

**MINUTES - HISTON PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING HELD THURSDAY
21st APRIL 2005 7.30 p.m. at the Parish Office, New Road, Impington**

Present: Cllr Parish (Chairman), Cllrs Jones, Barrett, Levitt

Also present: 1 member of public

Clerk: None present

PAGES: 2

Agreed to bring forward item 2, **S/0583/05/CAC and S/0584/05/F Bishops of Histon, adj 51 Station Road, total demolition of cycle shop and Bishops Cycles & Part r/o 51-55 Station Road, demolition of existing cycle shop and erection of 2 terraced dwellings and 1 bungalow**, as member of public present. All agreed to suspend standing orders to allow member of public to speak

Chairman noted that as Councillors had spent many hours at Planning meeting discussing planning applications made by the member of public it was appropriate for all Councillors present to declare a personal interest at this stage. The plans were reviewed and it was agreed to recommend to District Council that planning permission on the application S/0583/05/CAC be refused on the grounds of the need to retain commercial property in the villages. It would result in the loss of such an amenity and there were not finite proposals made as part of this application for its future use. Application S/0584/05/F also for Bishops should also be recommended for refusal on the grounds that: Station Road at this point is a busy road and there were concerns for increased traffic. Also concerns for increased noise and disturbance, the entrance to the parking and bungalow at the rear of the property was narrow and vehicles were still likely to park on Station Road restricting the view of vehicles using this entrance. There is a need to retain what commercial property is still available to the villages otherwise they become even more just dormitory suburbs. The Parish Council is also mindful of the letter from the resident at 26 Water Lane who states that the proximity of the proposed bungalow will interfere with their light.

Standing orders re-instated and return to order of agenda

1 Matters Arising 31 March 2005

Moor Drove Appeal Cllr Parish explained had been closed and the Inspector would be submitting his report by the end of the month. The flood plain issues which had been raised by the Environment Agency "went away" as they agreed in writing that the site would not be significantly adversely affected. Both sides (Parish and District) and the Moor Drove travellers summed up and although the Barrister for the travellers had reduced Mrs Gale to tears over his character assassination of the Gales' human rights compared to the travellers' rights it was felt that good arguments had been presented to the Inspector to enable them to refuse the appeal.

2 New Applications

S/0288/05/F R Gilson, 17 Glebe Way, Extension – amendment For Information only "Internal layout description added and boundary fence shown". Noted Now Refused
S/0423/05/F C Clark, 25 Shirley Road, extensions (part retrospective) – amendment For Information only "Omission of single storey rear extension" Noted amendment and that Parish Council had originally recommended acceptance

S/0468/05/F Mr & Mrs A Jones, 10 Home Close, extensions – amendment "Removal of one side facing roof light in bedroom and insert 2 front facing lights in bedroom and study". Although for information only, Councillors agreed the changes proposed significantly changed the view from the road and as the original application had been

refused on the grounds of “poorly designed roof extension would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area” could not see why 2 road facing roof lights would not do the same.

3 **Appeal – Moor Drove**

See matters arising

4 **Refusal and Acceptances by SCDC** **SCDC DECISION**

PARISH COUNCIL **Recommendation**

Granted

S/0322/05/F Mr & Mrs P Barrett, 15a Mill Lane – extension

Approve

5 **Other Correspondence and Reports**

36 Saffron Road Planning application to be dealt with at next Planning meeting
Land Partnership, 53 Cottenham Road Letter read to all. Concerns on the implication that officers already “agreed” this application. Secondly that Highways did not see any issues with such a development at this corner. To be noted and dealt with when application received.

Meeting closed 10 p.m.