

**MINUTES - HISTON PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING THURSDAY 9<sup>th</sup>  
FEBRUARY 2006 7.30 p.m. at the Parish Office, New Rd, Impington**

Present: Cllr Barrett (Chairman), Cllrs Jones, Harris, Cleaver, Parish  
Mr C Anderson, Mr R Dias (both in part)

Clerk: Mrs A J Young

PAGES: 3

All agreed to bring forward part of item 2

**2 New applications (1 of 2)**

S/0125/06/O Highcliffe Properties Limited, land at 102 Cottenham Road – 7 dwellings, new access and parking for 102. Committee members looked at new plans, previous reasons for recommending refusal and minutes 5 January. After discussion, Committee believe developer had gone a long way towards satisfying previous concerns in new version but still had concerns over:

- Overdevelopment of the site and its location
- Traffic issues – entrance and exit during rush hour periods on the B1049 is a concern, as pointed out by residents on other side of road during the recent experimental trial period
- Precedent for opening up further land for development to rear. If District Council minded to approve Parish Council would request a condition to cover
- If District Council minded to allow, Parish Council would prefer 4/5 dwellings

With agreement of Committee, Chairman suspended standing orders to allow Mr Anderson to speak. All agreed parking concern now largely addressed and discussed landscaping plans. Standing orders re-instated and Committee all in agreement to **RECOMMEND REFUSAL**. Mr Anderson left the meeting

S/0124/06/F S M Bishop Ltd, r/o 51-55 Station Road – 4 dwellings and 2 garage blocks following demolition and provision of gardens. Members studied papers provided and discussion followed on need for retail in Histon. All felt latest application was an improvement. Following discussion agreed following comments:

- Retail. Whilst Committee would like to see retail retained and believe this possible within the development, with permission already given to demolish existing, Committee is not sure that 9 months worth of interest is a good indication of what could possibly go there, particularly with the property in its current condition. Business successful over the years for the type and location of a rural settlement. On the other hand should retail prove impossible, then the sympathetically terraced housing is in keeping with area
- Parking. Concern at under-provision of parking/garages for the proposed dwellings including 51-55 which is incorporated in the plans, and the “outhouse” at the back
- Access, Traffic, and Site. Station Road has parking along most of its length, severely restricting visibility. There is concern it is a major route to school. Traffic survey carried out during the experimental period and was without permission of Highways Authority. It does not reflect the current traffic situation
- Hedges and Trees. Application form states no removal of trees and hedges required. Concern about beech tree to rear of 49 and removal of part of beech hedge in order to gain a wider access. Rad is narrow at this point

With agreement of all, Chairman suspended standing orders. Mr Dias of 44 Station Road was concerned that:

- Any new owners of the new properties may be subject to noise and disturbance from the premises trading as a restaurant and delivery service at No 44 and would join current residents in complaining. Noted the 3 new houses were designed with living area to the rear

- Also concerned that his premises would be the only commercial property left in the area. Committee pointed out hairdressers, garage, hire car company all still local
- He felt concern over safety issue of access to site

Standing orders re-instated. 3 Councillors voted to **RECOMMEND REFUSAL** which was agreed, with 2 Councillors initially preferring to make No Recommendation. Mr Dias left the meeting. Chairman returned to agenda

## **1 Matters Arising 2 February 2006**

Cllrs Barrett and Jones agreed minutes correct and to be signed  
Guided Bus Mr Menzies, County Council, to attend Full Council 13 February  
Sale of SCDC Car Park Further letter from SCDC asked Council to reconsider position. Full Council 13 February. Cllr Parish outlined issues recently raised S/2376/05/F M & M Bell, 53 Narrow Lane – extensions. SCDC Chairman's delegation meeting, recommendation was for approval. Noted Northstowe Discussion on work by Councillors from Planning Committee. Representation with SCDC by end March. Noted no land provision for Church. Reports of an additional 1,000 dwellings had been made. Cambridge & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Development Plan Committee agreed to confirm a joint response should be made as recently suggested by Impington PCllr Payne regarding Cambridge and Milton sites, and routing restrictions at Smithy Fen,. Noted Donarbons site had own resident litter pickers.

## **2 New Applications (2 of 2)**

S/0070/06/F Mr & Mrs R O'Reilly, 24 Station Road – outbuilding for hobby room. Cllr Barrett declared prejudicial interest (friend), Cllr Cleaver personal interest (known). Cllr Harris took the chair. Following inspection and discussion all agreed to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL**. Cllr Barrett returned to meeting and chair S/0090/06/F J McDonald, adj 18 Clay Street – House. Clerk left meeting (interest as near neighbour). Cllr Parish took meeting notes. Committee inspected new and previous refused application. Agreed to **RECOMMEND REFUSAL** on:

- Car parking unacceptable, restricting visibility once cars parked
- Overdevelopment
- Although applicant had made some concessions, proximity of the road out of keeping with neighbourhood

S/0102/06/F Mr & Mrs C Hill, The Grove, 22 Water Lane – Double garage. All agreed to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** commenting how if fence to be demolished or replaced, Committee would like to see a suitable entrance in its place in keeping with building and road

S/0116/06/F Carebase Limited, Chivers Way – erection of 63 bedroom care home. Previous application had been for 80 beds. Access remained via Chivers Way. Following lengthy inspection and discussion agreed to report to Full Council on 13 February with recommendation that a response be made recommending refusal, for the following reasons:

- Overdevelopment with a number of infrastructure constraints:
  - inadequate car parking
  - strain on local medical services
- Although it might well offer opportunities for local employment, very likely that a great number of staff will be from outside the village and require to travel by their own transport. This will have parking and transport implications

- Have not assessed the need for such a facility within the community, particularly now that the 85 bed Etheldred House facility is already coming on-stream this year
- Unsuitability as a care home – a factory site operating 24 hours a day. Potential of light and smell and noise pollution – do not consider site to be appropriate for a residential home
- Flooding and drainage issues remain unaddressed. Council's dossier (Sept 2005) to be provided as part of submission

To go to Full Council for confirmation/amendment

**3 Refusal and Acceptances by SCDC**  
**SCDC DECISION**

**PARISH COUNCIL**  
**Recommendation**

Refused

Mr & Mrs A Franklin, 48 Park Avenue – extension  
 (contrary HG12)

**Refusal**

**4 Other Planning Correspondence and Reports Received**

Appeal by Bovis Homes Limited, land off Kay Hitch Way – 46 sheltered retirement apartments Papers not yet received but understood written representations to be with Planning Inspectorate by 15 March.

CPRE Planning workshop 11 March. Cllr Barrett wishing to attend, cost £12.50

Closed at 10.25 p.m.