

LITTLE ABINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
DRAFT TO BE AGREED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL
Notes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Monday 3 September 2018 at 6:30pm in the Abington Institute, Great Abington.

Present

LAPC: Ms Pattinson (Chair), Mr Allum, Dr I Smith, Dr R Smith, Mrs Dalton (Clerk)

In attendance. Headway- 3 representatives, Mr& Mrs Sam (owners of 54 High Street) and 4 members of the public.

- 1. Apologies for absence:** Mr Brunning, Mr Ellis

Agenda Order

The Chairman proposed discussing items 4,5,7 and 8 first and devoting the rest of the meeting to discussion of the application for 54 High and Street including public participation time. This was agreed

- 2. Declaration of Interests.** None
- 3. Public Participation for items 4,5,7 and 8.** None
- 4. S/2697/18/FL, 29 West Field, Little Abington**
Single storey side and rear extension. New flue to woodburning stove. Internal alterations and conversion of garage to family room.
The Committee reviewed the plans provided. They agreed to support the application without referral to the SCDC Planning Committee or any comments.
- 5. S/3061/18/FL 35 West Field, Little Abington.**
Single storey front extension
The previous planning application was refused. The Committee reviewed the plans provided. It was noted that the proposal would facilitate disabled access to the property.
The Committee agreed to support the application without referral to the SCDC Planning Committee or any comments.
- 7. Planning decisions made by SCDC.**
No recent decisions have been notified to the Parish Council.
- 8. Footpaths**
The Perse School has proposed formalising residents' access to paths rounds their playing fields in Bourn Bridge Road by erecting permissive path signs. It was understood that the Cambridge International School would follow suit.
The Committee supported this proposal noting problems a few days previously with trail bikes on the paths. They suggested the signs should make it clear what was permitted or prohibited. There was some concern that horse riding churns up the paths in wet and wintry weather. However, they would be footpaths not bridleways.

6. S/2981/18/FL, 54 High Street, Little Abington

Temporary Planning Permission (for 5 years) for change of use from C3 (domestic) to D1 (health) and widening of access.

Public Participation.

- Mr Lacey from Headway briefly set the scene.

Headway supports people recovering from, and living with, brain injury. This could be after stroke, brain surgery, accidents or major trauma. Their current base at Ida Darwin in Fulbourn is earmarked for housing development so the service needs to find new accommodation. Mr & Mrs Sam from Greenaway, 54 High Street in Little Abington have offered their property as a temporary base. The site would be used as a day centre Monday to Friday.

Headway envisage using it for people who are well advanced in their recovery. This would be for therapy, counselling and some rehabilitation work. There could be on site activities such as gardening, art classes and Tai-Chi.

Headway recognised that working on this site would present some challenges and they were keen to work with neighbours and the local community to minimise disturbance. They welcomed the opportunity to be part of a small thriving community and they would be keen to involve members of the community in their work

Mr Lacey extended an invitation to visit them in Fulbourn although they would be moving soon.

- Mr. & Mrs. Popper are neighbours. They live at Damson Cottage, 38 High Street.

Mr. Popper emphasised he was committed to supporting people who are ill or who have mental health problems. He was very keen to support this development. His background searches showed Headway is a good organisation. However, he had some concerns about the proposal.

One of the reasons they had moved to Little Abington was for peace and quiet. There would be a large number of traffic movements on the site near his home and car parking would be very close to his boundary. He was very anxious about it. There would need to be arrangements for managing noise from traffic and reducing traffic on the site.

The drop off point would be 11 metres from his boundary. There was a risk of noise from vehicles and people coming and going.

According to the plans there would be two parking spaces by the boundary hedge. He was worried there would be headlights pointing across his drive into the kitchen as well as noise

He was also concerned about sewerage arrangements. There are frequent problems with drainage and these need to be investigated.

Damson Cottage is a listed property in a conservation area of historical significance. He had concerns about impact on the building and its curtilage.

He also suggested a planning condition that the application limits use of the site to Headway only.

Mr. Popper was concerned about the decision-making process for this application. He said he did not receive a notice from SCDC about the development until the end of August. SCDC had not posted any site notices in the village either.

- The Clerk updated the meeting. She understood Mr. Popper's concerns about not having enough time to reply. The Parish Council had been informed of the application on 20 August and given 21 days to reply i.e. by 10 September. She had contacted the Planning Officer at SCDC that morning (3 September). He had agreed to extend the consultation period until 21 September. This would allow more time for neighbours and residents to respond to the application. There was also an option for the Parish Council to consider reconvening the meeting closer to this date. The Committee felt it was unlikely there would be any new information if the meeting was rearranged.

- Mrs Scoffings said she was involved in early discussions when she was a Parish Councillor. She has worked with Headway in her career as a GP and she found them very good. She thought Greenaway would be a perfect venue for them. She welcomed the opportunity for community involvement which might, for example, include the local scouts group.

- Mr Lacey replied to Mr Popper's points:

The modelling of vehicle movements was a worst-case scenario based on current activity at Fulbourn

He estimated there would be, at most, 6 staff members on site on any day and up to 13 clients. Some of the clients would need to be dropped off at the door due to their disability. Others could park further away on the drive. The parking near Damson Cottage would be for staff who would arrive in the morning and leave in the evening i.e. they would not be coming and going. Thus, there would be few vehicle movements near Mr Popper's home. One option might be to swap the location of the proposed disabled parking space with the two staff parking spaces. There was a planting scheme in the application to thicken up the hedge on the boundary too.

He thought it would be sensible to review and modify arrangements when the service was up and running. Mr. Popper agreed the best approach would be to maintain the conversation.

Mr. Lacey pointed out that the house would be empty overnight and at weekends making it a very peaceful environment. He emphasised the importance of peace and quiet to the people who use Headway services.

- Mr. Sam said he was not aware of problems with drainage and sewerage. There had been a problem recently but he thought it had only affected his property and it had been fixed. Mr. Lacey pointed out that it was unlikely that the new service would have any significant demand on drainage systems. Patients and staff would not be using showers and baths.
- The Committee suggested noise and light issues near the boundary could be mitigated by building a wall or erecting fencing. Mr. Popper said fencing would not be in character so close to a listed building.

- Following the discussion, the Committee moved to decision-making.

There was unanimous support for the application and it was felt there was no need to refer it to the SCDC Planning Committee.

The following comments will be sent to SCDC:

1. Neighbours are concerned about noise and disturbance caused by car lights and traffic movements on the site. The Planning Committee was pleased to hear that the applicant is already working with them to reduce this. This includes the possibility of rearranging car parking so that there are fewer traffic movements close to the boundary with 38 High Street. A planting scheme on the boundary to maintain privacy and reduce interference from light and noise has been proposed. This should go ahead as soon as possible. Speed restrictions on the site might also help.
2. It seems there may be a problem with drainage in the vicinity. This needs to be investigated urgently although it was felt that the change in use was unlikely to add any significant load onto existing sewerage systems overall. However, there would be greater use than at present of toilet facilities during the working day Monday -Friday when the centre is open.

8. Any other matters.

None.

The meeting closed at 7:50 PM.

Signed by Parish Council Chairman

Date

24 September 2018