

# ALCONBURY WESTON PARISH COUNCIL

www.alconburywestonparishcouncil.co.uk

**Parish Clerk: Alison Brown**

46 Oakdale Avenue, Peterborough PE2 8TA

[parishclerk@alconburywestonparishcouncil.co.uk](mailto:parishclerk@alconburywestonparishcouncil.co.uk)

Tel: 01733 346483

Minutes of the Annual Alconbury Weston Parish Council meeting held on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at Alconbury Sports and Social Club, Great North Road, Alconbury PE28 4EX at 7.00pm.

Minutes taken by Cllr N Morton due to the Clerk's annual leave.

## 19.0 PRESENT:

**Councillors:** M. Waring (Chair), A. Stone (Vice Chair), K. Brine, N. Morton, and P. Harper-Harris  
**Members of public** - 15

## 20.0 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs J. Baker and P. Baker (personal).

## 21.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

## 22.0 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

13 residents raised objections regarding planning application 22/00145/S73 – agenda item 23.0.

One of the Developers, (2 present), explained their rationale behind submitting the planning application. The Chair thanked the Developers but explained that the Parish Council had to work with the documents and information presented.

Two members of public raised concerns relating to lack of clarity from HDC.

## 23.0 PLANNING

22/00145/S73: Removal of conditions 3 (Material), 4 (Landscape), 5 (levels), 6 (ecology), 7 (tree protection), 10 (architectural details) to 18/01946/FUL as the majority of the works are now complete on site at 50 Hamerton Road Alconbury Weston Huntingdon PE28 4JD.

Opening comments from Cllr Waring detailed the purpose of the meeting.

Cllr Harper-Harris gave a statement outlining various planning concerns.

**RESOLVED:** The Parish Council recommend REFUSAL of planning application 22/000145/S73 and requests that the original conditions of the planning permission be enforced.

The following comments will also be submitted to HDC:

1. Condition 3. The PC is concerned that the building materials that have been used and the finished appearance are not in keeping with the Alconbury Weston Conservation Area, in which these houses stand, notably:
  - Materials are not to the required specification. i.e., doors and windows are UPVC/composite whereas they should be wood. The cladding is also not timber, it is composite
  - Despite chimneys being shown on all plans submitted, including the developer's revised plans, there are no chimneys. As far as the PC is aware, all houses within the conservation area have chimneys.
  - The colour of the cladding is a fashionable modern colour and is not in keeping with other properties in the Conservation Area.

- Roof tiles are not the correct colour.
- The colour of the doors and windows is not as originally specified.
- Porches are missing from the finished properties.
- The external appearance of the garages is not in keeping with the Conservation Area.

The PC objects to the removal of Condition 3, and requests that remedial action is taken to address the appearance of this development.

2. Condition 4. The planning application seeks to remove Condition 4. The PC has assumed that the developer has changed his mind, as he has now submitted both hard and soft landscaping plans. The hard landscaping proposal is comprehensive, but retains the road construction that currently exists but with a different surface. This is contrary to Condition 8 and does not achieve the flood risk reduction requirements. There is great concern within the village community that Condition 8 has not been met. We note that there has been no request to remove Condition 8, but it is unclear to the PC if there is provision for rainwater/surface water run-off as detailed in Condition 8 and it is still unclear to the PC how this condition would be met. The PC originally observed that the data used was some 20 years out of date and since that data was provided there have been several "1 in 100 year" floods. We are not clear as to the nature of the current drainage solution for this development and cannot determine if it is fit for purpose. The development seeks to barrier itself off from surrounding properties through the use of 1.8m high solid fencing, walls and some hedging inside the fencing. The PC considers that this is not in keeping with the boundaries between other properties within the conservation area, and recommends greater use of hedging, which would also contribute to flood alleviation. The PC objects to the hard landscaping proposal.
3. Condition 5. The PC has no access to the site to determine whether the floor level of all buildings is correct. The PC consider that it is unacceptable to remove Condition 5 and request that the planning authority determines why this condition should be removed.
4. Condition 6. The PC does not understand why condition 6 needs removing. The developer has submitted a Biodiversity Method Statement dated April 2022, and while the major part of the report has been undertaken by the completed development, the PC would wish to see the remaining activities completed and inspected.
5. Condition 7. The PC note that the Retrospective Arboricultural Impact Assessment submitted by the developer states that Condition 7 has not been met. However, the PC support the recommendation of this report that the terms of Condition 7 are applied for the 5 years following completion of the development. The PC therefore object to the removal of Condition 7.
6. Condition 10. The PC consider that Condition 10 is critical to the appearance of the finished properties and their blending into the conservation area. The PC note that there are some details on the plans that allude to the architectural design, but they are not sufficient to comment on. As many of these details are to be completed in the final stages of development, we cannot observe on their implementation, but would expect the developer to fulfil the requirements of Condition 10.
7. The PC request that you note that the meeting saw a large public participation (13 members of the parish + 2 developers), with the parish members particularly concerned about the appearance of the development where it is situated within the conservation area, and also that Parish advice has not been sought of any significant proposed deviations from the approved planning approval before they have been carried out. The overall feelings of the parishioners' present were that the development is significantly altered from what was initially approved.

The meeting closed at 7:35 pm.