

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**26 JUNE 2013 - 1.00PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Miscandlon (Chairman), Councillor D W Connor (Vice-Chairman), Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor D Hodgson, Councillor B M Keane, Councillor Mrs K F Mayor, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor D R Patrick, Councillor T E W Quince, Councillor W Sutton.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor D Stebbing

Officers in attendance: Officers in attendance: G Nourse (Head of Planning), Ms A Callaby (Planning Performance Manager), Ms C Flittner (Area Development Manager), R McKenna (Principal Solicitor (Litigation and Planning), Miss S Smith (Member Services and Governance Officer)

**P16/13      MINUTES OF 29 MAY 2013**

The minutes of the meeting of 29 May 2013 were confirmed and signed.

**P17/13      F/YR12/0846/F  
BENWICK - 27 DODDINGTON ROAD, ERECTION OF 2-STOREY SIDE AND REAR  
EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING  
REAR EXTENSION AND REMOVAL OF CHIMNEY.  
(MRS C ELY)**

Members considered objections.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the local Council participation procedure, from Mr Hall, the applicant's agent. Mr Hall made reference to the officers report stating that five letters of support were received and a petition with ten signatures of support from residents who live down Doddington Road. He referred to some who are against this proposal but pointed out that they do not live down Doddington Road and there is no mention of consultation with the Local Highways Authority who have not raised any issues and comments from the Parish Council are still awaited.

Mr Hall stated that the design of the extension has already been approved. He pointed out that the recommendation is to refuse the application and asked if he could hand out three emails to committee members. The Chairman requested that the emails were passed to the Legal Officer for his approval prior to circulation to members of the Committee. It was agreed that the emails could be passed to members. Mr Hall explained that the first email stated that a one and a half storey extension was not acceptable but a two storey may be acceptable. Mr Hall advised members that he had spoken with the applicant based on the written advice given by officers on 17 April 2013.

Mr Hall pointed out that the second email was received on 24 April 2013 with officers advising that if concerns were addressed the application would be likely to receive support. The third email was received on 13 June with an officer recommendation for approval. Mr Hall stated that a lot of time and money had been spent on the application by the applicant and the emails are clear that the application was likely to be supported.

Officers clarified that, having checked the file for information, there is no further update on the report, there is one petition to support objections to the application and confirmed that further checks could be made with the planning officer concerned for clarification. Officers pointed out that the words in the email say the application is **likely** to be accepted. The planning officer had checked with the Planning Performance Manager and the Area Development Manager, who have a good knowledge of the site and agreed that they had considered the appropriateness of the site and had evaluated a different balance for the site and the recommendations from the delivery team were different and they believe that the aspirations of the applicant could not be met on the proposed dwelling.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Newell asked if officers had received a response from Benwick Parish Council. Officers confirmed that reconsultation had taken place on 26 April and confirmed that any response received should be on the case file. Councillor Mrs Newell responded that all consultation responses should be received prior to applications being included on the Planning agenda. Officers confirmed that the Parish Council have no objections to the proposal and other letters from local residents confirm the same stance, however officers do not feel that they can overcome the design issues in the recommendations and confirmed that they would address information contained on the file after the meeting;
- Councillor Murphy made reference to Policy CS16, D and E, which states that an application should only be considered 'if it makes a positive contribution to the local area...' and he expressed the view that this application goes against all the information contained within D and E of Policy CS16;
- Councillor Quince asked if there are any objections from the neighbouring owner. Officers confirmed that objections have been raised by the neighbour;
- Councillor Bucknor referred to the plan shown on the screen and asked why the garage was not shown in the same position as viewed at the Site Inspection. Officers confirmed that the plan shown on the screen is the original plan, with the garage shown on the side and confirmed that the new entrance to the garage is on the front;
- Councillor Patrick expressed the view that officers were right not to support the application;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that she agreed with both Councillors Patrick and Murphy and officers recommendations;
- Councillor Sutton expressed the view that the Agent and the Applicant should not be in this position as it appears that clear advice had been given from an officer right up to the point of the application being presented to committee and he supported members views. Officers confirmed this would be explored following committee, whilst asking Member to consider the planning application on its own merits as set before them.

Proposed by Councillor Patrick, seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor and decided that the application be:

**Refused for the following reason -**

**The proposal is considered contrary to Policy E9 of the FDWLP and Policy CS16 of the FDP-CS in that it does not respect the scale and character of the host dwelling and would result in an adverse impact on the adjoining residential occupier, by virtue of its over-dominant and imposing appearance and relationship with the common boundary. In addition it is considered that the scheme will have a negative impact on the street scene.**

*(Councillor Connor declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of being lobbied extensively and with regard to Paragraph 4 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters declared that he had attended a private site meeting with the applicant and to avoid the perception of improper influence, retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)*

*(Councillor Miscandlon registered, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he had been lobbied on this application)*

**P18/13 F/YR12/0907/F**  
**EASTREA - LAND SOUTH OF 14-24 WYPE ROAD, ERECTION OF 14 X 2-**  
**STOREY DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING COMPRISING OF 7 X 2-**  
**BED, 6 X 3-BED AND 1 X 4-BED AND ADDITIONAL GARDEN AND PARKING**  
**AMENITY FOR NOS 16 AND 18 WYPE ROAD.**  
**(STEPFORD HOMES)**

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04)) during its deliberations.

Members considered letters of objection.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the local council participation procedure, from Councillor Mrs Laws, Chairman of Whittlesey Town Council's Planning Committee. Councillors Mrs Laws stated that she would like to register strong objections to the application and asked for planning consistency. She drew attention to the history of the site and the refusal for the erection of five detached bungalows in November 1994. Councillors Mrs Laws requested permission to handout a letter from the Planning Inspectorate and Fire Regulations which was granted.

Councillor Mrs Laws referred to previous preapplication meetings with two other potential developers wanting to build on Wype Road who were informed that no other development could be considered as it would increase the volume of traffic to Wype Road and more congestion to the A605. She requested that consideration be given to highways issues regarding the A605, on road parking and its close proximity to a busy garage business and also the high volume of agricultural traffic. She expressed the view that the site is not sustainable as there is no school, church, shop or bus service for the village of Eastrea.

Councillor Mrs Laws stated that the Town Council does not consider that the proposal for fourteen dwellings is acceptable and that the implications of proposal for them to be two-storey has not been assessed on the surrounding area. She asked members to take into account their site visit which showed that one-storey dwellings do exist in the area and two-storey dwellings would be out of character, having major impact on privacy to homes and gardens. The access has been widened at less than one metre from the previous application which was refused for five bungalows which would have been more appropriate for this site.

Councillor Mrs Laws expressed the view that Fenland District Council's (FDCs) policy would not allow refuse lorries to access unsuitable roads and this application clearly displays permeable paving which means that the lorries will not go door to door to collect bins.

Councillor Mrs Laws made reference to the comments of FDCs Leader regarding the need for affordable housing, this site offers four affordable dwellings which is a very small percentage on a very unsuitable site on Wype Road. She requested that members let common sense and planning consistency prevail and that they should refuse this application.

Councillor Hodgson asked Councillor Mrs Laws what she anticipated the land would be used for. Councillors Mrs Laws responded that the Town Council would like to see five single-storey dwellings and this would be acceptable.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ms Coulson, the applicant for the proposal, speaking on behalf of Roddons Housing Association. Ms Coulson informed members that Stepford Homes had taken up the option on the site to produce affordable housing for the district. She stated that she is aware of the need for housing in the district and the housing waiting list number. She referred to the ward being the fourth in the county as having barriers to affordable housing and expressed the view that the site is believed suitable for affordable housing. Ms Coulson confirmed that Roddons housing stock in Eastrea equals seventeen homes in the village, including nine one-bed bungalows and Roddons are looking to supplement this. There is a demand for shared ownership homes and this would result in seven homes for this purpose.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Fieldhouse, the applicant's agent. Mr Fieldhouse stated that the planning application has taken eighteen months to bring to committee, the design and road have been central to the development of the site and they have tried to provide footpaths that give a safe means of access to the road up to Local Highway Authority standard. The access is narrow but is still five metres and there is sufficient turning for refuse vehicles to turn on the site and there are no soakaways on the site, this has been addressed by the paving to ensure that there are no flooding issues on the site. Three visitor parking spaces have been included in the development following consultation with the Town Council.

Mr Fieldhouse pointed out that there are two-storey dwellings in the surrounding area and back to back depths of the properties are twenty two metres and flank to rear is thirteen metres which addresses issues of overlooking and he believes that the development will provide much needed affordable housing in the area.

Councillor Patrick asked Ms Coulson if the dwellings are all affordable housing. Ms Coulson confirmed that they are a mix of rented and shared ownership dwellings, seven of each type.

Councillor Hodgson asked Ms Coulson if Roddons Housing Association would consider building fewer dwellings on the site. Ms Coulson confirmed that the cost of the site reflects the viability to deliver fourteen properties as a deliverable site and confirmed that with the grant and private finance building could start on the site this year.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Mayor informed members that she was born and brought up in the village and was not happy with the access to the site, stating that Wype Road is used frequently by large vehicles, there is a garage on the main A605 road and access is constantly required for parking, making the access for this development dangerous. She advised that there is no other way for access to this plot of land and she believes that there could also be a forthcoming plan for another access onto another road and this would increase traffic even more. Councillor Mrs Mayor confirmed that she could not support this application;
- Councillor Hodgson asked if all surrounding properties were bungalows. Officers confirmed that numbers 24 and 26 are houses, the property to the east of the development, number 9 is a new property built in a farm yard, pointing out that those shown on the bottom of the plan are bungalows;
- Councillor Connor expressed the opinion that the site is over intensified and would be happy to revisit the application with fewer dwellings.

Proposed by Councillor Patrick, seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor and decided that the application be:

**Refused for the following reason -  
the proposed development constitutes overintensification of the site and is out of character with the area.**

Members do not support officers recommendation to Grant planning permission as they feel that the site would be overdeveloped.

Members requested that additional information from speakers be made available to them prior to the meeting to allow them time to read it.

(Councillor Murphy declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of being a Board Member of Roddons Housing Association, and retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)

(Councillor Miscandlon registered, in accordance with Paragraph 15 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he took part in the discussion of this application at the meeting of Whittlesey Town Council at which it was discussed and stated that he will consider all relevant matters before reaching a decision on this proposal)

(Councillor Miscandlon registered, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he had been lobbied on this application)

**P19/13**

**F/YR12/0936/F**

**MANEA - LAND SOUTH OF THE BUNGALOW, STATION FARM, FODDER FEN ROAD, ERECTION OF 10 X 2 STOREY DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF: 7 X 3-BED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING, 1 X 3-BED DWELLING WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE, 1 X 4-BED DWELLING WITH AN ATTACHED DOUBLE GARAGE, A BIOMASS CABIN AND THE FORMATION OF 2 X ACCESSES AND 1 POND.**

**(MR R WALES)**

Members considered objections.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- the description of the application should now read 'the formation of 2 x accesses, 1 pond and 18 car parking spaces;
- an updated site plan forms part of the presentation and was shown to members on the site visit;
- at 4.4 in the report the comments are from Middle Level Commissioners (MLC) and not North Level IDB as stated;
- in response to the objections from MLC and Anglian Water the Agent has annotated an amended plan to indicate that all private drainage will go to MLC ditch via proposed sewage treatment plants and the necessary consents will be sought. No further comments have been received from consultees;
- the amendments made do not overcome the policy and principle issues highlighted in the report so the recommendation remains one of refusal.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Cole, an objector to the proposal. Mrs Cole informed members that she lived at Station Farm, Manea, adjacent to the site proposed for the erection of 10 x 2-storey dwellings. She confirmed that she has lived on the working farm for 52 years and objects to the development, speaking on behalf of her husband and two neighbours. Mrs Cole stated that there had been four previous applications for two dwellings which had all been refused, the current proposal is for five times that number. She expressed the opinion that the proposed development is situated in open countryside, outside of the built up area of the village, it is detrimental to the rural setting and too distant from the village. It would require residents to have a car to reach the village, there are no footpaths or streetlights on a small Fenland road with heavy agricultural traffic. Walking and cycling would be dangerous due to the increase in traffic, stating that newspaper deliveries are not allowed on safety grounds. Access is not safe and there is a drainage ditch on Mrs Cole's property which would mean extra pressure on drainage, highway safety and flood risk.

Mrs Cole stated that there is a need to build properties for local people but believes that as a longstanding resident in the area that there are more suitable sites than the one in question and respectfully requested that the committee refuse the application. Mrs Cole asked officers what consultation had taken place regarding the proposal as she was not notified of any.

Officers confirmed that public consultation had taken place in the Church rooms at Manea which had been publicised by the Agent.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Humphrey, the applicant's agent. Mr Humphrey pointed out that Manea is a growth village and stated that there will be growth there. He stated that the site contributes to sustainability due to its proximity and closeness to the railway station. Mr Humphrey pointed out that Policy CS12 states that the development should be in or adjacent to the development footprint and confirmed that the site is surrounded on all three sides by development, causing no adverse impact, surrounded by natural hedgerows. He pointed out that the development will retain natural boundaries and does not impact on space, land or amenities. He informed members that 96% of those that attended the public consultation supported the scheme.

Mr Humphrey stated that as a result of the public consultation the application was amended to include a car park for the railway, a smallscale development needed for growth in Fenland. He informed Members that the site is close to a school, an old people's home and should be supported as a logical, practical and sustainable location adjacent to the railway.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Hodgson asked officers if there are more appropriate sites for development and are they definite. Officers confirmed that there is an application towards the centre of Manea which will be presented at the next Planning Committee for 46 dwellings in Flood Zone 1 and stated that there are other sites that are sequentially preferable to this one. Officers advised that these sites should be considered first in response to the National Planning Policy Framework, the Environment Agency and Core Strategy Policies, moving towards less vulnerable land for flooding. There is a systematic and sequential process for these sites to be considered first;
- Councillor Hodgson asked officers if the Core Strategy suggests that too many properties are being built in Manea. Officers advised that there is a strong element of support for development in Manea but this needs to be proportionate, flood risk has to be carefully managed and there is a duty to consider sites in Flood Zone 1, the broad locations of growth and sites that are sequentially more preferable and less vulnerable to flooding;
- Councillor Patrick expressed the opinion that there is a problem of sustainability with this site;
- Councillor Murphy asked if a successful sequential test had been carried out. Officers explained that a sequential test had not been carried out as part of the application, however the local planning authority has looked to see if there are other sites that are available in Flood Zone 1 areas and there are and officers believe that this application fails to meet the sequential test.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor and decided that the application be:

**Refused for the following reasons:**

1. the proposed development, being beyond the existing development footprint of the village of Manea fails to satisfy the criteria of Policy CS12 of the Fenland Local Plan, Core Strategy, Proposed Submission (February 2013) and is therefore contrary to that policy which sets out the definition of "the developed footprint";
2. the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the application site, which lies within Flood Zone 3, should be developed prior to more sequentially preferable sites which can be identified within the District. As a result the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policies CS14 (Part B) and CS12 of the Fenland Local Plan, Core Strategy, Proposed Submission (February 2013) and section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Councillors Connor and Sutton registered, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been lobbied on this application. Councillor Sutton stated that he would consider all relevant matters before reaching a decision on this proposal)

**P20/13**

**F/YR13/0175/RM**

**MARCH - LAND SOUTH OF ELLIOT ROAD AND EAST OF FISHERMANS DRIVE, ERECTION OF 60 DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 9 X 3-STOREY 1-BED AND 9 X 3-STOREY 2-BED FLATS, 1 X SINGLE STOREY 2-BED, 19 X 2 STOREY 2 BED AND 22 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED SHEDS, BIN/CYCLE STORES, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. (RODDONS HOUSING ASSOCIATION)**

Members considered letters and a petition of objections.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- amended plans have been submitted regarding Highways and Access which have satisfied all the technical issues, however it has been indicated that from a highway perspective the application should be refused. The concern relates to the retention of the track from Fishermans Drive which serves dwellings in West End. Applicants and the agent have not been able to negotiate the removal of this Right of Way, hence it has been retained, to remain as an inconspicuous entrance. It will not cause issues or divert traffic from the Elliott Road entrance;
- extensive discussions have taken place with the Police Architectural Liaison Officer, applicant and agent in respect of crime prevention and the overall scheme is likely to receive a full Secured by Design Award;
- amended plans regarding the layout of the scheme have been submitted. The two pairs of 2-bed semi detached dwellings on plots 13-16 have been replaced with four 1-bed bungalows. This improves the relationship of the new dwellings with the individual properties in Elliott Lodge and should overcome the objectors concerns which related to overlooking;



- point 4.3 of the agenda relates to comments from the Middle Level Commissioners (MLC), not the North Level IDB as stated - MLC have indicated that byelaw and discharge consents have been received and are the subject of internal consultation;
- as a result of necessary reconsultations regarding the amended layout the recommendation is to approve subject to no further objections being received in the consultation period.

Members received a presentation, from Councillor Mrs French, the Fenland District Council ward member for March West Ward which this proposal lies in. Councillor Mrs French stated that she welcomes the development and hopes that building will start very soon as so far Roddons have not produced the number of homes that have been promised. She has concerns over the flats but believes these can be overcome. She expressed the view that she welcomed the consultation that had taken place with the residents of Elliott Lodge regarding plots 13-16 which had resulted in these proposals being replaced with bungalows.

Councillor Mrs French thanked officers for the way they have dealt with the application and the concerns of the residents at Elliott Lodge and welcomes the police initiative 'Secured by Design' as the way forward to address anti-social behaviour. She raised concerns as to whether the site is affordable housing or split shared as there is no Section 106 for education and the sixty extra dwellings will increase the need for school places and requested that officers consult with the residents over their requirements.

Members received presentations, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ms Coulson, on behalf of the applicant. Ms Coulson responded to the issue raised by Councillor Mrs French regarding tenure, confirming that the site is a mix of rented and homes for shared ownership and the huge demand in the market towns. She stated that the site has been secured by private, grant and cross subsidy funding and work can start on this site this year with delivery completed by the end of 2015.

Ms Coulson informed members that a recreation ground scheme had been drawn up and feedback by residents has been taken into account. The rights of way will be discouraging the use of the track with the development designed to keep rights of way but providing an adoptable road that will encourage residents to use it as a preferred route. Ms Coulson requested that members support the provision of affordable housing on this site.

Members received presentations, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Lawrence, the applicant's agent. Mrs Lawrence informed members that the application is for 60 dwellings with a mix of dwellings, bungalows, houses and flats. The layout of the site had raised concerns from existing neighbouring dwellings, making the agents aware of concerns for plots 13-16 and overlooking Elliott Lodge, this has been addressed by replacement with four bungalows and close boarded fence between them. There are a few rights of way over the site which constrains the site, Fishermans Drive has been kept for private use and people will be discouraged from using this access.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Newell raised concerns regarding the lack of Section 106 funding for education. Officers responded that the practice is that Cambridgeshire County Council have taken a 'hit' on education in favour of the benefits that affordable housing will bring in supporting the local community;

- Councillor Quince asked if Anglian Water had been contacted as they have not commented on the application. Officers confirmed that comments from Anglian Water are included on the outline approval and are being addressed and therefore not considered on this, a reserved matters application;
- Councillor Connor commented that he was pleased the concerns of the residents of Elliott Lodge have been considered and the application includes bungalows;
- Councillor Patrick expressed the view that this is a good application and he agreed with officers recommendations but had concerns regarding no Section 106 funding for education;
- Councillor Sutton commented that he had been disappointed with plots 13-16 and welcomed the fact that this has been addressed by the provision of four 1-bed bungalows.

Proposed by Councillor Patrick, seconded by Councillor Connor and decided that the application be:

**Granted, subject to the conditions reported.**

*(Councillor Murphy declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of being a Board Member of Roddons Housing Association, and retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)*

*(Councillors Keane and Quince stated that they are members of March Town Council, but take no part in planning matters)*

Members took a 10 minute break following determination of this application.

**P21/13**      **F/YR13/0209/O**  
**WISBECH - LAND EAST OF 37 CRAB MARSH, ERECTION OF 10 COMMERCIAL**  
**UNITS FOR B1, B2 AND B8 USE.**  
**(MR M GIBBARD, TINGDENE DEVELOPMENTS LTD)**

Members considered a letter of objection.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04) refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- the Agent has responded to the points made in the objection letter with the following information:

**Proposed development at Crab Marsh, Wisbech, Design of the Industrial Estate Road**

**1.0 Existing Crab Marsh**

- 1.1 The existing track that runs along the side of Crab Marsh Boat Yard is in the order of between 3.0m and 3.5m wide;
- 1.2 We understand the following from Drake Towage Ltd:

- The nature of their business means that large heavy goods vehicles have to travel the full length of Crab Marsh to reach the site. A number of trips are made on a daily basis in these types of vehicles for a variety of purposes including the delivery and collection of cranes, steel and other plant and machinery connected to the operation of the business. At present these vehicles are unable to manoeuvre on site to turnaround and therefore reverse back along Crab Marsh to exit the premises;

## **2.0 Freight Transport Association publication "Designing for deliveries"**

### **2.1 "Designing for deliveries" states the following:**

- "When traffic flows are very light and vehicles entering and leaving meet only infrequently, it is reasonable to reduce the safety margins on the assumption the drivers will need to pass slowly. In these cases a carriageway width of 6m can be considered as an absolute minimum, and used only when there are no vertical obstructions within approximately 0.5m of the carriageway edges.
- Carriageway widths must be increased at bends because here vehicle paths are wider."

## **3.0 Design Parameters**

### **3.1 The design comprises the following:**

- Crab Marsh carriageway widened to 6.1m wide
- The main industrial estate road, running parallel with the existing Crab Marsh, to be 6.1m wide.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ms Barrow, an objector to the proposal. Ms Barrow informed members that she was speaking on behalf of Drake Towage, a marine contractor of 30 years, lying to the north of the application site. She advised members that Drake Towage have contributed a considerable sum of money to the local economy and employs 13 local people.

Ms Barrow stated that the access to their site is via Crab Marsh, along a straight narrow road and they have a legal right of way over Crab Marsh. This has been maintained by them for their benefit and the public, with large business vehicles accessing the site, sometimes up to 14 feet wide. The new proposals would lead to operational difficulties, to negotiate forward and reverse gears along the 'S'; bends. She confirmed that Drake Towage support the application in principle for industrial units and the previous layout of a cul-de-sac but raised concerns that Drake Towage were not consulted prior to the application being made and that there is no formal agreement between all the parties concerned and Drake Towage are very disappointed. Ms Barrow said it was not clear if with appropriate legal consultation the right of way can be maintained and requested that members refuse the application.

Councillor Bucknor commented that there are two entrance gates and these are closed most of the time and asked where the public footpath was as it was unclear to him. It was confirmed that there is a stile next to the gates for public access.

Councillor Murphy made reference to the decision made as last month's Planning Committee where permission was given to Drake Towage to extend their property and for a turning circle and asked if this was still going ahead. Officers responded that the final decision will be taken by Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council. Ms Barrow responded that Drake Towage are asking that careful consideration is given to their access as there is no guarantee as to what the outcome of the final decision will be by Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.

Councillor Sutton asked what the reason was that the Drake Towage could not continue to use the road. Officers confirmed that there are legal implications, the layout for a stand alone road is outside the planning process and officers confirmed that all parties involved are currently working to develop a solution. Officers requested that members consider the application on planning terms and pointed out that there are no grounds to reject the application on highway grounds.

Councillor Patrick asked Ms Barrow if the proposals could cause the demise of the business. Ms Barrow responded that it could if Drake Towage could not access their premises.

Members received presentations, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Hannify, the applicant's agent. Mr Hannify thanked members for allowing him the opportunity to speak. Mr Hannify informed members that the application comprises outline proposals for ten commercial units and associated access to Crab Marsh on disused brownfield land, 200-400sq metres with flexibility for the use of units by businesses. He confirmed that the layout of the development was agreed with officers by preapplication discussions. The access is important and a vehicle analysis has been carried out by auto tracking, confirming that a low loader of 16.6m and 2.5m wide could be accommodated on the industrial estate road. No objections have been raised by the Highways Authority and the new road would be the one that would be adopted by Drake Towage with the existing straight road no longer being used.

Mr Hannify acknowledged that there are legal issues, pointing out that the local and national EMP1 support proposals for new businesses. The scheme creates jobs and prosperity and sustainable economic growth. He pointed out that Wisbech is reliant on the food industry, logistics and storage and this proposal supports the economy of Wisbech, the expansion of businesses, wider employment opportunities, vitality and expansion of the port area. Mr Hannify requested that members support and grant the outline permission for this proposal.

Councillor Mrs Newell asked Mr Hannify if the rights of way had been discussed with Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC). Mr Hannify confirmed that he will be holding discussions with CCC.

Councillor Bucknor asked Mr Hannify if the hammerhead on the land behind Osborn Road is to be developed and used as a continuation road. Mr Hannify confirmed that the land east of the development site had not been considered but notes that there is scope for future development that would be dependent on a detailed analysis.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Sutton asked if the access could be considered at the Outline planning stage. Officers confirmed that the access is committed and it would not be possible to revisit access at this point. The Legal Officer confirmed that access for Drake Towage has been raised as an issue with the Property Team but had no further information at this point in time. Officers requested that the application be considered on its planning merits, informing members that there are legal considerations that can be considered outside the planning process in consultation with the Assets and Valuation Officer to develop a solution between all parties;

- Councillor Bucknor made reference paragraph to 4.6 of the planning report and asked for clarification regarding the development model used for the junction of the site. Officers informed members that the Highways Authority are satisfied with the junction and advised that ownership of the road is not part of planning considerations and confirmed that Fenland District Council will ensure that its interests are protected. Officers explained that the legal position will be fully explored and Drake Towage would not be inconvenienced from an economic viewpoint. The current rights of Drake Towage cannot be taken away from them;
- Councillor Patrick expressed the opinion that the proposals would take away part of the road as Drake Towage know it at the present time. Officers confirmed that the proposal is a new route and the road width has been explored and the width increased, with the turning points being wide enough to accommodate alternative traffic and associated areas;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor pointed out that she was struggling between the provision of ten new commercial units that will provide employment, whilst also considering a longstanding company that are already employing 40+ people who may experience difficulty with their business due to possible access issues.

Proposed by Councillor Miscandlon and decided to:

**Defer, to allow the Legal Officer to explore problems concerning access and rights of way.**

Members decided to defer the application as they feel that more information is required regarding the legal access and rights of way and requested more information from the Legal Officer to allow them to make a more informed decision.

*(All Members present declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of Fenland District Council owning part of the land)*

**P22/13**      **F/YR13/0228/FDC**  
**GUYHIRN - LAND SOUTH OF 52 CHAPELFIELD ROAD, ERECTION OF 3 NO.**  
**DWELLINGS**  
**(MR T WATSON, FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL)**

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that North Level IDB have no objections to the application in principle but have requested details of the sustainable drainage system proposed by the applicant.

Councillor Sutton raised concerns as to whether the number of dwellings on this piece of land is enough. Officers explained the constraints of the site.

Proposed by councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Quince and decided that the application be:

**Granted, subject to the conditions reported.**

*(All Members present declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of Fenland District Council being the applicant)*

**P23/13**      **F/YR13/0265/F**  
**PARSON DROVE - LAND WEST OF 114 MAIN ROAD, ERECTION OF 2 X 3-BED**  
**AND 2 X 4-BED 2-STOREY DWELLINGS WITH ATTACHED GARAGES.**  
**(ROWELL FAMILY)**

Members considered six letters of objection.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that a response has been received from Parson Drove/Wisbech St Mary Parish Council stating that they support the application as it will compliment the streetscene and recommend that members grant approval.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Broker, the applicant's agent. Mr Broker informed members that planning officers recommend approval of this application. He stated that the site is ideally situated, well contained, in a sustainable location and passes the sequential test in a Flood Zone 1 area.

Mr Broker expressed the opinion that the site is in keeping with others on the main road and is of a similar standard. The Highways Authority have requested a footpath for the front road and this has been agreed. He expressed the opinion that this is the best road frontage site in Parson Drove at this moment and requested that members approve the application.

Proposed by Councillor Murphy, seconded by Councillor Connor and decided to:

**Grant, subject to the conditions reported.**

*(Councillor Sutton declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of his nephew being employed by the applicant's agent, and retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)*

**P24/13**      **F/YR13/0271/F**  
**WISBECH - LAND WEST OF 48 RAMNOTH ROAD, ERECTION OF 2-BED 2-**  
**STOREY DWELLING INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE.**  
**(MR T BARNES)**

Members considered one letter of objection.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberation.

Officers informed members that:

- a letter of support had been received from a resident stating that he had no objections to the application and feels that the proposals would benefit residents at the end of the street;
- Wisbech Town Council recommend refusal of the development.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Broker, the applicant's agent. Mr Broker stated that Prince Street is one of the oldest streets in Wisbech, has predominantly on-street parking, the application site is at the end of the roadway and set away from the footpath, has offroad parking and a small garden. He informed members that the existing site has two offroad parking spaces, whilst these may not be accessible they are there and useable. The number of vehicle movements to the site will remain unchanged whilst proposing one parking site and off road parking.

Mr Broker informed members that the letter from the neighbour states that he has purchased the adjacent bungalow 'Greenways' which has no vehicular access to the offroad parking, the applicant would allow him to adjust for vehicular access. The dwelling is in character with the streetscene, it is plain and simple as any other form of development would be out of character with the area and meets the needs for small affordable housing in the town. Mr Broker confirmed that Councillor Miss Hoy has given her permission to support the application.

Councillor Bucknor asked if Greenways is also number 18. Officers confirmed that number 18 is Greenways.

Councillor Patrick asked Mr Broker if he was aware that lots of vehicles have to reverse into this road. Mr Broker confirmed that he was.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Connor expressed the opinion that he thought officers had made the correct recommendation of refusal, there is parking both sides of the road making it very cramped;
- Councillor Patrick stated that residents often have to reverse all the way into this road and it is very cramped and would support refusal of this application.

Proposed by Councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Patrick and decided that the application be:

**Refused for the following reason -**

**the proposed development is out of keeping with the existing form, scale and character of the surrounding area, by virtue of the size of the site, which cannot comfortably accommodate a dwelling.**

**The proposal will result in the overdevelopment of the site and will be detrimental to the residential amenity of adjoining dwellings as well as future occupiers of the proposed dwelling and will result in an adverse impact on highway safety.**

**As a result the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs, 17, 32 and 58, Policy CS16 of the Draft Core Strategy and policies H3 and E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan.**

(Councillors Bucknor, Hodgson and Patrick stated that they are members of Wisbech Town Council, but take no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Sutton declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of his nephew being employed by the applicant's agent, and retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)

**P25/13**      **F/YR13/0275/F**  
**WHITTLESEY - 2 ORCHARD STREET, ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY REAR**  
**EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING AND CONVERSION OF STABLES/STORE**  
**TO 1-BED ANNEXE INCLUDING ERECTION OF 2-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.**  
**(MR AND MRS S AND K BURRILL)**

Members considered one letter of objection.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- as per section 6.1(d) of the report an ecological statement has been provided. The statement has been written in accordance with the information set out in 'Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines' which is advocated by Natural England. The statement stipulates that a preliminary site inspection will be carried out by an ecologist prior to the commencement of works on the barn. A condition to this effect is recommended on any consent given;
- a heritage statement in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF has been provided;
- condition 5, on page 116 of the agenda should read 'the occupation of the existing dwelling at 2 Orchard Street' rather than 'the occupation of the existing dwelling at #'
- the Resolution to Grant permission remains as per page 115 of the agenda with the following additional condition:
  - Prior to the commencement of development, the results of a preliminary ecological site inspection shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In the event that the presence of bats is identified a full survey shall be carried out and appropriate mitigation measures identified. The results of the survey and mitigation measures (where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in perpetuity.
  - Reason -

To ensure that no protected species are harmed as a result of the development.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that the Town Council recommend refusal of the application on the grounds of overdevelopment, there are concerns with parking in this area, there is nowhere for vehicles to turn around and it is a single track road when cars are parked along the road;
- Councillor Bucknor expressed the opinion that he supported the application;
- Councillor Sutton confirmed that he supported the application;



- Councillor Connor confirmed that he supported the application and feels that the development will bring the site back into use;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor asked if North Level IDB had made a response. Officers confirmed that they were consulted on 10 May. Councillor Mrs Mayor said that this raised concerns as she sits on the North Level IDB and is aware of the list of applications that they consider and this application was not on the list. Officers agreed to consider this issue outside the meeting.

Proposed by Councillor Bucknor, seconded by Councillor Quince and decided to:

**Grant, subject to the conditions reported and the following additional condition:**

**Prior to the commencement of development, the results of a preliminary ecological site inspection shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In the event that the presence of bats is identified a full survey shall be carried out and appropriate mitigation measures identified. The results of the survey and mitigation measures (where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in perpetuity.**

**Reason -**

**To ensure that no protected species are harmed as a result of the development.**

*(Councillor Miscandlon registered in accordance with Paragraph 15 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a member of Whittlesey Town Council and stated that he will consider all relevant matters before reaching a decision on this proposal)*

*(Councillor Miscandlon registered, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he had been lobbied on this application)*

*(Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she is a member of Whittlesey Town Council, but takes no part in planning matters, is not on the planning committee and takes no part in planning matters)*

**P26/13**

**F/YR13/0280/F**

**MARCH - LAND WEST OF THIRTIES FARM, UPWELL ROAD, ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLING AND DETACHED WORKSHOP FOR B1, B2 AND B8 USE, INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BARN AND OUTBUILDINGS. (MR AND MRS J POOLEY)**

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- no pre-application discussions were undertaken and Middle Level Commissioners consider that the applicant has not provided adequate evidence to prove that a viable scheme for appropriate water level/flood risk management that meets current design standards exists. Middle Level Commissioners request that the applicant clarifies the method and location of surface water disposal devices;

- Environmental Health have no objection to the proposal, however they have noted the previous usage of the site and request that a contaminated land condition needs to be added if permission is granted, to ensure that the land is suitable for its intended end use;
- no business plan has been provided by the applicant and the Council does not have a workplace homes policy.

Members received a presentation, from Councillor Yeulett, the Fenland District Council ward member for March East Ward which this proposal lies in. Councillor Yeulett informed members that the applicant currently lives with his parents, accommodation is cramped, the dwelling is close to his parents house and will allow the family to grow the business.

Councillor Yeulett stated that the dwelling will provide the applicant with a dedicated office area and improved site security, there have been a number of break-ins and there is lack of surveillance from the current house.

Councillor Yeulett expressed the opinion that the proposed dwelling will dramatically improve security and in line with the Council's Open for Business Priority will secure the longevity of the business. He informed members that there are no flooding or highway issues and the Town Council recommend approval. The dwelling will keep the family together, the applicants have run the business for many years and the development will tidy up the current site. He pointed out that Government are encouraging development and requested that members adopt a commonsense approach and approve the application. He commented that he feels sure that the applicant can provide a business plan if requested.

Members made comments, asked questions and received response as follows:

- Councillor Patrick made reference to the Council's Open for Business priority and stated that there is still a requirement for a business plan. He commented that he could not support the application due to the lack of preapplication discussion with Middle Level Commissioners and said that this was speculative;
- Councillor Quince stated that he would like to see the application approved, he knows the site well, they are good groundworkers and need a new workshop and a place to keep big machinery securely under lock and key as they are currently operating from an old barn;
- Councillor Murphy expressed the opinion that the first thing would be to request a business plan and to defer the decision until one was provided;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor asked what flood zone the site was in. Officers responded that it is in flood zone 3 and reiterated the comments from Middle Level Commissioners requesting the clarification of method and location of surface water disposal devices;
- Councillor Connor commented that under the Council's Open for Business priority this development would allow expansion and he feels that the length of time the business has been there means that it stands on its own merits. Officers responded that justification is required for the provision of a dwelling on this site and a business plan would enable the applicants to demonstrate why another house is required on this site;
- Councillor Hodgson stated that he is against deferral of the application and believes that business should be encouraged to develop;

- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that a business plan should have been put forward and suggested that the application be deferred until one is received;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented on the overcrowding and possible need for a second property and that she feels inclined to support the application but would like answers to some questions before making a decision;
- Councillor Bucknor commented that there may be a business argument for this development and pointed out that members need to be consistent when making a decision and requested that it be deferred pending the submission of a business plan.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Newell, seconded by Councillor Bucknor and decided to:

**Defer the application, subject to the submission of a Business Plan by the applicant.**

(Councillors Keane and Quince stated that they are members of March Town Council, but take no part in planning matters)

**P27/13      F/YR13/0302/O  
CHATTERIS - LAND WEST OF 55 HUNTINGDON ROAD, ERECTION OF A  
DWELLING.  
(MR AND MRS D TAYLOR)**

Members considered one letter of concern.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Bevens, the applicant's agent. Mr Bevens stated that he had a preapplication discussion with the Highways Authority and the proposal provides good highway safety. He explained that should the application be granted it is the applicant's intention to sell the site and retire and as a result the commercial vehicles will be removed from the site. He pointed out that the siting of the property can accommodate both car parking and the required visibility requirements.

Mr Bevens stated that property numbers 37B, 51 and 67 are set back on the footpath, this development is not out of keeping with the surrounding area or setting a precedent and pointed out that there are numerous properties in Chatteris where windows are in close proximity. Mr Bevens expressed the opinion that this property is a contemporary style, opposite the entrance to the park, it is in a sustainable location and is better than a commercial vehicle park and requested that members grant the application.

Councillor Bucknor asked Mr Bevens to clarify the position of the windows at number 55. Mr Bevens confirmed that the windows are 4.2 meters away from the proposed property, including one obscured bathroom window.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Bucknor asked officers if the windows are a problem and if they are to near the proposed building. Officers responded that so little separation from the boundary should not be encouraged and is contrary to the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework;

- Councillor Mrs Newell stated that her main objection to the proposal was the vehicles and said that lots of properties in Chatteris have windows that overlook and she has no objection to the proposal if the vehicles are removed. Officers confirmed that the removal of vehicles could not be conditioned and nothing can be done after the fact if they are not removed;
- Councillor Hodgson referred to the loss of two parking spaces on the road and pointed out there are already two vehicles parked and there would be no loss of parking;
- Councillor Bucknor asked if there could be a restriction against commercial vehicle parking. Officers confirmed that there could not;
- Councillor Sutton expressed the view that he had not made his mind up regarding a decision and asked officers if they were saying that this site is undevelopable as he would like to think that it was acceptable. Officers confirmed that they had given due consideration to the layout put forward and could not say that the development is acceptable in scale and form but could give it due consideration if a full application were to be submitted. Officers confirmed that they were happy to work with the applicant regarding a full application to see what is achievable on the site, at the present time considering the outline illustrative application on its merits officers recommend refusal of the application. Councillor Sutton confirmed that he was in support of officers recommendations.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Patrick and decided that the application be:

**Refused for the following reasons -**

1. **the proposed development by virtue of its layout and relationship to adjacent dwellings would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore the proposal fails to comply with policies H3 and E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and CS16 of the emerging Core Strategy and advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework which places a strong emphasis on 'good design';**
2. **the proposed development would have an immediate detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the adjacent dwelling of number 55 by virtue of its close proximity. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies H3 and E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and CS16 of the emerging Core Strategy and advice contained within paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

*(Councillors Mrs Newell and Murphy stated that they are members of Chatteris Town Council, but take not part in planning matters)*

**P28/13**

**F/YR13/0311/F**

**CHATTERIS - LAND EAST OF 134 LONDON ROAD, ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLING AND DETACHED GARAGE/CARPORT WITH STORAGE AREA ABOVE AND ERECTION OF A 2M HIGH SECURITY FENCE AND GATES.**  
**(MR D WHITE)**

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- Environmental Health have no objections to the proposal;
- concerns have been raised by Middle Level Commissioners regarding water levels and a suitable flood risk management system which may become overloaded in events of high rainfall;
- no business plan has been put forward.

Members received presentations, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs White, the applicant. Mrs White informed members that she was not aware of the concerns raised by Middle Level Commissioners and as such was not prepared and could not answer the concern but confirmed that there were plans to harvest the rain water off the roofs of the development.

Mrs White stated that she was speaking on behalf of herself and her husband, they would like to build a house near the garden centre, however business had been poor over the last couple of years. She confirmed that their current house is up for sale as they have plans to build a more economical house but is aware that planning officers have recommended refusal of their application. She informed members that a large number of people walk to the garden centre and there have been some security issues and stock stolen and the new dwelling would provide more security and pointed out that applications for two other properties have been granted by the committee in the last few months.

Councillor Quince made reference to the current property on the site and asked Mrs White if she lives in the property. Mrs White confirmed that her daughter lives in the house.

Councillor Hodgson asked if the application is granted will the garden centre remain as a business. Mrs White confirmed that if her house is sold she will reinvest money in the business to ensure it continues.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Patrick requested a business plan be submitted, stating there is already a dwelling on the site and he would like more information regarding the business;
- Councillor Keane expressed the opinion that the Council promotes business, this one is getting bigger and should be encouraged, not refused;
- Councillor Mrs Newell stated that there are sporadic houses along this stretch of road and the committee has recently approved two more developments in close proximity to this one and there are plans for 1,000 houses on the opposite side of the road and wants to see the area built up;
- Councillor Murphy asked why a business plan was being asked for, he stated that this is a full planning application and asked if the applicants had at any stage in the process been asked to provide a business plan and if not, why now. Officers responded that a business plan is a requirement of the Core Strategy, there is no written evidence in the application to say what will happen to the existing dwelling. Officers stated that there should be a need for a new dwelling and it should be functional and members were requested to be mindful that there is also a flat and cafe on the site.

Officers informed members that there is no policy to support this type of development and members would need to be mindful of the policies applied to other approvals given in this area. Members were asked to consider if this application is coming forward as a business case for a dwelling on the site and are other material considerations acceptable if not attached to a business. Officers stated that in terms of consistency our policies allow for a business plan and this has been requested for other applications and the applicants should be given the chance to submit a business plan;

- Councillor Murphy expressed the opinion that concerns raised by Middle Level Commissioners were farcical as this application is on Ferry Hill, the highest point in Chatteris and is very unlikely to flood. He stated that two other properties have been approved in this area and the Town Council supports the provision of 'decent' housing along the front of this road, not estate houses;
- Councillor Sutton expressed the opinion that in fairness to other applicants and for reasons of consistency a business plan should be submitted;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor requested that members listen to the comments of local councillors who know their area, who know that this area does not flood;
- Councillor Bucknor referred to the two examples of requests for a business plan, to the fact that the applicant said the business is waning, members need proof that the business is growing as the applicant admitted that part of this application is a business proposal. He requested that the applicant submit a business plan to allow members to consider the application on its merits;
- the Legal Officer informed members that for the sake of consistency a business plan should be requested;
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that there is a need for business plan and officers need to understand that members will ask for a business plan;
- officers agreed that consistency is required across applications and were hopeful that agents would consider policy aspects to provide appropriate evidence. Officers have seen that there is an existing dwelling, a flat and a cafe and a business plan would be required to provide evidence for the requirement of an additional dwelling and made reference to a previous request for a business plan in London Road, Chatteris. Officers reminded members that the Core Strategy resists development in London Road and if a business case is the 'driver' to sustain investment in the garden centre, members need the evidence to allow them to make an informed decision based on factual evidence;
- Councillor Connor requested that the applicant be given the opportunity to submit a business plan for the sake of consistency;
- Councillor Miscandlon expressed the opinion that officers should request business plans at an earlier stage of the process so that applications are not deferred for this reason alone.

Proposed by Councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Quince and decided to:

**Defer the application, subject to the submission of a Business Plan by the applicant.**

(Councillors Mrs Newell and Murphy stated that they are members of Chatteris Town Council, but take not part in planning matters)

Members do not support officers recommendations of Refusal of planning permission as they have requested that a Business Plan be submitted to allow them to make a more informed decision.

**P29/13**

**F/YR13/0031/F**

**MURROW - LAND NORTH OF 15-27 MILL ROAD, ERECTION OF 5 DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF: 1 X 3-STOREY 6-BED DWELLING WITH DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE, 2 X 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLING WITH DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGES, 1 X 2-STOREY 5-BED DWELLING WITH DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE AND 1 X 2-STOREY 5-BED DWELLING WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE. (KL ELENER ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN)**

Members considered eleven representations of concern.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that two further letters had been received from neighbours with the following comments:

- views remain unchanged;
- previous concerns still apply.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Goy, the applicant for the proposal. Mr Goy stated that the location of the site is within the built up area of Murrow and can be considered as infill, with Mill Road 120 yards to the east joining Murrow Bank. He informed members that there is a pub, school and village hall and the site opposite was granted planning consent two years ago. He confirmed that Murrow Primary School had 78 pupils in April and there are 27 vacant places and it has been agreed that the Section 106 will contribute to improvements in the school. Mr Goy informed members that the quality of his agricultural land is graded as 2 on the Defra map, following a survey four years ago the land is confirmed as mainly 3a and 3b and this has had an impact on what can be grown on the land.

Members made comments, asked questions and received responses as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Mayor asked if concerns regarding access by North Level IDB to the drain via Plot 5 and its impact upon the garden of that property had been taken into account. Officers confirmed that this has been taken into account.

Proposed by Councillor Quince, seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor and decided that the application be:

**Granted, subject to the conditions reported.**

5.25pm

Chairman