



COMMITTEE for ABINGTON HOUSING

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 26th October 2016 at The Institute

	<p>Present – Bernie Talbot, John Ellis, Jane Bowen, Liz Sainsbury, Tony Orgee, Peter Brunning, Tania O’Farrell, Marc Wheeldon, Keith Stringer, James Snell, Emma Pery and Julie Barnes.</p> <p>In attendance – Mitchell Tredgett and Glyn Mutton (Hill Residential)</p>
1.	<p>Apologies – Apologies received from Bob Chesham, Paul Pritchard and Pennie Zimmern</p>
2.	<p>Minutes – The minutes of the meeting held on 10th August had been previously circulated and were agreed.</p>
3.	<p>Pampisford Road/ High Street site – Mitch gave an update.</p> <p>The application had been approved by SCDC at their October meeting.</p> <p>There had been a few changes since the scheme had been presented to the committee previously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a rumble strip had been added to the entry from Pampisford Road• Plots 12 and 13 will have a wall between them and have private drives• the internal road will be a shared surface and look more like a drive <p>The section 106 agreement was still to be agreed. Following this Hill would receive a final document from SCDC with planning conditions. This should be by Mid November and then be followed by a review period of 6 weeks.</p> <p>It was anticipated that Hill Development would own the site by early January and people would be on site clearing and levelling soon after.</p> <p>Building work likely to start in May. The site will be boarded while the building takes place. Liz suggested having prints of children’s art on the hoarding to involve the village.</p> <p>The anticipated build time is 18 months. Sales should begin in December 2017 and the first people moving in around May 2018.</p> <p>The affordable housing must to be handed over to the Housing Association, South Cambs, before the rest can be completed.</p> <p>Tony had asked the SCDC Planning Committee to ensure that the planning conditions did not hold up the build.</p>

From the beginning of 2017 Hill's project manager would be the point of contact. Mitch agreed to bring him to the next CAH meeting.

Hill are part of a 'Considerate Contractors Scheme' so will listen to any issues or concerns.

The public open space will be where the site offices will be located during the building work.

Arrangements for contractor parking still had to be agreed.

4. Linton Road site – Glyn gave an update.

A pre-application meeting had taken place with SCDC. Planners were supportive of Linton Road but less so for Church Lane. Hill went back to the landowners who had agreed to de-couple the two schemes.

The Linton Road proposal will move forwards independently with 40% of its total being affordable housing.

The entrance had moved a little further out of the village due to highways feedback on the shape of the internal road.

There will be a new allotment access off the internal road and the existing one from Linton Road will be blocked with hedging. There will be a license with the land owner for access to the allotments.

The houses at the front of the scheme now have south facing gardens and front the service road running parallel with Linton Road.

The eastern access road serves 12 dwellings and will be shared surface.

The Community Orchard will be half an acre.

Plot 13 and 14 could be switched from market units to affordable if Church Lane progressed early enough to re-couple the schemes.

The scheme showed a new permissive footpath from the end of the internal road by the substation linking towards Magna Close along the back of the allotments.

The meeting suggested a few minor alterations. Unit 35 needed to be slightly tweaked in alignment to face the entrance and Linton Road to make it a gateway house.

Marc from West Lodge Kennels was concerned that he couldn't obtain a guarantee from the Environmental Health Officer that there wouldn't be an issue with noise. Marc felt that his business should be protected and the meeting agreed wholeheartedly with this and confirmed it would like to see Hill address the issue in a positive way. Glyn was asked to take a strong message back to his colleagues about this. Marc explained that he would have no choice but to object to planning once Hill have submitted their application.

	<p>The street scape was shared and comments were made about lack of chimneys and the uniformity of the roof lines. It was suggested that where there were two single storey units next to each other they could be broken up with a two storey in between.</p> <p>There were nine bungalows in the scheme. The lack of one and half storey houses was commented on for downsizing people.</p> <p>The meeting was concerned about the road leading to the field beyond. It was suggested that the substation could be put at the end of the road to demonstrate that it will not be used for access to the land beyond and further development.</p> <p>The general view of the meeting was that the new layout for the site was much better.</p> <p>Hill anticipated submitting a planning application in mid-November. Glyn undertook to share the submission pack with the CAH and Parish Council. The build time for the site was likely to be 20-21 months.</p>
5.	<p>Church Lane site – Glyn gave an update. There was no definitive time on when this site will be progressed. The sticking point with the planners was density and size of dwellings, this echoed what Little Abington PC had fed back.</p>
6.	<p>Planning policy for former LSA The small working group is meeting regularly and progressing slowly. Formal support from SCDC had been confirmed.</p>
7.	<p>Strawberry Farm An outline planning application has been submitted and discussed by Gt Abington PC. The meeting recommended refusal as the site is part of the former LSA so proposals should be in keeping with the emerging neighbourhood plan. Amendments were subsequently submitted to change internal road on site to a shared surface and access changes. There was no footway to the bus stop. GAPC recommended refusal of the amended proposal.</p>
8.	<p>Other issues Section 106 funding for Education was discussed. The County Council Education Planning section are responsible for this and not SCDC. Officers at Education Planning base the number of school places required on births in the catchment area. Discussions are taking place from different sources because there is additional pressure on the places at the local schools due to Granta Park. The District and County Councillors are on the case.</p>
9.	<p>Village News BT proposes a standard update for next month, copy deadline Nov 15th.</p>
10.	<p>Next meeting January date TBC by BT when he has found a free slot at the Institute.</p>