A meeting of the Planning Applications Panel was held in the Town Hall, Market Hill, Huntingdon on Thursday 10th December 2015.

Present: Councillors A Beevor (Chairman); S Gifford; A Mackender Lawrence; B Morrell; and R Valatka.

In attendance: Mr Thomas Whild and Mr Gideon Lemberg on behalf of Churchill Retirement Living.

Absent: Councillor D Brown.

117. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors T Forster; S Hassell; B Manning.

118. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There was none.

119. MINUTES

Copies of the minutes of the Planning Applications Panel meeting held on 26th November 2015 (M14) had been published to the website following their informal approval by the Chairman. It was therefore

RESOLVED to approve these as a correct record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

Clerks note: amendments were made to the members present, and to the automated merged file.

120. PUBLIC ADDRESS/ADDRESS BY OTHER TOWN COUNCILLORS TO PANEL

Two representatives on behalf of Churchill Retirement Living were present and wished to address the Panel. It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED to adourn the meeting.

Mr Whild and Mr Lemberg wished to speak to Members about a previous application for retirement living appartments at the end of Edison Bell Way (Old Travis Perkins Site). Members had recommended REFUSAL for the original application. Mr Whild and Mr Lemberg had subsequently taken
comments from Huntingdon Town Council and Huntingdonshire District Council into account and amendments had been made.

The scheme had now been designed to be broken down into more individual elements, meaning that the road frontage would appear to be adjoining individual buildings. The buildings had been lowered to a more sympathetic height of 3-4 storey, which had resulted in a lower number of residential units. The designs would feature differing materials and heights, and individual doors to each building. The aim of the design was to be less monotonous, more individual and to have more character.

The number of apartments had decreased from 51 to 47, but the designers had incorporated more parking bays, which would increase from 20 to 27.

Mr Whild explained that the number of bays provided was based on the research and assessment of an independent consultant who had assessed the number of parking spaces needed per apartment and per site. This survey was undertaken on an annual basis to ensure that new sites were developed with appropriate facilities. The recommendation was for 1 space per 3 apartments. Churchill Retirement were careful and considered when choosing a location, ensuring that it would be close to local amenities and public transport.

A Member questioned whether Churchill Retirement Living had ever received complaints over the number of parking spaces. Mr Lemberg explained that they hadn't generally received complaints and that the parking situations were monitored throughout the year by the Lodge Manager and that an independent survey was completed annually.

A Member asked whether the building/s would also be for retirement living. Mr Whild explained that there was a condition within the lease that meant that the building use could not be altered from retirement living for over 60's (55 years if the partner is over 60).

A Member queried the 4 storey properties, asking if the property was lowered to 3 storey, how many apartments would be lost. Mr Lemberg explained that a significant number of units would be lost and that the project would no longer be viable. The Member also questioned if residents purchased a parking space as part of their apartment. Mr Lemberg clarified that the parking spaces are not allocated to an apartment or resident, and that bays would be used on a first come, first serve basis. The Member noted that this could result in a resident not being able to park near their unit. Mr Lemberg wished to add that all parking would be closely monitored by the Lodge Manager, and that alternative options such as car shares could be made available to support residents relinquishing their vehicles.

A Member stated that they agreed with the allocation of parking and that the number of spaces was similar to that of other retirement apartment complexes in and around Huntingdon. It was also noted that the Member felt the new design and building heights were more inkeeping with the street scene and that the development was more visually sympathetic to surrounding properties.
Mr Lemberg confirmed that resident parking was less likely, and that parking was likely to be utilised more by care givers or ambulances, and that there would be covered scooter parking as residents tended to use mobility scooters.

A Member questioned whether there would still be a pathway through to Views Common. It was confirmed that the public footpath would remain providing access to Views Common.

A Member asked what parking and traffic restrictions would be in place, such as yellow lines. Mr Whild explained that within the development there wouldn’t necessarily be yellow lines or restrictions, but that the parking and vehicles would be monitored by the Lodge Manager.

Mr Lemberg also commented that there would be pedestrian access to the building from the car park, but also there would be a pedestrian access out onto Edison Bell Way.

A Member wondered what the average age of a resident was. Mr Whild stated that on average retirement residents were 79 years. A Member also queried the size of the apartments and it was confirmed that there would a mixture of 1 and 2 bed flats available.

Members thanked Mr Whild and Mr Lemberg for their information, designs and comments and it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED to reconvene the meeting.

121. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Members of the Panel considered the planning applications received from the Huntingdonshire District Council contained in a list dated 10th December 2015 as set out on the attached schedule.

Clerk’s note: the following abstentions and votes were recorded.
- 15/02075/FUL 4 Members voted to refuse the application, Councillor Morrell voted in favour of approval.
- 15/02082/S73 4 members voted to approve the application, Councillor Valatka abstained from voting.

121. DECISION NOTICES

The Panel considered the decisions made by the Huntingdonshire District Council contained in a list dated 10th December 2015 as set out on the attached schedule and it was

RESOLVED to note these with thanks.

122. CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL APPLICATION REF:H/50140/15/CC

Members had before them a copy of the letter received from Cambridgeshire County Council regarding an application for a proposed extension to form three KS2 classrooms, breakout/group/resource areas, locker areas &
associated toilets/cloakroom. Provision for two scooter racks. Huntingdon Primary School, Ambury Road, Huntingdon. Members were invited to comment if necessary and it was proposed, seconded and

**RESOLVED** to receive and note the information, and to comment ‘Recommend APPROVE’.

Clerks note: Councillor Valatka abstained from voting.

123. **PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF ENTRY**

Members had before them information about Cambridgeshire County Council’s proposal to prohibit vehicles from proceeding in a north easterly direction along Great Northern Street, Huntingdon, beyond a point 35m North East of its junction with Ermine Street. It was proposed, seconded and

**RESOLVED** to note the information.

124. **DATE & AGENDA OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting was noted as 17th December 2015 at the Town Hall, Market Hill, Huntingdon.

Clerks note: Councillor Mackender Lawrence wished to show Members photographs of trees at the Masonic Lodge, Huntingdon.

**CHAIRMAN**