



## COMMITTEE for ABINGTON HOUSING

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at The Institute

		Actions
	<p><b>Present –</b> Bernie Talbot, Keith Stringer, Bob Chesham, Paul Pritchard, Marc Wheeldon, Liz Sainsbury, and Peter Brunning</p> <p><b>In attendance –</b> Glyn Mutton (Hill Residential) and Simon Gooderham (Cheffins)</p>	
1.	<p><b>Apologies –</b> Apologies received from John Ellis, Pennie Zimmern and Alison Johnson.</p>	
2.	<p><b>Minutes –</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> August had been previously circulated and were agreed.</p>	
3.	<p><b>Linton Road site –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) It was reported that the contract to sell the Linton Road and Church Lane sites to Hill had been signed earlier in the day.</li><li>b) Hill had requested a pre-application meeting for both sites and were waiting for dates to be offered by James Plant, the case officer.</li><li>c) Pedestrian access along Linton Road was discussed and it was suggested by the meeting that it would be better to improve the footway on the opposite side rather than try to provide one on the South side.</li><li>d) Hill would be asking for the 30mph limit to be moved further out. The meeting suggested moving it to the East of the kennels.</li><li>e) A site plan and pictorial representation were shared and discussed.</li><li>f) The plan showed a pumping station and it was explained that this was for pumping sewage to the west to join the main sewer.</li><li>g) Mark raised concerns about the proximity of houses to the kennels and the likelihood of complaints about dog noise. After a long discussion it was suggested that Hill extend the noise reduction measures on the kennels site well beyond the recommended minimum. Glyn agreed to meet with Mark when the full report was received from their acoustician.</li><li>h) The long term security of the allotments was raised as a concern. Simon clarified that a one year agreement had been signed and it was expected that a five year agreement would be signed at the end of that year. He was asked to explore with the landowner, the possibility of the land being sold to the village with an uplift clause or similar provision.</li></ul>	

<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Church Lane site –</b></p> <p>a) A site plan and pictorial representation were shared and discussed.</p> <p>b) Concern was expressed about the site extending beyond the farmyard boundary up to the public footpath.</p> <p>c) Whilst the scheme was designed with open rear gardens it was noted that owners might have different ideas about their gardens and boundary treatments.</p> <p>d) It was suggested that the visual impact from the South could be reduced by switching some of the units round.</p> <p>e) It was noted that the number of units was 50% greater than that originally proposed to the Local Plan by the committee.</p> <p>f) Following the pre-app there would be a village consultation event similar to the one held for the High Street/Pampisford Road site.</p>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>High Street/Pampisford Road site –</b></p> <p>Bernie reported that there had been a number of problems and many meetings involved in progressing this scheme through planning. An amended planning application had been resubmitted to SCDC on Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> April. It was expected that the next step would be for the plan to be sent to GAPC for formal consideration at a Parish Council meeting.</p>	
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Terms of Reference –</b></p> <p>The revised terms of reference for the committee had been agreed by both Parish Councils.</p>	
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Planning policy for the former LSA –</b></p> <p>A GAPC working group was taking steps to create a Neighbourhood Plan for the former Land Settlement. There was a lot of work to be done and there would be regular communication with the rest of the village.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Strawberry Farm –</b></p> <p>Plans to build eight houses on land at Strawberry Farm, Pampisford Road were discussed. It was noted that although the site was outside the village framework and on part of the former LSA its location made it significantly different. A scheme had been shown to the Parish Council and had been shared with the village at a public consultation event. It was understood that the landowner was in the process of making a formal planning application.</p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Other Communication –</b></p> <p>There had been no other significant communications.</p>	

<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Other issues –</b>  a) School capacity was raised as an issue with the development of extra houses in the village.  b) The sewage system was raised as another ongoing concern.  c) Rainwater problems in the High Street and Linton Road were raised as an ongoing issue in the village.</p>	
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Village News entry –</b>  It was agreed that Bernie would draft a news entry and circulate for a rapid response prior to submitting for publication.</p>	<p><b>BT</b></p>
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Future meetings –</b>  It was agreed that the next meeting would be fixed when the date for the site consultation was known. Ideally it would be about a week before the consultation event.</p>	<p><b>BT</b></p>