

D/24/07/34/1 DC/24/0895/TCA - Trees in a conservation area notification on Holly (T1 on plan) and one Oak (T2 on plan) overall crown reduction by up to three metres and crown lift to give a ground clearance of three metres - The Kremlin Bungalow, 1A Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk.

D/24/07/34.01 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the Tree Officer's approval.

D/24/07/34/2 DC/24/0800/TPO - TPO 012 (1956) Tree Preservation order- one Lime (T180 on plan, within A3 on order) one Ash (T181 on plan, within A3 on order) re-pollard to nine metres above ground level and remove epicormic growth from main stem; one

Horse Chestnut (T179 on plan, within A3 on order) crown lift to five metres above ground level - 33 Norfolk Avenue, Newmarket, Suffolk.

D/24/07/34.02 Resolved

The Committee objected on the issue of ownership of the trees as the trees line a pathway at the rear of the properties in Norfolk Avenue and are believed to be the responsibility of WSC and not the residents. There are other trees in the vicinity belonging to WSC that also require maintenance work.

D/24/07/34/3 DC/24/0784/HH - Householder planning application-a. new timber portico porch (following removal of existing timber/glass porch) b. rationale external pipework c. four dormers in existing former hayloft roof d. new flat infill in junction of main house e. single storey rear extension f. link extension between house and garage, reopening the passage and reinstating the external door and over light with new steps g. reopen blocked up first floor window on NW elevation h. arbour structure with lead roof i. new air source heat pump - Boyarin Lodge, 30 Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk.

D/24/07/34.03 Resolved

The Committee voiced no objection as works are in keeping with the existing building and will be an enhancement in the Conservation Area.

D/24/07/34/4 DC/24/0684/HH - Householder planning application - a. addition of windows to side elevations b. render to all elevations - 1 Stanley Stud Cottages, Snailwell Road, Newmarket, Suffolk.

D/24/07/34.04 Resolved

The Committee voiced no objection, subject to no loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

D/24/07/34/5 DC/24/0933/TCA - Trees in a conservation area notification-five Lime (G1) pollard to six meters above ground level - 5 Mill Reef, Newmarket, Suffolk.

D/24/07/34.05 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the Tree Officer's approval.

D/24/07/35 Amended and Deferred

D/24/07/35/1 DC/24/0653/ADV & DC/24/0654/LB – 58-60 High Street – further information was considered, and the following was agreed:

D/24/07/35.01 Resolved

The Committee maintained their original objection for the applications regarding the signage. In addition, this is a prominent listed building in the High Street and ownership is not clear and there are no reassurances that the aesthetics of the building will provide continuity and compliment the High Street.

An item for Listed Buildings will be added to the next agenda with specific relation to the former McColls building on St Mary's Square.

D/24/07/35/2 DC/24/0720/OUT – Hatchfield Farm, Fordham Road (SANSOVINO business unit application) – the application was considered, following the presentation on 01/07/24. The following was agreed:

D/24/07/35.02 Resolved

That Delegated Powers be given to the Town Clerk, Chair and Vice-Chair to formulate a response and report back to Full Council for approval.

Cllr Nobbs gave his apologies and left the meeting.

D/24/07/35/3 DC/24/0763/FUL – 8 Park Lane – Cllr Hood reported that she had spoken with the Planning officer and the following was agreed.

D/24/07/35.03 Resolved

The Committee objected to the demolition of a building in a conservation area.

D/24/07/35/4 DC/24/0808/CLP – 4 Lisburn Road - response to request for site visit. The following was agreed:

D/24/07/35.04 Resolved

The Committee made no comment and will await the decision on whether a planning application is required for the extension.

D/24/07/36 Planning Appeals

D/24/06/36/1 AP/24/0019/STAND Garage at Nowell Lodge, Fordham Road – appeal in progress.

D/24/06/36/2 AP/0008/STAND – Chels 51A Bury Road – it was noted that the appeal started on 1st March 2024 and is ongoing.

D/24/07/37 East Cambs Planning Applications

The East Cambs Weekly Lists were noted.

D/24/07/38 To Receive Results of Applications as Determined by West Suffolk and Plans Withdrawn

West Suffolk Planning Determinations received during week commencing 24/06/2024 & 01/07/2024.

Applications	Description	Address	WS Decision	NTC Decision
DC/24/0636/HH	Householder planning application-ramped pedestrian access	67 Vincent Close, Newmarket, Suffolk	Approved	No objection
DC/24/0603/FUL	Planning application-external alterations of unit 1 to enable subdivision into two units (class E)	1 Exeter Road, Newmarket, Suffolk	Approved	Objected
DC/24/0717/TCA	Trees in a conservation area notification-one Yew (Blue on plan) and one Sycamore (Yellow on plan)	fell 6 Falmouth Gardens, Newmarket, Suffolk	Approved	No objection

D/24/07/39 Delegation Panel Decisions

DC/23/1897/FUL - Planning Application - a. refurbishment of existing ground floor retail unit b. change of use of first and second floors to residential use c. conversion of existing outbuilding for residential use - 43 High Street, Newmarket, Suffolk.

It was noted that the Panel were minded to “grant” permission.

D/24/07/40 Licensing
None noted.

Cllr Perry had contacted WSC Licencing, and it was confirmed that a pavement licence is required for all businesses that want to use street furniture. The licences are valid for a 2-year period and the new regulations will be phased in.

D/24/07/41 Enforcement
Mesnil Warren, 40 Bury Road - information from the Conservation Officer is awaited. No further information received.

Town Clerk confirmed that she had written to WSC regarding the other properties that were identified, and a response is awaited. The following was agreed:

D/24/07/41.01 Resolved
That a copy of the letter regarding the enforcement issues be copied to the WSC CEO.

D/24/07/42 Litter
This item was deferred to the next meeting.

D/24/07/43 Consultations
WSC Street Trading Policy – the proposed response to the survey will be further considered by the Chair and Cllr Harvey.

WSC Unmet Taxi Demand Survey – the Chair and Cllr Harvey will compose a response to the survey.

D/24/07/44 Correspondence
The Town Council’s response to the Hatchfield Reserved Matters application was discussed and a re-statement regarding the TRO will be made – “TRO including double yellow lines and traffic calming to ensure low speed and no stopping at any time.”

D/24/07/45 Date of Next Meeting
Monday 5th August 2024 at the Memorial Hall.

Meeting closed at 7:25pm.

Signed _____ Date _____

Summary of Resolutions/Recommendations

Book Number 43 2024 - 2025

Minutes of Development & Planning Committee held on Monday 15th July 2024

Resolution/Recommendation	Resolution/Recommendation Wording
<u>D/24/07/32.01 Resolved</u>	That the Town Clerk sends all relevant information to SCC PROW and to request that it is recorded on the definitive map as a PROW.
<u>D/24/07/32.02 Resolved</u>	That Delegated Powers be given to the Town Clerk, Chair and Cllr Yarrow to compose a letter to be sent to WSC and SCC PROW to ensure that the path is reinstated when the property is sold and that this is imperative.
<u>D/24/07/32.03 Resolved</u>	That Cllr Jones contacts Laureate School to collate information regarding the use of the path.
<u>D/24/07/34.01 Resolved</u>	The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the Tree Officer's approval.
<u>D/24/07/34.02 Resolved</u>	The Committee objected on the issue of ownership of the trees as the trees line a pathway at the rear of the properties in Norfolk Avenue and are believed to be the responsibility of WSC and not the residents. There are other trees in the vicinity belonging to WSC that also require maintenance work.
<u>D/24/07/34.03 Resolved</u>	The Committee voiced no objection as works are in keeping with the existing building and will be an enhancement in the Conservation Area.
<u>D/24/07/34.04 Resolved</u>	The Committee voiced no objection, subject to no loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
<u>D/24/07/34.05 Resolved</u>	The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the Tree Officer's approval.
<u>D/24/07/35.01 Resolved</u>	The Committee maintained their original objection for the applications regarding the signage. In addition, this is a prominent listed building in the High Street and ownership is not clear and there are no reassurances that the aesthetics of the building will provide continuity and compliment the High Street.
<u>D/24/07/35.02 Resolved</u>	The Delegated Powers be given to the Town Clerk, Chair and Cllr Harvey to formulate a response and report back to Full Council for approval.
<u>D/24/07/35.03 Resolved</u>	The Committee objected to the demolition of a building in a conservation area.
<u>D/24/07/35.04 Resolved</u>	The Committee made no comment and will await the decision on whether a planning application is required for the extension.
<u>D/24/07/41.01 Resolved</u>	That a copy of the letter regarding the enforcement issues be copied to the WSC CEO.

Development and Planning Committee
Planning Applications – West Suffolk Council

Weeks commencing 8 th & 15 th July				
Application	Constraints	Case Officer	Applicant name	Consultation expiry date
<u>DC/24/1000/TCA</u> Trees in a conservation area notification-one Sorbus (T1 on plan) fell Bassett House, 29 Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 7BY	Conservation area	Daniel Gospel	K Evans	Fri 9 th Aug
<u>DC/24/1022/TCA</u> Trees in a conservation area notification- one Crab Apple (as indicated on plan) fell Buck House, 21 The Avenue, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 9AA	Conservation area	Daniel Gospel	Mr Desmond Burnett	Tue 13 th Aug
<u>DC/24/0957/FUL</u> Planning application - single storey reading room located within an existing courtyard St Louis Catholic Academy Fordham Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7AA	Conservation area	Adam Yancy	Helen Bates	Mon 19 th Aug

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

DC/24/0720/RM: - Hatchfield Farm, Fordham Road, Newmarket – Reserved Matters

Newmarket Town Council supports the development of suitable business and local employment opportunities, with a strong preference for encouraging start-up and technical type units rather than large industrial units and distribution centres, which are not acceptable within this town as these conflict with our delicate eco-system.

There are concerns about additional vehicles on the A14 slip-roads, particularly larger vehicles. A potential review of the slip-road itself is preferable, with direct access to the site for related traffic movement.

Sufficient onsite parking is required to avoid ingress into the residential part of the site.

Under our Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan, approaches to the town need to be beautiful and attractive and any large, oblique warehouses are totally unacceptable in our market town.

Complimentary building styles, are a must and landscaping and net eco-gain is essential to this development.

Newmarket is not a standard town - simply a suitable stop on the A14 between Cambridge and Felixstowe for large warehouse storage. It is unique and needs sensitive employment land development.

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

WEEKLY LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

(Alphabetically by Parish)

Reference: 24/00678/FUL

Officer: Lisa Moden

Location: 56 Isaacson Road Burwell Cambridge CB25 0AF

Date application valid: 12th July 2024

Parish: Burwell

Proposal: Single storey extension to front of existing garage to form a bicycle/garden store

Applicant:

Dr Adam Platt
56 Isaacson Road
Burwell
Cambridge
CB25 0AF

Agent:

Andrew Fleet Architectural Technologists
FAO Mr Steve Crawford
6 Regent Place
Soham
Ely
CB7 5RL

Grid Reference: 559382 266183

Reference: 24/00716/FUL

Officer: Olivia Roberts

Location: 64B Fordham Road Soham Ely Cambridgeshire CB7 5AH

Date application valid: 15th July 2024

Parish: Soham

Proposal: Proposed two storey extension, new entrance porch, replacement garage and alterations

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs D Clemence
64B Fordham Road
Soham
Ely
Cambridgeshire
CB7 5AH

Agent:

Jamie Palmer Architectural Design Services Ltd
FAO Mr Jamie Palmer
131A Brook Street
Soham
Cambridgeshire
CB7 5AE

Grid Reference: 560196 272197

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Decision List

Weeks commencing 8 th & 15 th July	NTC Comments
DC/24/0719/TCA Trees in a conservation area notification- two Sycamore (area marked in red) fell; group of Shrubs (area marked in red) crown reduction in height by two metres 15 Highfield House, Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 7BX Decided-No objections	 The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and object to the felling of healthy trees. The Committee objected to this application and requested that the application be submitted to the Tree Officer for consideration and a full report. If the height of the trees is interfering with the signal the Committee requested that height reduction be considered. The Committee voiced no objection to the crown reduction of the shrubs.
DC/24/0640/HPA Householder prior approval- single storey rear extension Bungalow 2, Rayes Lane, Newmarket Suffolk, CB8 7AB Decided- Prior approval required & granted.	
DC/24/0615/CLP Application for lawful development certificate for proposed use or development- a. Replacement of single-glazed sashes with timber double glazed sashes to same dimensions, retaining existing sash boxes; b. Installation of in-roof solar PV panels to the rear roof slopes; c. Demolition of brick link passage to the garage, and refurbishment of door and overlight, new steps d. Demolition of the woodshed and replacement with a new studio office with flat green roof e. Removal of chimneys Boyarin Lodge, 30 Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 7BT Decided approve application	



Decision List

DC/24/0309/FUL Planning application- replacement fencing following removal of existing fencing Land north of the Severals, Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk. Decided- Approve application.	 The committee voiced no objection and supported the proposal.
DC/23/1897/FUL Planning application- a.refurbishment of existing ground floor retail unit b.change of use of first and second floors to residential use c. conversion of existing outbuilding for residential use 43 High Street, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 8NA Decided- approve application	 The Committee supported the revised plans for the development; however, they maintained their objection on the lack of parking which is insufficient to be in accordance with parking requirement for town centre developments (as per NTC parking and transport statement below:NEWMARKET TOWN COUNCILS STANDARD PLANNING RESPONSE FOR APPLICATIONS WITH PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND PARKING CONCERNS Newmarket Town Council (NTC) takes serious issue with any view that considers that the town has good, or even adequate, public transport. For the reasons listed below, public transport does not meet the Suffolk County Council (SCC) guidance criteria as it is neither frequent nor wideranging. There is no direct bus service into Bury St Edmunds, which is a major destination for work, education and leisure. The most frequent services (bus and train) run hourly. There is no bus service on a Sunday. Bus services stop running early evening / late afternoon. There is no bus service to / from the railway station1, 2 There is no bus service covering the South side of the town. Most local amenities are situated either in the High Street, which bisects the town East to West, or to the North of the town. Many bus routes are dependent on short term funding by Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) and hence cannot be guaranteed in the long term. The railways station is on a branch line and there is poor connectivity to mainline services. Cycle lane provision is limited. There is no cycle lane running from Newmarket to Cambridge, although the Cambridge end of the route does have a cycle lane in place. 1 The proposed service linking Newmarket and Haverhill will include the railway station but only runs every two hours. The last bus is several hours before the last train. Therefore, it cannot be considered a connecting service. 2 A privately funded shuttle bus links Newmarket Railway Station with the racecourse on race days. This is particularly relevant to any car free application when there are also potentially significant impacts due to current on-street parking stress and very limited ready access to off-street parking. There is a clear indication that there is a lack of parking and this should be evidence for future planning applications. NTC will continue to press SCC Highways to update their information regarding both Newmarket public transport and parking provision to ensure accurate advice is provided to West Suffolk Planning Authority.



Decision List

DC/23/1898/LB Application for listed building consent- Internal and external alterations to allow for the refurbishment of existing ground floor retail unit b. change of use of first and second floors to residential use c. conversion of existing outbuilding for residential use d. removal of rear wall 43 High Street, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 8NA Decided- Approve application.	
DC/24/0778/TCA Trees in a conservation area notification- one Yew (T1 on plan) and one Conifer (T2 on plan)- fell The Kremlin Bungalow, 1A Bury Road, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 7BX Decided- No objections.	The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and objects to the felling of healthy trees. The Committee objected to this application due to the absence of a Tree Officer's report and no reason being given to fell the trees.
DC/24/0311/RM Reserved Matters Application- Submission of details under outline planning permission DC/13/0408/OUT (Granted by Secretary of State under reference APP/H3510/V/14/2222871)- Site wide landscaping outside of residential parcels Hatchfield Farm Fordham Road, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 7XL Decided- Approve application	

Decision List

DC/23/0864/FUL Planning application- a. 50 dwellings, garages, associated infrastructure including substation and foul water pumping station and public open space following demolition of existing building and hard standing) b. new vehicular access onto Fordham Road following closure of existing southbound access- c. re-location of tennis courts Land at former St Felix School, Fordham Road, Newmarket, Suffolk	Comments from West Suffolk Councillors (Newmarket) in response to revised planning application Sent on behalf of Newmarket Councillors: Sue Perry (Newmarket East), Kevin Yarrow (Newmarket West), Janne Jarvis (Newmarket North), Michael Anderson (Newmarket North). We acknowledge the detailed response to the concerns we raised about the original planning application in the applicant's supporting letter of 19/10/23. However we note that those concerns have not been adequately addressed and that only minimal changes have been made to the original plans. We therefore maintain our original objections and would like to add the following comments on the applicant's revised plans and their response. These are based on the applicant's covering letter dated 19/10/23 unless otherwise stated. The application fails to take account of the strategic importance of this site for sport and leisure provision (response to Newmarket Councillors, page 12). The focus is entirely on housing, landscaping and very limited provision of sports facilities with no consideration as to how the site could be best utilised as part of an overall strategy for sport and recreation. Provision of tennis courts and the assurance that there are no technical constraints for the development of an indoor sports facility builds on the historic, piecemeal approach to sport and leisure development that has led to the current situation where provision is both fragmented and inadequate. The siting of the filtration basin and the location of the tennis courts on the amenity land precludes any other use for this space. 1 C DC/23/0864/FUL Former St Felix School site Sport and leisure context The Newmarket Community Network Report Aug 23 demonstrated the need for green space for both sport and recreation. The applicant notes that there is no up-to-date playing pitch strategy (response to Sport England page 6) but this does not mean that there is no need for one. The applicant states (response to Public Health Suffolk, page 12), that details of the open space management will be dealt with by through Section 106 procedure and planning conditions. Again demonstrates a lack of strategic thinking. Any strategic plan would require that management, which will be integral to success, is determined before any planning application is agreed. The need for housing development It should be noted that planning permission has recently been granted for 123 houses on a longdisputed site off Newmarket High Street (HM Planning Inspectorate ref APP/F3545/W/22/3303347). This provides 73 houses in addition to the 50 allocated in the SAP 2019. This eases the pressure on the five year land supply. Comments received from local residents demonstrate that residents want the St Felix site to be used as a sport and leisure facility and not as a housing development. Flaws in the original consultation that led to the development brief were highlighted in our previous submission and are also noted by Sport England (see below). Suffolk County Council has been elected to serve the needs of the residents of Suffolk not to act as a housing developer. It is within the council's power to withdraw the application and demonstrate acommitment to acting in the town's best interests. We also note the SAP 2019 allows up to 50 houses on the site. This does not mean that 50 houses have to be built. Protection of space for sport and leisure The re-shaping of the filtration basin and its rebranding as "an ancilliary benefit" does not alter the fact that the basin, along with the pumping station, are integral requirements of the housing development to ensure adequate drainage. As such they should be incorporated within the
---	---

Decision List

	part of the site allocated to housing and not be allowed to encroach on land designated as amenity space. The plans included on page 60 of the development brief clearly show how the land was apportioned. The developer states (response to Greens Space and Heritage Team, page 5) that there is no scope to locate the basin anywhere else on the site. This alone is sufficient to make the scheme non-viable. The stated functional requirement for the pumping station to be located away from the proposed dwellings to ensure the preservation of residential amenity suggests that it is not compatible with the stated desire to provide a tranquil amenity space (response to Sport England, page 6). The applicant recognises (response to Public Health Suffolk page 5) that the scheme falls short by 0.2 hectares of the requirement for new public open space but asserts that this is more than compensated for by opening up space with no current public access. The reduction in the number of tennis courts is justified on the basis of improved quality (response to Sport England page 6). Refurbishment and upgrade of sports facilities should not involve a concurrent reduction in level of provision unless there is evidence of reduced need. Arguments on the need for increased rather than reduced facilities have already been made. Quality and quantity cannot be used as equivalent measures and this argument is invalid. Hence the scheme remains in conflict with the policies cited. Sport England in its response (email 12/7/23) finds that the provision of landscaped informal recreational space makes land unavailable for playing pitches and there is an overall reduction in playing pitch provision without any concurrent evidence of reduced need. It also notes that “the multiple pre-application meetings that were held do not appear to have addressed development on playing field land, nor does the consultation reference any engagement with sports bodies”. The developer rejects the suggestion made by Place Services – Landscape (page 4) to incorporate occasional tree planting and justifies it to “maximise the usability of the open space for recreational opportunities”. This argument is also used to justify the level of replacement tree planting falling short of that recommended by the WSC Tree Officer (page 4). Hence the proposal sets up competition between green space for informal recreation, increased biodiversity and sports facilities when in fact all three are required. Policy requirements for one cannot be achieved without compromising at least one of the others. We do not agree with the compromises proposed by applicant, and object to the fact that all the compromises involve the amenity land rather than the housing. The applicant states that planning conditions will be used to address several issues raised in response to the initial application. For example, it is stated that “it can be confirmed upon grant of any planning permission a suitably worded planning condition will be imposed requiring that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved drawings. This means the area allocated as open space will be required to be retained for its intended function, with any 2 application for development within this space being required to meet the relevant development management policies which seek to protect such space”. Given that latest plans submitted fail, by the developer’s own admission, to abide by policies cited, or the space allocation in the development brief (see above), this statement provides no reassurance whatsoever. The fact that 50% of the amenity land will be owned by a development company and not by Suffolk
--	---

Decision List

	County Council raises alarm bells about its future. It is difficult to see how a development company would engage in any amenity that did not serve to maximise profit. A number of other issues are also to be addressed by planning conditions eg, future management of the open space and landscaping. However, no detail of these planning conditions is provided and hence the impact of these is unclear and cannot be guaranteed. This means that a decision to grant the application would be partly based on things that are as yet unknown. We dispute the confirmation by the highways consultant that there are parking spaces adjacent to the open space as well as visitor parking within the development (response to Newmarket Town Council, page 11) The small number of visitor parking spaces provided is insufficient by some considerable margin to meet the needs of a sports and leisure facility. If those spaces are used up by leisure visitors, it will significantly impact on the amenity of residents for whose convenience the parking is designed. The only other parking available is a car park on the Fordham Road side of the George Lambton Playing Field. This is some considerable distance from the western end of the St Felix site and cannot be considered adjacent. Sustainability We appreciate the comments made on the incorporation of PV panels but note that the scheme fails to optimise energy efficiency and some dwellings will be more energy efficient than others. Housing mix and supported housing The supporting letter states that Strategic Housing has not raised concerns regarding the absence of bungalows. However, they do recognise a need for level access accommodation, in particularly the ground floor one bed flats to M4(2) standard (Strategic Housing comment 6/11/23) This need has not been addressed. We are also of the view that a range of accessible housing is required to cater for the needs of a broader range of housing need for people who find stairs difficult or impossible to manage and that bungalows should be part of any development. Public transport, traffic, station accessibility We maintain our view on the inadequacy of public transport provision as laid out in our original comments. We invite the Highways Authority to visit the town to see for themselves just how difficult things are for those who depend on public transport, and how unattractive it is for those who do not. We consider that the railway station is too far away to be considered convenient for residents. As well as distance to the station, it should be noted that there is no obvious safe cycle route from the town end of the cycle path on the Yellow Brick Road to the station. 3It should be noted from the comments of local residents that the increase to traffic along Fordham Road is a concern, particularly given the additional 400 houses that are currently under construction at Hatchfield Farm further along Fordham Road. Other concerns Newmarket Town Council raised a concern that Anglian Water (AW) has made no comments despite the pumping station feeding foul water into the drainage system. AW's lack of comment is taken to mean that it has no concerns. This cannot be assumed for such a critical issue and it is essential that written confirmation is sought. There is no certainty that Suffolk County Council will adopt the roads on the housing development. Management of the estate is likely to fall to a company set up by the developer or by the residents. This will mean that residents will have to pay separately for such amenities as street lighting when they will also be required to pay council tax. Conclusion A decision on this application should not be made until SCC, WSC
--	--

Decision List

	and the community have fully explored the potential for the site as part of a sports and recreation strategy. In order for the housing development to go ahead, there is a requirement for informal recreational space, formal sports facilities and a net gain in biodiversity. However, what the current proposal demonstrates that none of these can be achieved without compromising at least one of the others. We reject the argument that the filtration basin can be classed as a leisure amenity. If Suffolk County Council is unwilling to withdraw the housing development in its entirety, the number of houses should be reduced to allow for the re-location of the infiltration basin and the pumping station within the piece of land designated for housing. This would at least allow the requirements outlined above to be met in full. We also ask that our other concerns be addressed. We re-iterate our objection to this scheme.
--	---

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



Report to	Development and Planning Committee
Subject	Trees
Purpose	Information/Decision
Classification	Unrestricted
Meeting date	5th August 2024
Item number	17
Written By	Cathy Whitaker CLERK

Summary: This report outlines the Town Council current statement on trees and its policies in the Newmarket Neighbourhood Plan.

1.	Current statement regarding trees in a conservation area
a.	Statement of non-objection:- The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and does not object to this application, subject to the Tree Officer's approval.
b.	Statement of objection including request for re-planting:- The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and object to the felling of healthy trees. The Committee objected to this application and requested that the application be submitted to the Tree Officer for consideration and a full report. If the tree is to be felled, that it be felled outside of the bird nesting season and the Committee requests that a suitable replacement be planted.
2.	NNP Policies
a.	NKT14: Trees <i>a: Development proposals should:</i> <i>i: protect existing trees and hedges that have amenity value as perceived from the public realm;</i> <i>ii: provide appropriate replacement planting, where felling is proved necessary;</i> <i>iii. provide sufficient space for trees and other vegetation to mature; and</i> <i>iv. encourage the appropriate planting of native species, particularly on available open space sites, including playgrounds.</i> <i>b: Development will be permitted as long as it does not involve or increase the likelihood of felling, significant surgery and potential root damage to trees that have amenity value as perceived from the public realm, unless there are demonstrable public benefits accruing from the proposal which clearly outweigh the current and future amenity value of the trees.</i> <i>c: Particularly consideration should be given to veteran or ancient trees, as defined by Natural England, in order to preserve their historic, ecological and amenity value.</i>
b.	Community Action C3: <i>Trees: NTC will liaise with the Woodland Trust to audit the town's trees and to establish an on-going planting programme (including the replacement of any street trees which die or are felled) to ensure that there is a good variation in the ages of trees within the environment.</i>

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Fw: Urgent Risk to Life of Race Horses

Townclerk <Townclerk@newmarket.gov.uk>

Mon 2024-07-15 11:37

To:Townclerk <Townclerk@newmarket.gov.uk>

Urgent: Risk to Life of Race Horses

Dear Town Clerk

I am writing on behalf of residents and users of Oakfields, Vicarage Road, CB8 8HP to set out our fears for the risk to life posed to race horses travelling to and from Warren Hill down Vicarage Road caused by on street parking either side of our gated entrance.

The action we propose that you take to eliminate this risk is the removal of three parking spaces either side of the entrance to Oakfields.

The dangers faced by users of Vicarage Road and those exiting Oakfields has always been evident but representations to Forest Heath District Council by the developers for alternative access arrangement, and by residents to West Suffolk Council have not been successful. The gate is in near constant use by residents, visitors, public service and trade vehicles. The usage is increasing as more houses are occupied. Matters came to a head on Thursday 4th July. I was driving out of Oakfields at 9am in the company of my wife and a horse owner/jockey club member. There was a white van parked to the right of the entrance as shown in photo No 1, and the second white van shown parked in front of it was at that time park to the left of the entrance. My line of sight up and down Vicarage Road was totally blocked.

As I cautiously edged my car forward to get a full view, I was suddenly confronted by a single horse and jockey emerging from behind the white van my right. Despite the caution I had taken, the horse was clearly surprised by the appearance of my car. Fortunately the experience of the jockey helped him to bring the horse under control and to a stop a few feet from the front offside wheel of my car.

All were shocked by the experience but both parties safely went on our way. Had this been a less experienced jockey, or a younger mount, the horse would probably have hit my car and possibly suffered a terminal injury. Photo no 2 demonstrates that the horse and rider's view of the gate was also impeded by the white van. Note the extent to which both vans overhang the parking bay lines thereby reducing the size of the exit and further impeding the line of sight for both parties.

Before composing this submission, a horse owner/jockey club member took a video (**Oakfields Video 1 sent separately via WeTransfer 12th July 2024**) which clearly shows how far into Vicarage Road drivers leaving Oakfields have to go before a view of other road users can be obtained. It also shows the potential for a collision with other traffic, and a string of horses transiting to Warren Hill. The difficulty drivers such as this one faced is increased when, as frequently happens, there is a high sided commercial vehicle or SUV parked on both sides of the gate: as was the case in my near miss with a horse and jockey on the 4th July. In requesting that the equivalence of six parking bays be removed, we are aware of the potential detriment to other residents of Vicarage Road. But:

1. Consultation with a representative of the owners of Oakfield Place confirms that there are sufficient parking spaces to the rear of that development for residents and visitors, and the three parking bays currently occupied by the two white vans on Vicarage Road are not used by Oakfield Place residents. In that discussion it was pointed out that the two vans currently parked there have been there for over a week.
2. Moreover, between Oakfields and St Gatien Stables there are only four residential properties requiring on street parking, but there are 20 car parking spaces. So between the junction of Vicarage Road and St Gatien Stables there is a total of 23 car parking spaces but an on street parking requirement for only four houses. Most of the spaces are therefore probably used by visitors who should be parking in off road car parks as urged in Town Council records.

We therefore contend that the removal of three parking spaces either side of the Oakfields gate, a total of six, would be of no detriment to other residents in Vicarage Road, only an inconvenience to visitors to Newmarket. But the removal

of these bays would resolve the rear danger that, one day, a horse and jockey are going to be badly injured because of vehicles parked so close to the Oakfields gate.

Among the residents of Oakfields there are horse owners and jockey club members, so we take the risk of life to horses travelling up and down Vicarage Road very seriously. This submission to you is therefore being copied to the trainers whose horses are most at risk to show that we care about their wellbeing, and to the Head of Estates at the Jockey Club who has already viewed the dangers. Meanwhile, the residents of Oakfields will continue to exercise all possible due care and attention when entering Vicarage Road.

In summary: the parking of vehicles either side of the Oakfields entrance, especially when occupied by high sided commercial vehicles and SUVs, blocks the view of those emerging from the gate of other road users of Vicarage Road - as witnessed in the attached video. This creates the constant risk of a road accident and the real threat of involving a horse and jockey. We request that the Town Council take immediate action to suspend the parking in three bays on either side of the entrance until a permanent Traffic Regulation Order can be obtained, with your support, from West Suffolk Council.

We trust that the Town Council will judge that the risk of serious injury to users of Vicarage Road, especially race horses, far outweighs the value derived from providing six parking bays for the use of visitors to Newmarket.

We look forward to hearing from you and we are ready to help conduct a site inspection with all parties as you deem necessary.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this submission.