

**Histon Parish Council Planning Sub-Committee**  
**Meeting Parish Office**  
**20<sup>th</sup> March 2008**

Present:

Chairman M. Barrett, Cllrs: C.Jones, J.Emmines, C.Rose, A Eade, M.Parish,  
Mr R. Dias

1. Members' declaration of interest: Cllr. Parish noted that he had a prejudicial interest if the appeal at 2, Church Street Histon was to be discussed: APP/W0530/A/08/2067787/WF
2. The minutes of the meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> February 2008 were noted as accurate by those who attended the meeting and as the chairman was not present at that meeting Cllr. Parish was delegated to sign the minutes as approved.
3. The Chairman proposed that agenda item No. 4 item two was brought forward with the agreement of Councillors.
  - a. Councillors agreed to suspend standing orders to allow Mr Dias to join in the discussion regarding application S/0307/08/F land at Bishops Cycles 49 Station Road and land to rear of 51-55 Station Road: Erection of 4 dwellings following demolition of existing buildings.
  - b. It was agreed to respond to this application as follows:

We note that the only difference between this application and the previous one, which was refused, is the façade to the road. The Parish Council believe that as Histon & Impington are designated as a Rural Centre, the infrastructure should be retained and grown as necessary. This should include its retail provision. Although the current retail buildings have been left to deteriorate the retail provision should remain.

Further, the proposed new dormer windows in the roof and the bay windows at street level on this narrow road add to the massing effect which will detract from the current character of the area, where houses are on two storeys not three, noting especially the proximity of units 3 & 4 to the road which adds to the problem. Thus either units 3 & 4 should be moved back from the roadway 2-3 ft or the bays should be removed, so the frontage lines up with the terraced cottages and the façade retains a simpler elevation. **Recommend refusal.**

Council agreed also to bring forward item 8 on the agenda: Appeal Strategic Land Partnership LLP, site at Station Road – S/0163/07/F

Noted that notice of the appeal had not been received by the Parish Council and it had only become aware as a result of a Mr Dias receiving notice and copying the Parish Council. The Council agreed to write to the Inspectorate asking for an explanation for this omission.

The Parish Council agreed to ask the Planning Inspector to refuse the appeal and submit the comments made by Cllr Rose at the 7<sup>th</sup> November 2007 SCDC planning meeting including the comment that the Parish Council endorses SCDC's reason for refusal but believes that it did not go far enough in considering the need to retain retail space in a Rural Centre. The Parish Council therefore strongly recommends that the refusal be upheld.

Standing orders re-instated and Mr Dias left the meeting.

Moving back to agenda:

4. Matter arising:

- Meeting held with Anglian Water and SCDC Planning on 13<sup>th</sup> March together with Impington. Cllr. Parish noted that the Parish Council representatives were cautiously optimistic that Anglian Water was prepared to look at the issues raised and expected to report back in October 2008.
- Tree works 5 School Hill. Cllr. Eade noted that he had recommended that the works be allowed to proceed.
- Noted that no further action had been taken on Histon Station development statement plans to-date.

5. New Planning Applications received:

S/7006/07/O Creation of new town of Northstowe. Cllr Parish supplied copied of draft joint submission with Impington Parish Council. Cllrs. agreed to read and submit any changes a.s.a.p. Agreed that, as still awaiting Cllr Mason's comments on drainage, the comments on the application should be submitted, with any amendments supplied for the closing date of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008.

S/0322/08/F 106 Cottenham Road: Agreed to recommend approval.

6. Refusals and acceptances noted.

7. Guided Busway up-date. Requested that the question of whether re-instatement of soil up to the edge of the guideway, to make it less prominent, would happen?

8. Other planning correspondence: A letter had been received from a resident complaining about the difficulties residents of Brackenbury in Impington had, with being confused with Brackenbury Manor residential home. It was noted that Brackenbury Manor was situated in Kay Hitch Way and was a building not a thoroughfare. It was suggested that residents in Brackenbury should be careful when giving directions, to tell drivers to ignore the Brackenbury manor yellow signs when making deliveries.

It was also noted that the residential home had been able to get the county Council to erect signs on the lamp standards very quickly, whereas the Parish Council were still awaiting their car parking sign to be replaced in the High Street.

The revised plans for 103 Cottenham Road, which were submitted for information only were noted.

The appeal notice for 2, Church Street APP/W0530/A/08/2067787/WF was also noted. [Cllr. Parish left the meeting while this item was discussed.] It was agreed to support SCDC's condition 4 on this application where the appellants were asking for the condition to be removed.

Meeting closed 10.10 pm

M. Parish  
March 2008