

GREAT ABINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Mrs. PM Harper
17 Lewis Crescent, Great Abington, Cambridge CB21 6AG
Telephone: 01223 892000
Email: harper802@btinternet.com

A planning meeting of Great Abington Parish Council was held at Abington Institute, meeting room on Monday 14th October 2024 s

Present: Tony Orgee, Jane Bowen, Louise Patten, the Clerk and seven members of the public.

Meeting started at 7pm

67. Open Forum – Jane asked why the café business which was replacing the hairdressing business on the High Street, near the pub did not need to have change of use planning permission. It was highlighted by a member of the public that the location was not likely to require a planning application for change of use as both business types were within the same planning classification, only a license to sell alcohol would be required.

68. Declaration of interest in items to be discussed. No interests were declared.

69. Planning applications to be considered:

- a) **24/03494/S73 – The Portway, Granta Park – S73 to vary condition 8 (Materials-External surfaces) of planning permission 20/034409/FUL (Internal & external refurbishment together with associated works) to change materials for the bin store roof.** In the original application there was no roof on the bin store. **Councillors unanimously supported this application.**
- b) **24/03483/HFUL – 22 Larkfield -Part two storey, part single storey front, side & rear extension connecting to existing garage, with part conversion of garage to habitable space. Relocation of air source heat pump.** The Council had received correspondence from three residents opposing this application. The architect for the planning application, James Snell, was asked to address the meeting and to answer queries about the revised access statement, why the road seemed to be included as part of the property and extent of the site. He outlined the reason why additional space was required and that the applicant had tried to sell their home, without success. The design was planned to have minimum impact, and would most effect neighbours at number 34 , mainly due to the two storey element. When the householders had purchased the property, number 22, they had

the standard covenant which applies to the rest of the development taken off to enable them to convert the garage into a habitable space, which the householder felt was a greener solution with less impact. Mr Snell concluded by saying that there was enough space for 6 cars in the driveway so the loss of the garage would not impact on street parking.

The neighbour living at number 34 stated that the plan was overdevelopment of the site, in scale and mass, which would dominate his property. The proposed plan did not conform to the District Council's design principles as it reduced the distance between houses from 17.5 m to 10m. The garden at number 34 and the principle inhabited room (main sitting room) would be dominated by the two-storey extension. The proposed additional space would be the same size as a 2 bedroomed house, as it was a 65% increase on the existing 5 bed-roomed house, into a 7/8 bedroomed dwelling. The householder at number 34 felt that there would be a loss of daylight in their principle room, in summer and winter. The planned extension would reduce the garden area by 45%, which helps to soften the hard landscaping. Other householders stated that their eyeline would change with the creation of the two-storey extension. Another neighbouring resident raised the scale of the proposed additional dwelling space and that it would make a 201m² house, increasing the size by 130m² (larger than the area of the neighbouring bungalow) to 331m², urbanising a rural environment using brick, which was inappropriate for this location. The distance required between habitable room was stated by Mr Snell as being 17m with a minimum 12m of required.

Parish Councillors unanimously recommended that this applications be refused. The Parish Council recommends that this application is considered by the planning committee, and that the planning officers and committee visit the location to consider the impact the application would have on the neighbouring houses and the existing environment. The proposed extension is an overdevelopment of the site, developing a 201m² dwelling into a 331m² dwelling (including the conversion the garage into habitable space). It reduces the garden by 45% and would result in loss of daylight to residents at number 34. It would have an impact on the countryside edge of the development.

- c) **Land at 49 North Road- erection of a veterinary building replacing existing structure and change of use from agricultural to Class E (veterinary practice).** The existing structure is a polythene tunnels, not a permanent structure. The original plot at 49 has planning permission to convert the old piggery to a new house, 49A as per the Neighbourhood Plan. The plan for a veterinary building does not show the proposed building in relation to number 49A, and the plan shows access which is

too small for larger vehicles. The former business was on the site was horticultural, it was a business-to-business nursery which was not open to the public and was not agricultural. The application is for change of use of an agricultural building. Animals are likely to need to stay overnight which may cause noise nuisance to neighbours, when the deeds for these properties have a covenant about not cause noise nuisance to neighbours. It was noted that it is not clear how much of the land will be used for the building, there is no context. Policy 3 of the neighbourhood plan states *Policy 3: Road usage limitation in the Neighbourhood Plan area Development that would result in a substantial increase in traffic on the Land Settlement estate, or the need for significant related road development, such as businesses that by their nature require large numbers of vehicle movements, will not be permitted.*

6.23 The roads on the Land Settlement are South Road, North Road, Chalky Road and Cutting Road; all are unadopted roads. They are owned by Abington Estate Management Limited (AEML) which is a limited company set up to manage the roads. They are single tracked roads with passing places. Whilst it may be possible to increase the number of passing places it will not be possible and is not considered appropriate to increase road capacity through road widening. 6.24 Any development proposals that would individually or cumulatively lead to substantial increases in traffic would not be appropriate in the NP area due to the limited capacity of the road network. Policy 3 will apply to all proposals requiring planning permission in the NP area not just the residential proposals

This business would be in breach of Policy 3

Councillors unanimously voted to request that the application be refused and if the officer was minded to approve it, the council requested that the application be considered by the Planning Committee. Councillors requested that a condition be included should the application be approved, stating that all vehicles (construction and delivery vehicles) visiting the site, must park on the site and not park on the single track road or in the passing bays. Any damage to the verge during the construction period be 'made good'.

*It was noted that there was a typo error in the agenda, the planning application above should have been on the agenda as 49 North Road, not South Road.

70. Items for the next meeting on 18th November 2024- complaint about the condition of the path on the High Street from Pampisford Road on the right, the tree had blown down by the bridge and changes to the bank mandate.

Meeting closed at 8.25pm