

MINUTES - HISTON PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING THURSDAY 18TH MAY 2006 7.30 p.m. at the Parish Office, in the new Recreation Centre, New Rd, Impington

Present: Cllrs Barrett (Chairman), Mason, Parish, Rose Mr R Dias (in part)

Clerk: Mrs A J Young

PAGES: 3

Standing orders suspended to allow Mr Dias to address the Committee. Part of item 2 brought forward, all in agreement

2 New Applications

S/0856/06/F R Dias, 44 Station Road variation of condition 3 of planning permission S/0242/01/F to allow hot food takeaway service between the hours of 17:00 hours 23:00 hours. Mr Dias explained to the Committee why an application was being made to vary the condition. All letters accompanying the application were read out. Discussion followed on existing uses and history of applications and appeals on the site and a debate on technicalities of the submission. Points raised on:

- Traffic had worsened since Appeal decision to dismiss on grounds of traffic and potential disturbance to neighbours in 2002
- Parking had got worse, particularly near to the garage. Councillors questioned the history of the parking survey provided by Mr Brace (CCC) and submitted with the application comparing this with the official consultation results from the A14 Traffic Calming Scheme recently completed
- Vehicles often parked opposite the site (outside nos 53-61) and limited room for manoeuvrability into car park at 44 Station Road may lead to short term inconsiderate parking for instance on pavements or double yellow lines in the area, were an evening takeaway service available during these hours
- Observation that current use of the restaurant appeared to be very low with little use of on site parking and manoeuvring. Previous comments on these aspects of the site had been made at the last appeal

Following Committee decision to **RECOMMEND REFUSAL** as it was felt the facts had not moved sufficiently away from the Appeal situation, Mr Dias then commented on the bollards outside his property preventing people parking there and pointed out that permanent planning permission for takeaway at lunch time was now in place and constituted, he felt, a material change. A discussion on the present evening operation by the management followed, in particular Mr Dias's comments at his last appeal hearing in 2004, to the Planning Inspector and the District Council appeals and enforcement officers, regarding current arrangements for restaurant customers to either have hot food delivered to their table in a container, which was eaten at the table or taken away, and arrangements were also made to deliver hot food on the street outside or at the garage down the road, neither of which, he felt, contravened a ban on hot foot takeaway. Mr Dias confirmed that both Romanos and the Flying Tandoori operated from the premises and he stated that others may be added as well. Standing orders were re-instated. Mr Dias left the meeting.

Response comments were then worded:

"The applicant has advised the Parish Council that he is submitting a fresh application on these premises for hot food takeaway because he believes that a substantive change has taken place with regard to the original condition No 3 placed on S/0242/01/F in that as a result of an appeal decision made in 2005 he was granted permanent lunch time permission for hot food takeaway and he now wishes to extend this to evenings. The Parish Council refer to the subsequent application and appeal reference S/0861/01/F (June 2002) whereby the application for hot food takeaway was refused by the Inspector on the grounds of disturbance to residents and traffic considerations. Throughout the planning application history

on this site over the last 13 years the Planning authorities have consistently refused evening hot food takeaway use and the Parish Council support these views and strongly recommend refusal of this application”

Chairman returned to agenda order, with agreement of members

1 Matters Arising 27 April 2006

All agreed minutes correct and to be signed

Bovis Homes Appeal (ref. APP/W0530/A/06/2007521 S1878/05/F) – 46 sheltered retirement homes Appeal had been allowed. All agreed Cllr Mason to approach John Koch regarding a possible challenge to this decision, which appeared to ignore evidence submitted by the Parish Council but took into account late amendments submitted by the applicant on which neither the PC nor the public had the opportunity to comment

Local Development Framework Further paperwork to be copied to Cllrs Mason and Payne

Appeal Unwins Properties had been dismissed

S/0647/06/F H Price, land at Moor Drove, Cottenham Road – siting of 12 caravans. Cllr Mason reported that the District Council had taken decision not to determine the application. Agreed to SUPPORT and note the decision. It was noted that Cllr Parish had researched the new circular 01/2006 and Section 70A in order to inform the Committee

2 New Applications (2 of 2)

S/0571/06/F Mr Dixon & Ms Cullham, 37 Park Lane – extension and dormer window – For Information Only. Noted

S/0771/06/F Murfet Development Limited, Muncey Walk – 5 bungalows. All AGREED to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** commenting the Parish Council were disappointed with the lack of imagination in the design, being they felt a bland and uninspiring development. Reference to be made to the application of high standards of design at other parts of the villages (Arbury Park) and to the new Housing Design Standards Guide that was currently being recommended as supplementary guidance by the District Council

S/0812/06/F Mr T Barker & Miss A Daley, 7 Somerset Road – single storey rear extension and double storey to side, rear and front. Following close examination, all AGREED to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** commenting the boundary wall ought to be set back from the public footpath, and that the loss of the garage was a concern with potential loss of a parking space

S/0862/06/F Mr & Mrs A Bevis 3 Home Close – first floor side extension. All AGREED to **RECOMMEND REFUSAL** stating that although the Parish Council is happy with the design of the extension, there are concerns that the loss of the garage and attempt to “shoehorn” parking onto the front could lead to local parking problems on the road outside and would detract from the character of this locale

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

PARISH COUNCIL **Recommendation**

Granted

S/0284/06/F Mr & Mrs Barker, 12 Aingers Road – conservatory

S/0289/06/F Mr R Smith, 55 Orchard Road – extensions

S/0415/06/F Mr & Mrs B Burrows, 8 Normanton Way – extension

S/0355/06/F Mr & Mrs J Burrows, 40 Shirley Road – extension

Approval

Approval

Approval

Approval

S/0505/06/F Mr M Benstead, 80 Station Road – extension and Outbuilding	Approval
S/0116/06/F Carebase Limited, Chivers Way – 63 bedroom care home	Refusal
<u>Refusal</u>	
S/0290/06/F J P Gardiner, 30 Narrow Lane – carport/store	Refusal
S/0441/06/O C Hall, land r/o 20 & 22 Orchard Road – bungalow and garage	Refusal

4 Northstowe – Up-date

Cllr Mason reported current position. Further applications were anticipated at District Council. Agreed to meet informally 27 June to discuss further the Parish Councils response

5 Other Planning Correspondence and Reports Received

South Cambs District Council “Planning Pack” draft. New version for comment by 23 June. All to be sent copy, with comments to Cllr Barrett by 18 June
Letter from County Cllr at Haddenham re “Mereham” development noted
Briefing paper on planning circular 01/2006 meeting at SCDC 26 May re Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites. Dist Cllr Mason will attend. Agreed Cllr Rose to attend for Parish Council

Closed at 9.35 p.m. Next meeting due 8 June 2006. Highways Traffic & Transport meeting previously scheduled 8 June to be brought forward to 1 June