

**ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**HAVERHILL AREA WORKING PARTY**

**Minutes of a meeting held on Thursday 10 June 2010 at 4.15 pm  
in the Meeting Room, Castle Manor Business and Enterprise College,  
Eastern Avenue, Haverhill**

PRESENT: Councillors Ager, Aitkens, Marks, McManus, Mrs Richardson,  
Mrs Rushbrook and A Whittaker

BY INVITATION: Haverhill Town Councillor Mrs E McManus  
Mr G Mussett, Clerk to Haverhill Town Council

**1. Substitutes**

No substitutions were declared.

**2. Election of Chairman**

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED:-

That Councillor A Whittaker be elected Chairman of this Working Party.

**3. Appointment of Vice Chairman**

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED:-

That Councillor Mrs K D Richardson be appointed Vice-Chairman of this Working Party.

**4. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Gower and Redhead, and Haverhill Town Centre Manager, Tina Hanks.

**5. Minutes**

In respect of a matter recorded under Minute 102 of the previous meeting of the Working Party held on 22 April 2010, the Head of Property Services and Engineering wished it to be recorded that he had responded to Councillor Cox by email regarding his query relating to the Haverhill Community Football Project.

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**6. Declaration of Interests**

Members' declarations of interests are recorded under the item to which the declaration relates.

## **7. St Edmundsbury Borough Replacement Local Plan 2016: Policy HAV3 Strategic Employment Site: Hanchett End, Haverhill: Draft Concept Statement**

The Working Party considered Report B42 (previously circulated) which sought approval for the draft Concept Statement for Hanchett End, Haverhill for public consultation.

Land at Hanchett End, Haverhill was allocated in Policy HAV3 of the St Edmundsbury Borough Replacement Local Plan 2016 (Local Plan) as a Strategic Employment Site (Use Classes B1 (offices, research and development and light industrial) and B8 (warehousing)). Policy DS4 of the Plan required that the Masterplan for the site was agreed and adopted by the Borough Council before a planning application for the site could be approved. Masterplans were to be informed by a Concept Statement produced by the Borough Council.

A draft Concept Statement for the development at Hanchett End had been prepared by officers. The landowners and Ward Members had been consulted. Subject to the Concept Statement being approved, public consultation would commence in June/July 2010 for a four-week period. This would be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and all responses to the consultation exercise would be reported initially back to the Working Party and the Sustainable Development Panel and if necessary, a modified version of the document would be submitted for final approval as planning guidance.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer tabled a location plan of the site, which was annotated CS02 (Jan2010) and was an addition to the draft Concept Statement attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

In addition, a response to the draft Concept Statement from Carisbrooke Investments Limited, agents acting on behalf of the principal landowner, was tabled. The Working Party noted that Carisbrooke had recognised the aspiration to develop the majority of the site as a Research Science and Technology Park and also noted Carisbrooke's support for a range of higher value uses for a proportion of the site, such as residential, retail, hotels etc. However, these would not accord with the current Local Plan policies and do not, therefore, form part of the draft Concept Statement.

The proposed developers had commissioned Cheffins and Carter Jonas, Commercial Property Advisors to develop a marketing strategy and Members were advised that due to the length of the document, copies were only available upon request. The strategy indicated the developers' genuine intent to bring forward the Research Science and Technology Park.

A detailed discussion was held and whilst the Working Party was generally in support of the proposed developers' intentions, the Borough Council should carefully consider whether the suggested high value uses for the site should be implemented, principally because some of these contravened Policies detailed in the Local Plan. Members did however, recognise that some of these uses could be an asset and complement the proposed Technology Park but it was important that investment in this site should not detrimentally impact upon businesses located in the town centre.



### ***RECOMMENDED:- That***

- (1) subject to there being no over-riding adverse comments from the landowners and Ward Members, the draft Concept Statement for Hanchett End, Haverhill as detailed in Appendix 1 to Report B42, as amended to include the***

*location plan annotated CS02 (Jan 2010), be approved for public consultation; and*

- (2) *the Head of Planning and Economic Development Services be authorised, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning, to make any minor factual, grammatical and typographical amendments to the Statement, as appropriate.*

**8. Haverhill Town Centre Management: Supplementary Report on Activities to Animate Queen Street, Haverhill Throughout the Summer 2010**

The Working Party considered Report B43 (previously circulated) which sought approval for additional funding to be allocated to the previously proposed budget of £2,700 for the suggested programme of activity to animate Queen Street, Haverhill during summer 2010.

On 22 April 2010 the Working Party agreed that the proposed activities for Queen Street, Haverhill in May 2010 could be planned and delivered from the previously proposed budget of £2,700, (Minute 106 of the Haverhill Area Working Party minutes referred) and that before approval of the remainder of the programme could be sought, details be provided of the associated and supporting costs for the programme.

The Haverhill Town Centre Manager had since liaised with officers, Haverhill Town Council (HTC) and a number of other entertainment providers to formulate the remainder of the programme and the associated costs involved, such as providing additional street cleansers and marshals. This had resulted in the request for a further £285 to be allocated from the existing Haverhill Town Centre Management budget to enable the other events planned for summer 2010 to be delivered. Section 2.5 of Report B43 outlined the variety of the proposed activities.

In response to a question, the Working Party was informed that should it be ascertained that there was no increase in litter as a result of the activities being held, additional street cleansers would not be employed unnecessarily. In addition, should Members require a breakdown of the associated costs, the Town Centre Manager would be able to provide these details upon request.



***RECOMMENDED:- That***

- (1) *an additional £285 be allocated to provide a revised total budget of £2,985, to enable the remainder of programme between June and September 2010 to be delivered, as detailed in Section 2.5 of Report B43; and*
- (2) *this funding be allocated from the overall existing Haverhill Town Centre Management budget.*

**9. Evaluation of the Haverhill Locality Pilot Project and Summary of the Returns to the Haverhill Partnership Questionnaire**

The Working Party received and noted Paper B44 (previously circulated) which was a briefing note on the evaluation of the Haverhill Locality Pilot Project and the feedback emanating from the questionnaire distributed to those involved with the Haverhill Partnership. The briefing note was supported by Reports B45 and B46, (also previously circulated).

The Working Party was informed that Report B45 had been produced by Clair Harvey, Suffolk County Council's Head of Localities, which outlined the process involved with the Haverhill Locality Pilot project and whether the pilot fulfilled its two main objectives. The objectives were:-

- (a) working with St Edmundsbury Borough Council and other local partners to explore whether the established Haverhill Partnership could fulfil the functions of a Community Board in terms of:-
  - (i) using robust community engagement to identify local priorities;
  - (ii) allocating resources to these priorities;
  - (iii) addressing these priorities through joint problem solving with the local community; and
- (b) working with Haverhill Town Council to identify potential opportunities for the devolvement of decisions, services and/or budgets to a more local level and to develop an understanding of the capacity building required to support effective devolvement.

A community engagement exercise had been undertaken by the Haverhill Partnership with local residents, communities, established organisations and businesses. The engagement activity involved attending meetings of existing networks and partnerships that brought communities together. Emanating from the consultation were a number of agreed priorities which the Partnership considered could make the most difference and would have the biggest impact on the community. These priorities had been developed having taken into account other local intelligence and data from organisations such as the West Suffolk Local Strategic Partnership (WSLSP) and the Local Area Agreement Delivery Partnership (LAADP). The priorities were then grouped into the following five themes:-

- (a) Welfare of Older People;
- (b) Activities and Things to Do;
- (c) Environmental;
- (d) Facilities and Places to Go; and
- (e) Feelings of Safety/More Visible Policing.

In respect of the other objective of the pilot to identify potential opportunities for the devolvement of decisions etc to Haverhill Town Council, progress had been slow. A number of possible reasons for this were detailed in Section 6.1 of the report.

The Head of Localities had acknowledged in the report that it took time to understand a locality and establish relationships which was difficult to measure when trying to evaluate outcomes. It had also been identified that many representatives of organisations in Haverhill attended meetings where similar issues were discussed; therefore opportunities would be explored by the Haverhill Partnership to streamline this process in order that people were spending less time in meetings.

The Working Party acknowledged the benefits and outcomes of the pilot project; however it was considered that many of the identified priorities had been recognised on previous occasions as areas that would create the most impact for improving the town. Concern was expressed that as part of the community engagement exercise, the WSLSP and the LAADP could provide little information on Haverhill, as detailed in Section 3.5.2 of Report B45.

Report B46 contained a summary of the responses emanating from the Haverhill Partnership Questionnaire. The survey had been distributed to 40 members of the

Partnership's Executive Group and 61 members of its Forum. The questionnaire had been designed to ascertain what people gained from being involved in the Partnership and in total 23 questionnaires had been returned. Of particular note, the majority of respondents agreed that by attending Partnership Forum meetings, this provided good opportunities for keeping up to date with activity in the town and for networking with other representatives of Haverhill's organisations. Other benefits of being involved in the Partnership highlighted the opportunity to raise the profile of their organisation; information sharing; and understanding the community and needs of the town.

Section 2 of the report detailed specific responses to the questionnaire and particular reference was given to the relationship of the Partnership with the Haverhill Area Working Party. The majority of respondents had felt unable to comment on this issue due to their lack of understanding about the role of the Working Party and some were not aware of its existence at all. It had been suggested that there was not necessarily a need for two groups if both had a similar aim. The Working Party noted that a working group, which included Councillor Mrs Gower; Geoff Rivers, the Borough Council's Chief Executive; and Gordon Mussett, Clerk to Haverhill Town Council, had been established to identify whether the Haverhill Partnership and the Haverhill Area Working Party should continue to exist as separate bodies and whether these two bodies had distinct aims and objectives. Members considered that the Working Party had provided a significant contribution to the town as a separate entity by enabling the progression and delivery of a number of Borough Council-led projects. It recognised that the profile of the Working Party may need to be enhanced to make people of Haverhill aware of its existence and purpose, but no changes would be considered until recommendations had been received from the appointed working group.

*(Councillor Mrs Rushbrook arrived during the consideration of this item.)*

## **10. Haverhill Community Football Project: Update**

The Working Party received and noted Report B47 (previously circulated) which was the Project Status Report for the Haverhill Community Football Project as at 1 June 2010.

The Head of Property Services and Engineering drew relevant issues to the attention of the Working Party including that the construction of the clubhouse was almost complete and the Haverhill Community Sports Association (HCSA) had now taken control of the operation of the building. Following the initial archaeological digs some areas of the principal pitch had settled and consequently, the pitch was not yet in a satisfactory condition that was acceptable enough to allow the formal handover to take place. These problem areas of the pitch had been refilled and reseeded, and until such time the Borough Council was satisfied that a lease could be entered into with the HCSA, the project was operating under licence.

Snagging issues were currently being addressed and interviews for a Football Development Officer would be held on 10 July 2010. An official opening date was provisionally scheduled for 17 July 2010 and arrangements would shortly be made for the former Haverhill Rovers Football Club site at Hamlet Croft to return to Borough Council control.

In response to a question, the Working Party was informed that whilst two issues had been annotated 'red' on the Project Status Report, which were connected with the potential risk of vandalism to the site, closed circuit television and a burglar alarm had been installed. These measures had mitigated a degree of risk to the site, therefore it was possible to annotate these two risks as 'amber'. Some concern was expressed that vandalism may occur at the former Hamlet Croft site; however, Members were assured that the site would be sufficiently secured to reduce the risk of vandalism.

*(With the agreement of the Chairman, the following item was considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with S100B (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 in order that the matter could be resolved within the necessary timescale.)*

### **11. Traffic Regulation Order: High Street, Haverhill**

The Working Party considered a late urgent item (tabled at the meeting), which was in connection with the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order restricting vehicle access at certain times of the day in the High Street, Haverhill.

Suffolk County Council (SCC) had informed the Borough Council that in relation to the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in the High Street, Haverhill a Notice would be advertised in the Haverhill Echo on 17 June 2010 following the dispatch of correspondence to relevant consultees on 10 June 2010. The consultation period closed on 8 July 2010.

Discussions had previously been held by the Working Party on this issue and general support had been indicated. As the consultation period ceased before the next meeting of the Working Party on 22 July 2010, it was proposed that once they had been given the opportunity to examine the terms of the Order, Members provide their comments of support by email to Councillor Mrs Gower, Portfolio Holder for Haverhill and Housing. Subsequently, a letter of support would be formulated and sent to SCC on behalf of the Borough Council having finalised its content by the Head of Property Services and Engineering, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Haverhill and Housing.

In response to questions, the Working Party was informed that:-

- (a) investigations would be undertaken into identifying those individuals in Haverhill entitled to display blue badges; and
- (b) following the implementation of the proposed TROs for the High Street and Queen Street, it may be possible to use a proportion of the overall Haverhill Masterplan budget towards funding additional policing to address enforcement issues and this item would be placed on the next agenda, if appropriate.



#### **RECOMMENDED:-**

***That the Head of Property Services and Engineering, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Haverhill and Housing, be given delegated authority to finalise a letter of support to Suffolk County Council (SCC) on behalf of the Borough Council, in respect of SCC's proposal to implement a Traffic Regulation Order restricting vehicle access at certain times of the day in the High Street, Haverhill.***

RESOLVED:- That,

- (1) investigations be undertaken by the Head of Property Services and Engineering to identify those individuals in Haverhill entitled to display blue badges; and
- (2) the issue of allocating a proportion of the overall Haverhill Masterplan budget towards funding additional policing to address enforcement issues be considered at the next meeting of the Working Party on 22 July 2010, if appropriate.

## **12. Dates of Future Meetings**

The Working Party confirmed the following dates for future meetings in 2010:-

22 July;  
9 September;  
21 October; and  
9 December.

All dates were Thursdays and the meetings to commence at 4.15 pm.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm.

*(Subsequent to the meeting, it had been necessary to rearrange the next meeting of the Working Party on 22 July 2010 to 29 July 2010 to enable Members to attend the Freedom of the Borough Ceremony also scheduled for 22 July 2010.)*

**A WHITTAKER  
CHAIRMAN**