

PLANNING COMMITTEE



5 MARCH 2014 - 1.00PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon (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 (until 4.03pm), Councillor C C Owen, Councillor D R Patrick, Councillor T E W Quince, Councillor D Stebbing, Councillor W Sutton.

Officers in attendance: G Nourse (Head of Planning), Ms A Callaby (Planning Performance Manager), R McKenna (Principal Solicitor - Litigation and Planning), Mrs S Black (Senior Development Officer), Ms R Norman (Senior Development Officer), (Miss S Smith (Member Services and Governance)

P166/13 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 5 FEBRUARY 2014

The minutes of the meeting of 5 February 2014 were confirmed and signed.

Councillor Hodgson pointed out that he had not been present at the meeting of 5 February, however he had been mentioned on the last page within the section regarding Members' declaration of interest and asked for his name to be removed and the interest amended.

*** FOR INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL ***

P167/13 F/YR13/0809/F GUYHIRN - BRIAR CROFT, HIGH ROAD - ERECTION OF 2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS AND FORMATION OF VEHICULAR ACCESS AND RETAINING WALL WITH 1.2M POST AND RAIL FENCE ABOVE, INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING

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 considered three letters of objection.

Officers informed members that:

- Further to the information in the last paragraph of page 38 of the Agenda in relation to the request for the introduction of a pair of patio doors to the rear elevations, the Agent has advised that they are reluctant to add patio doors as there would need to be a substantial raised patio with steps to the rear elevation. The construction budget for the dwellings is very tight and this would add a significant additional cost;
- The Agent has queried conditions 3 and 5. To clarify condition 3 relating to full engineering works has been imposed at the request of the Local Highways Authority (LHA). The LHA have confirmed that the application has provided basic information relating to levels and layout of the arrangements and a standard footway specification, however these are not sufficient to construct the works within the highway in this instance and a detailed engineering scheme will be required.

As such condition 3 remains as detailed on page 40 of the agenda and the first sentence should read *'Before the dwellings hereby approved are occupied'*;

- In relation to condition 5, which requires details of temporary facilities to be provided prior to the commencement to allow construction vehicles to park clear of the highway during construction, this was imposed given the location of the site in relation to the bend in the road to the south in the interests of highway safety. It is proposed to amend the condition from requiring the submission of information prior to the commencement of the development to now read *'All vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction shall park clear of the public highway'*;
- In addition it is proposed to add the wording *'prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the works'* to the end of condition 4 on page 40 of the Agenda;
- One further letter of objection has been received concerning (in summary):
 - the planned visibility splay is not achievable as shown without agreement from third party landowners;
 - there is no cross section plan view to show the extent of the flood risk and invasion of privacy relating to differing ground levels of neighbouring properties;
 - there is no street plan to demonstrate the relationship to adjacent properties to allow greater clarity of impact to the village scene;
 - the lack of rear garden is not evident in drawings especially given that the trees are now remaining, meaning that 2/3rds of the planned garden will now be taken up by trees.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Britain, an objector to the proposal. Mr Britain stated that he is the representative for residents surrounding the proposal, in opposition to the current plans. Mr Britain stated that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment of the plot and that two houses of this size are not in keeping with the village scene. He commented that there are safety concerns regarding visibility splays, this is a dangerous corner and causes grave concern. He commented on the retention of the trees in the back garden, stating that these are family properties and if the trees remain two thirds of the back garden space will be lost. He stated that the street plan is four years out of date and the correct boundaries are not shown because of this. He commented on local infrastructure needs for new houses being built and stated that local infrastructure is not changing to support the proposal.

Mr Britain summarised that this is overdevelopment of the site, one property would be more in keeping with the village, it is on a dangerous road and there is significant risk of accidents and it was not supported at parish council level.

Councillor Owen asked Mr Britain if the road is not improved what effect will this development have on the road. Mr Britain responded that there is a 30mph speed limit and there is a 'black' corner to get onto the highway. Councillor Owen stated that we have to accept that people will use the 30mph limit responsibly.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Broker, the applicant's agent. Mr Broker stated that the application ticks all the boxes, it has been scrutinised and during the early part of the consultation with LHA the solution for access was approved. He pointed out that the application is being considered as he is an elected member and the application is recommended for approval. He stated that it may be possible to amend the access to rear gardens under different circumstances, a raised patio would raise the cost of the development and flood mitigation already required would mean the scheme would not be viable. The trees will be protected at the rear of the site.

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

- Councillor Patrick asked officers what is the size of the amenity space as he was concerned that there is a lack of space. Officers responded that the garden is 6 metres at its shortest point and 7 metres back, this was pointed out on the presentation screen;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that she uses that road regularly and believes that the proposed two properties to replace one original one is wrong, one two-storey property would not be a problem. She commented on her concerns regarding the flood risk and stated that moving the access towards the corner is asking for trouble and she could not support the application;
- Councillor Owen commented that one property would be good, two would be bad and agreed with Councillor Mrs Mayor's concerns regarding moving the access;
- Councillor Hodgson asked officers if the visibility splay and access were acceptable. Officers responded that the LHA have commented that the visibility splay is acceptable and advised that a refusal could not be sustained on advice from the LHA;
- Councillor Patrick commented that he could not support this as it is overdevelopment;
- Councillor Owen stated that it is approved by the LHA.

It was proposed by Councillor Patrick and seconded by Councillor Mrs Mayor to Refuse the application which was not supported by members.

Proposed by Councillor Owen, seconded by Councillor Mrs Newell and with the casting vote of the Chairman decided that the application be:

Granted, 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 took no part in the discussion and voting thereon)

(All Members present declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of a fellow Councillor having an interest in the site, being known to members of the committee)

P168/13

F/YR14/0091/F

**NEWTON - THE JAYS, GOODENS LANE - ERECTION OF AN ANNEXE
ANCILLARY TO THE MAIN DWELLING AND ATTACHED TRIPLE GARAGES TO
THE EXISTING DWELLING INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE**

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:

- Newton Parish Council have responded to advise that they are happy with this application;
- No response has been received from North Level IDB.

Proposed by Councillor Owen, seconded by Councillor Stebbing and decided that the application be:

Granted, 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 took no part in the discussion or voting thereon)

(All Members present declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of a fellow Councillor having an interest in the site, being known to members of the committee)

P169/13 **F/YR14/0092/F**
WISBECH - FENWELD ENGINEERING SERVICES, NEW BRIDGE LANE -
ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY OFFICE BUILDING

Officers informed members that:

- the Local Highway Authority have commented that the space for parking/loading is below a level which would normally be expected for a B2 unit and the permanent structure will theoretically reduce frontage parking. However the area in question is so small and poorly related to the site access that its usability in real terms is limited. Therefore have no objection to the proposal;
- Wisbech Town Council recommends approval.

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

Granted, 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 took no part in the discussion or voting thereon)

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

(All Members present declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of a fellow Councillor having an interest in the site, being known to members of the committee)

P170/13 **F/YR14/0053/F**
MARCH - 31 HIGH STREET - CHANGE OF USE FROM A1 TO A2 USE AT 31 HIGH
STREET, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, PE15 9JA

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:

- following the site visit, members requested further information on the impact of the proposal on the primary shopping frontage of Broad Street West and High Street cumulatively. The remaining A1 retail offering along these sections following implementation of the development will be approximately 56% of retail frontage length.

Councillor Owen commented on the statistics provided and that it was not favourable to the centre of March, however this needs to be weighed between having occupied or empty premises in March town centre and this could be reflective of the public appetite for out of town shopping.

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

Granted subject to the conditions reported.

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

(All Members present declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of a fellow Councillor having an interest in the site, being known to members of the committee)

(Following this item Councillor Mrs Newell took advice from the Legal Officer)

P171/13 **F/YR13/0879/F**
MARCH - LAND WEST OF OLD COUNCIL DEPOT, GAUL ROAD - VARIATION OF
CONDITION 12 OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR09/0648/F (ERECTION OF 135
HOUSES COMPRISING WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGES AND PARKING) IN
RELATION TO A SIGNAL CONTROLLED JUNCTION FOR THE PREVIOUSLY
APPROVED ROUNDABOUT SCHEME

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:

- the Local Highways Authority has raised no objection to the proposal, the junction would operate within accepted thresholds and with degrees of saturation on all approaches. This analysis includes committed development, background growth and some non-committed developments. Although there are wider growth proposals for March town, these proposals are not yet committed and would therefore need to be assessed on their own merits at the appropriate time;
- the scheme has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Issues were initially raised in relation to junction design and signal phasing, which have now been adequately addressed for the planning stage. Accordingly, the proposals are acceptable, subject to detailed design as part of a S278 Agreement with LHA to secure implementation;
- According to the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit the junction is required to be lit;
- A commuted maintenance sum will be secured by way of a Legal Agreement in accordance with County Surveyors Society advice document 'Commuted Maintenance Sums for Maintaining Infrastructure Assets';
- CONDITIONS - Condition 12 shall be varied to state:
 - the signalled controlled junction shall be provided at the A141, including the realignment of Gaul Road and shall be carried out and completed in strict accordance with Drawing number CS/057368-T-02D date stamped 21 November prior to the occupation of the 50th dwelling, or by 1 April 2015, whichever is sooner and thereafter retained;
- Cannon Kirk have advised that 27 plots are currently occupied, 11 plots of the new phase have been started, with total occupancy likely to be 45 by the end of the year 2014;
- on the site inspection members raised issues regarding maintenance infrastructure contributions and appropriate triggers and officers reminded members that in March 2013 they decided to approve the extension of time limit to develop and implement a roundabout and it is appropriate to align timescale to the April 2015 deadline as the scheme is possible and feasible within a year in terms of carrying out the safety audit and build programme;
- the LPA would not have any influence in terms of the actual lights and officers have been advised by the LHA it is unlikely that the provision of high level lights would be pursued;
- Maintenance Infrastructure contributions relate to highway aspects of the scheme and longevity of the lights in situ, the contribution being based on the life cost of the project, Section 278 will be bought through this agreement;

- a roundabout was agreed as part of the scheme and the LHA are satisfied that traffic lights will provide a similar function to the roundabout and officers recommend the scheme for approval subject to variation of S106 and amended Condition 12.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the local council participation procedure, from Councillor Mrs J French, District Councillor. Councillor Mrs French stated that she fully supports the application and March Town Council welcome the provision of traffic lights due to the number of road traffic accidents at the junction, resulting in fatalities and life threatening collisions, causing gridlock to the town as a result for up to 5-6 hours and putting a strain on emergency services. Councillor Mrs French stated that she was not in favour of traffic lights but agreed that they work exceptionally well at the Goosetree junction. She commented that she has been made aware of the S106/278 for maintenance of the lights, stating that the applicant will contribute. Councillor Mrs French raised concerns that the LHA request for a contribution of £200,000 from the applicant is unacceptable for 60 years of maintenance, as a smaller contribution amount was required for the maintenance of the lights at Wisbech Tesco for only 30 years, this being a much larger company compared to this application being a small developer. Councillor Mrs French pointed out that the developer is providing 21 acres of public open space when the development is finished and has spent a vast amount of money and the S278 is a vast amount of money and unreasonable, pointing out that the applicants are prepared to negotiate. Councillor Mrs French stated that she fully supports the application.

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

- Councillor Stebbing commented that if the traffic lights are the same as at the Goosetree junction they will be an asset;
- Councillor Murphy commented that traffic measures should be put in from the beginning of the development not at the end, this could be another year or two years and suggested that for any future similar applications traffic measures should be put in before the building starts, this is a bad junction and the traffic lights are needed now not later;
- Officers clarified that the S278 maintenance contribution has been discussed with the agent and that the LHA had advised that this will be subject to negotiation direct with the LHA. Officers advised that the timing condition for the traffic lights aligns to the decision made at December Planning Committee where the trigger point for the roundabout was agreed, this allows reasonable time for traffic assessments. There had been a robust evaluation of the time that it will take to develop the technical aspects of the proposal on highway terms and officers are satisfied that the timings are reasonable and achievable and will be built at an appropriate point in the building programme;
- Councillor Quince commented that he welcomes traffic lights at this junction as it is a dangerous junction;
- Councillor Murphy asked officers for clarification regarding when the traffic lights would be built. Officers responded that in accordance with requirements works will be completed by 1 April 2015;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she has to wait for up to 15 minutes to exit the junction and often turns around and uses the Burrowmoor where there are no hold ups only on the Gaul Road junction;
- Councillor Sutton commented that there would be a cost for the development for a roundabout and agreed that the contribution should be paid for ongoing maintenance.

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

Granted, subject to the conditions reported.

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

(Councillor Mrs Newell declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of her living in close proximity to the development)

(Councillor Owen declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of him previously expressing favour towards this application which could be seen as being predetermined, and retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)

P172/13 **F/YR13/0905/F**
TYDD ST GILES - LAND NORTH EAST OF PINCHPENNY FARM, BROAD DROVE
EAST - ERECTION OF 12 X 2-STOREY DWELLINGS COMPRISING 8 X 2-BED
AND 4 X 3-BED WITH ASSOCIATED SHEDS AND 2.1M HIGH (MAX) CLOSE
BOARDED FENCE WITH TRELIS OVER

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 considered ten letters of objection.

Officers informed members that:

- amended drawings have been received which include alterations to the parking area for plots 1 and 12, reduction in width of roadway by 0.5m, changed transition into the blocked paved area, addition of a footpath to meet the footpath at the community centre and the alterations to the visibility splays. In addition a landscape buffer has been included on the eastern boundary of the site;
- CCC Highways have confirmed that the highways related amendments have overcome their objections and therefore refusal reason 4 is no longer relevant. The addition of the landscape buffer is considered to be of benefit to the scheme however it is not considered to be enough to mitigate against the harmful effects the nature of this suburban development will have on the open countryside;
- a contributor has written in again objecting to the proposal. Their comments highlight the confusing nature of the Parish Council comments.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Simpson, an objector to the proposal. Mrs Simpson thanked members for the opportunity to speak. Mrs Simpson stated that the group of parishioners closest to the site strongly object to the development and she hoped that the committee will agree with the reason given and come to the same conclusion. She stated that the Parish Council are in support of this application, however it would create a cul-de-sac and would be a large development for the small village of Tydd St Giles. Mrs Simpson commented that the Parish Council have not invited the views of their parishioners and there is a contradictory stance inconsistent with Spring 2013 for a proposal for 9 houses in the village. She pointed out that there are significant building plots in the village which remain unsold, for some for 4 years and there should be no more development until these plots are sold and built on.

Mrs Simpson stated that the village infrastructure will not support this type of development and nothing has changed since the applicants amended their plans and objections remain the same. She pointed out that the development does not meet the criteria for sustainable development for this location, being a suburban development in open countryside.

It is inappropriate in scale and character, will harm the surrounding open countryside and flood risk is an increasing concern with the existing footprint of Tydd St Giles being within Flood Zone 2, this proposed site is in Flood Zone 3. She raised concerns that the neighbour joins the site and would have no access to maintain the dyke. Mrs Simpson pointed out that there is no village shop, no mains gas, a two hour post office service each week, no employment opportunities. The development is completely detached from the village and Broad Drove East is a 60mph country road and one car alone parked on the side of the road causes problems. Mrs Simpson stated that she agrees with planning officers recommendations and thanked them and hoped that the committee would refuse this application.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the local council participation procedure, from Councillor Mallett, Parish Councillor. Councillor Mallett stated that the Parish Council did agree with this application, in agreement with parish plans as it is very clear that the parish needs affordable housing. He pointed out that the shop had gone, there is a good community centre and there is a need in the village and thought this would be a good opportunity for all affordable housing to be in one place. He stated that the Parish Council is looking to put street lights along the road and requested that the application be passed, stating that there is a very good bus service and affordable housing was passed in Parson Drove and if this is not passed the school will be closed, the shop has already closed and Newton school as well. He advised members that Tydd St Giles do need affordable housing.

Councillor Owen pointed out the reason for the application being before the committee and pointed out Councillor Seaton's comments and asked if Councillor Seaton had spoken with him about the proposal. Councillor Mallett stated that this development will provide homes for younger people in the village and the village plan proves that it is required.

Councillor Bucknor asked Councillor Mallett if the Parish Council was concerned about the houses being Flood Zone 3. Councillor Mallett responded that the whole parish is in Flood Zone 3.

Councillor Hodgson asked Councillor Mallett if the Parish Council had listened to other residents. Councillor Mallett responded that the parish plan went to all villagers and all responses came back to say that affordable housing was needed in the village.

Councillor Patrick asked if this was the site selected and identified by Cambridgeshire ACRE. Councillor Mallett responded that this is the best site decided by Roddons.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Welland, the architect for the proposal. Mr Welland stated that this site was identified by the Parish Council, being the only site promoted by Fenland and the Parish and the Parish Council continue to support the application. He stated that an informal meeting was held with planning officers to discuss dwellings on the site and construction terms. A follow up meeting was held with planning officers to address concerns, adding a footpath link to the village. He pointed out that the design continues the linear line of the street, properties allow views through the field, all properties have two parking spaces with visitor parking, providing beyond the required parking standards. Mr Welland pointed out the similarities to Field Avenue, if it was frontage development, it would only achieve six dwellings and would not be financially viable. He explained surface water drainage, the site is in Flood Zone 3 but there are no objections from the Environment Agency and there are no other sites for sale.

Councillor Mrs Mayor reminded Mr Welland that Mrs Simpson had made reference to other plots available in the village and asked why these had not been considered. Mr Welland responded that he was not aware of other sites that were for sale.

Councillor Mrs Newell asked Mr Welland if he was aware of the two other sites that should be considered. Mr Welland responded that the other sites were not for sale.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ms Coulson, on behalf of Roddons Housing Association. Ms Coulson stated that she was speaking on behalf of Roddons after being approached by District and Parish Council after the site had been identified by Cambridgeshire ACRE. Ms Coulson addressed the issue of why affordable housing is required in villages and why this site in particular. She referred to a statement from Cambridgeshire ACRE regarding the need for affordable housing in villages. This site is part of the process of an exception site, being a call for sites to be put out in the local community, that can support lower prices and make them viable. Consultation has taken place with Cambridgeshire ACRE regarding the exception site and the site met 6 points of being suitable, is adjacent to or close to the village envelope.

Councillor Hodgson asked Ms Coulson if the character of the site is right for the development. Ms Coulson responded that the scheme fits in with the village with a green buffer to soften the entrance to the site, this is not a dense development, is adjacent to existing properties, is deliverable and onsite works can start by the end of 2014.

It was clarified that the pub, school and church were 15 minutes walk away for Councillor Sutton.

Councillor Hodgson commented that the character of the area was not right for the site.

Councillor Patrick commented that the area is sporadic, not linear, is suburban and not in keeping with the area and would support officers recommendations.

Councillor Owen commented about the letters of objection, there are concerns from the planning angle, however there is a shortage of affordable housing, there is a demand and this should not be denied. The development is on a main road, in a cul-de-sac, facilities remain in walking distance and the application should be given serious consideration. If flooding for the whole of the village is in the same flood zone there is no other reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Quince commented that this is not the right location for affordable housing and there must be other sites in the village that would suit this type of development.

Councillor Mrs Newell commented that localism should be supported and the Parish Council are the ones with the expertise and could not agree with officers recommendations.

Councillor Keane commented that the drainage board have no objection. Officers responded that if members were minded to approve the application a surface water condition would be required subsequent to approval.

Councillor Bucknor asked officers to confirm Flood Zone information. Officers responded that the report indicates that there are other sites in the village at lesser risk of flooding.

Councillor Stebbing commented that the Parish Council did not fully support local residents feelings and he would have more sympathy for the proposal if it was at the other end of the field.

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

Refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its detachment from the main settlement would fail to comply with the provisions of Policy H3 of the Fenland Local Plan, 1993 and Policies CS3 and CS12 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy - Submission Version September 2013;**
- 2. The development is located within Flood Zone 3 despite there being land available elsewhere in the settlement within areas of lower flood risk. The application is therefore contrary to CS14 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy (proposed submission 2013) and Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework;**
- 3. By virtue of the number and layout of proposed dwellings the proposal would result in a development which is suburban in character. The development would therefore appear as an incongruous feature within the open countryside, to the detriment of the rural locality. The application is therefore contrary to E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan, CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy (proposed submission 2013) and Section 07 of the National Planning Policy Framework;**
- 4. The proposal does not demonstrate adequate vehicular visibility or appropriate parking and turning for plots 1 and 12. The development therefore fails to address highway safety contrary to E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan, CS15 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy (proposed submission 2013) and Section 04 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

Members took a 15 minute refreshment break following determination of this application.

(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)

**P173/13 F/YR14/0011/O
MANEA - LAND EAST OF ORCHARD LODGE, OLD DAIRY YARD, WESTFIELD
ROAD - ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY DWELLING**

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 Tree Officer has reported that the site is overgrown with brambles, around the perimeter is an overgrown hawthorn hedge of poor condition and some scrub trees. No trees on site merit a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The site is likely more valuable as foraging for wildlife;
- During the site inspection members had questioned the business use of the hairdressers. Officers confirmed that the application for hairdressing salon had been submitted in 2002, as an extension to the existing bungalow, it was recommended for refusal by officers as it was not central to the village, approved by committee. The restrictions of the business should be one person working their due to its location;
- The application site has not been in use since 1979, the access and layout is committed to outline and is detached from the village core due to access.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the local council participation procedure, from Councillor Archer, District Councillor. Councillor Archer stated that the access is an official bridleway, it is a sustainable site and the proposal would bring back into use a derelict unusable parcel of land and it meets the aims of the planning policy framework.

He stated that officers have given no weight to the history of the site, pointing that Mrs Goude, the applicant can provide the site history, there are a list of applications for the Dairy Yard and they were all approved by this authority. He pointed out that the site currently houses three properties and two businesses, with the hairdressers being a stand-alone business and one other residential property will have little impact on the safety of the area. Councillor Archer commented that the plot has been used to house chickens and rabbits and the dike and hedgerows have been maintained to stop encroachment and it has been deliberately kept in this manner. He commented that officers recommendations are wrong and misleading. He stated that other residents have large gardens, with a rural aspect provided by their gardens and there are no open countryside views from the site. The place is surrounded by development and adequate amenity space can be provided. He pointed out that the LHA requirement of a five metre width road is only recommended and not the law, it is a fully maintained bridleway and problems can be overcome. Councillor Archer asked members to treat the application with fairness and approve it.

Councillor Hodgson asked Councillor Archer if the proposal will affect the existing business. Councillor Archer responded that the proposal would not be detrimental to the business and one more property would not impact on it.

Councillor Patrick commented that he would call it a narrow track and pointed out that the report says it is a footpath.

Councillor Owen commented that it is a bridleway and members are being told that it is a footway, further commenting that it is reasonably well maintained, is a private track and is not a reason to refuse the application and asked Councillor Archer if the track is adequate. Councillor Archer responded that there is a construction business with HGV vehicles up and down all day and this is used by the owner to access his own properties.

Officers confirmed that the Rights of Way at CCC say it is a public footpath.

Councillor Mrs Mayor asked Councillor Archer to clarify whether the hairdressing business is an extension to the dwelling or as he referred to it, a stand-alone business. Councillor Archer responded that the hairdressers is to the rear of the bungalow, tied to the dwelling. Officers clarified that a dwelling to the side was a replacement dwelling and both dwellings are served off the old Dairy Road access.

Councillor Sutton asked Councillor Archer why the Parish Council object to the proposal. Councillor Archer responded that the Parish Council reasons for objection relate to unlawful development in the area. Officers clarified that the Parish Council object as the access road is inadequate for this site.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Goude, the applicant. Mrs Goude provided history of the site and stated that the Old Dairy Yard was a four acre Deed of Gift on 23 February 1968, the parcel of land being sold in 1978. She stated that the bridleway is clearly shown on the map, explaining that it is historically a bridleway because it served traffic and was used by large farm vehicles to the arable land around it. The land was used as Manea Gun Club and the track served 30-40 vehicles at this point. The Plot of land in question was sold to R Goude and housed carpentry and building materials and the land to the rear of the plot was developed. Mrs Goude pointed out that vehicles using the track are varied and many and increase and decrease according to demand, her family have maintained this site since they took up ownership in 1978. She stated that she was Clerk to Manea Parish Council at the time and the land was deliberately left to go natural, some trees were felled, the land is protected by the briar patch.

Mrs Goude commented that Manea is a thriving village and its success is due to it being on a main railway line. She pointed out that the plot of land is away from the bend and asked that members see sense and fairness and approve the application.

Councillor Hodgson thanked Mrs Goude for the information she had provided.

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

- Councillor Keane commented that CCC say the track is a footpath, he pointed out that the track is asphalt and asked how this can be a footpath;
- Councillor Patrick commented that he could not see a problem with traffic and the proposal is in a sustainable location;
- Councillor Owen questioned the formal definition of a footpath, commenting that it is a roadway, is tarmacked, used by heavy vehicles, there is likely to be one vehicle to service the new dwelling and would not agree with officers recommendation as this is a sustainable and appropriate development.

Proposed by Councillor Owen, seconded by Councillor Keane and decided that the application be:

Granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Timing and development;**
2. **Site vegetation to be cleared outside bird season;**
3. **Vehicles to leave the plot in forward gear;**
4. **Construction of a temporary facilities area;**
5. **Environmental Health contamination condition for safeguarding;**
6. **Biodiversity survey prior to commencement.**

Members do not support officer's recommendation to Refuse planning permission as they feel that the proposal is a sustainable property in a sustainable location, consistent with the existing character of the area and acceptable in highway/access terms.

**P174/13 F/YR14/0033/F
MARCH - LAND NORTH WEST OF 321 NORWOOD ROAD FRONTING SMITHS
CHASE - ERECTION OF 2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS**

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 considered nine letters of objection.

Officers informed members that:

- There was a typographical error in relation to the application and should read as F/YR14/0033/F;
- The applicant has written to a number of objectors addressing their concerns and disputing some of their claims. Copies of these letters have been forwarded to the Local Planning Authority;
- Following this, further comments received from one objector which states:
 - "The information that I have previously given in opposition to this planning application is not in any way misleading to influence a planning decision, but merely the opinion of myself and neighbouring residents."

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Duckworth, Agent for the Objector. Mr Duckworth stated that he is a Chartered Surveyor dealing with boundary disputes and was approached by Mr and Mrs Wright regarding their boundary which they dispute with the proposed application. Mr Duckworth stated that he has investigated the facts and the registration document and notes there are inconsistencies the implications of which need to be understood. His clients have sought clarification from Land Registry and on basis of fact there is a dispute regarding the curtilage of number 6 and the dotted line of the curve should be taken out of the driveway as this has been superimposed from Land Registry, the curve is misleading and not a planning submission. Mr Duckworth pointed out that one of the most common mistakes is to rely on Land Registry plans as they do not define legal boundaries and the design and access statement does not provide detail on this point.

Mr Duckworth stated that there is no reference to the disputed land, his clients have not received a report and the full facts have not been received. He stated that a Certificate A has been issued and believes this is a misunderstanding and a Certificate B should have been served as the requirement. Mr Duckworth stated that a material error has been made from the title plan and his clients wish to preserve their property and for members to approve this application would serve as a trespass.

The Legal Officer asked Mr Duckworth what steps the client has taken. Mr Duckworth responded that he instructed them in September 2013 and a property lawyer has recently corresponded with the developer with the relevant points. His client has contacted Land Registry and they have confirmed on the basis of the evidence available that the land in question is within the curtilage of the property of number 6. There are two plans, a standard Ordnance plan and a second one based on the original block plan indicating the full width and despite the evidence provided by the objector at number 6 a Certificate A has still been submitted which Mr Duckworth questions.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the publication procedure, from Mr Swann, the applicant's agent. Mr Swann stated that he was in attendance to read out a personal statement on behalf of his client, the applicant, regarding the issues with Land Registry as the client say they own the land within the red line. The application does not change the access and the boundary fence will be created outside the existing roadway.

Mr Swann stated that his client inherited 321 Norwood Road from his mother in 2000, in 2001 it was let as a family home, tenants don't need large gardens and there is a lack of family homes in March. In 2007 the plot was bought to make the most of the plots potential and meet planning requirements and is happy with the result. It is an attractive design with no overlooking and two parking spaces for each dwelling. The letters of correction have been issued and Mr Swann's clients are disappointed with planning officers and are disappointed with paragraph 8.1 of the officers report to say that the design is unacceptable. In 1988 a bungalow was demolished on the next door plot and was replaced by a two-storey dwelling suitable for a town centre, with LHA access and planning history, approval is supported, providing affordable homes for rent.

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

- Councillor Murphy stated that officers have it right, this is an inappropriate development, there have been nine letters of objection and following the site inspection he was in agreement. The development is against planning policy E8, CS12, CS16 and paragraphs 56 and 64 of the NPPF and agrees with officers recommendation to refuse on the grounds of visual impact, character, prominence and scale;
- Councillor Quince commented that officers have it right to refuse the application and he agrees completely.

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

Refused for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed development would result in a form of development that is out of keeping with the character and core shape of this area. The development of this site is therefore, unacceptable and is contrary to Policy E8 of the Fenland DWLP (1993) and CS16 of the emerging Fenland Local Plan - Core Strategy (Sept 2013) and the requirement for 'good design' within paragraph 56 of the NPPF;**
2. **The proposed development by virtue of design, layout and siting of the dwellings on the site would result in undesirable and poor relationship between both the existing and proposed dwellings. This would impact upon the amenity of the existing and future residents in terms of both the proposed and neighbouring properties. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to policy CS16 of the emerging Fenland Local Plan - Core Strategy (Sept 2013), E8 of the existing Fenland District Wide Local Plan (1993), and would not meet the requirement for 'good design' as outlined within paragraph 56 of the NPPF.**

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

(Councillor Mrs Mayor declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of her knowing the applicant)

(Councillor Owen declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of him calling in the application, and retired from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)

(Councillors Miscandlon and Owen registered, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been lobbied on this application)

P175/13

F/YR14/0059/F

MARCH - LAND WEST OF THIRTIES FARM, UPWELL ROAD - VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR13/0280/F IN RELATION TO OCCUPANCY OF DWELLING (ERECTION OF A 4-BED 2-STOREY DWELLING AND DETACHED WORKSHOP FOR B1, B2, B8 USE, INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BARN AND OUTBUILDINGS)

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Pooley, the applicant. Mrs Pooley thanked members for the opportunity to speak and commented that the application is something valuable to her family and stated that the conditions were not expected to be so constrictive, lenders would not lend as there is no resale value. She pointed out that this is a family business, if there was no family link to the house it would have no resale value. Mrs Pooley stated that following a meeting with officers they have agreed a relaxation of the condition, this is not ideal but the house will be built, this will open up opportunities. She commented that they wanted a workplace home, which could not be justified by planners, however they were pleased to have been granted planning permission.

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

- Councillor Patrick commented that he had read the condition and could see nothing wrong with it and it should be approved;
- Councillor Sutton commented that he remembered that the previous condition could not be lifted and congratulated planning officers for their work on this.

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

Granted, subject to the conditions reported.

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

P176/13

F/YR14/0066/F

NEWTON - LAND EAST OF ABBEY GREEN, CHURCH LANE - ERECTION OF 4 X 4-BED 2-STOREY DWELLINGS WITH DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGES

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:

- there is an amendment to pages 105 and 107 (paragraph 5.1) of the Agenda, the site comprises Grade 1 agricultural land;
- 5 letters of objection received from neighbours concerning (in summary):
 - this is prime agricultural land and should be used as such;
 - there are other sites within Newton that should be developed before agricultural land ie the school site;
 - the land was not highlighted for residential use in the development plan;
 - Church Lane is a narrow road with a dangerous bend where it joins Rectory Road. The trees on the corner show evidence of where numerous cars have hit them;
 - 1 dwelling is very close to the corner;
 - the development will increase the number of cars using this road;
 - this land is used to allow visibility when existing properties exit their driveways;
 - the Village Hall and bowling green are opposite with a small car park which results in cars parking on the road here;
 - surface drainage problems, this section of road is frequently under water;
 - the existing drains frequently overflow and cannot support any more dwellings;
 - the farm access road is proposed at 10m wide which isn't a required width and suggests that the road is actually for further future development;
 - the positioning of the dwellings will result in overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear gardens of existing properties where their children play. If the development was approved assurance is required that all views into their garden from first floor windows are obscured;
 - Rectory Road/Church Lane is a blind junction and this site currently offers views to oncoming motorists as they approach the corner;
 - the proposed dwellings are not essential to any local worker or farmer. The owner has in the past sold properties associated with this land as they were not required;
 - there is no local enterprise that calls for properties of this size or type. This is a rural community with many earning the minimum wage;
 - the size and style of the dwellings are not in keeping with the character of the area;
 - this field has, in the past, been given to the community for use on bonfire nights. The community will not gain from this development;
 - the view of the Village Hall through this open gap is picturesque;
 - the Village Hall is used for parties and events and assurance is required that dwellings in this location would not impact on the use of this facility through noise complaints etc;

- there is no safe pedestrian access to and from the site due to the lack of footpath in this location;
 - this is a very dark section of road and additional street lighting should be installed should the development go ahead;
 - the full length of this proposal is on disturbed ground. The area was used for storage of potatoes in graves resulting in deep trenches having been dug on this site;
 - there is currently a wide range of habitat in this area which will be affected by the development;
 - vehicles regularly travel above the 30mph speed limit in this location raising concerns for highway safety through the introduction of new accesses;
 - there are no facilities to support the development. The village shop and local pub are at the other end of the village;
 - most of the land in Newton was given to farmers by the Church. Have the covenants been investigated?;
 - there is no affordable housing proposed;
 - the proposal cannot be defined as infill;
 - there does not seem to be consistency in decision making;
 - concern over the proximity of the dwellings to existing dwellings and the resulting overbearing effect;
 - there are inaccuracies and misleading statements in the application document as the site does not physically adjoin a proposed affordable housing development which lies some 300m to the west, there is no housing within the site at present and there is to be 1.8m galvanised steel fencing erected. These have been discussed with the Agent who agreed that these were errors and advised that they would be submitting a revised document prior to the committee meeting;
 - during a recent talk at the village hall by a local auctioneer there were 24 cars parked along the road where the development is proposed. It has been advised that parking will be made available by the developers and we suggest that the developer also undertakes maintenance of their trees along the road as a branch has fallen across the road;
 - should the development go ahead we require assurance that any future accident will not be attributed to the new development;
- Comments have been received from the Local Highways Team as follows:
 - the site is somewhat remote from the main core of the village. Whilst a footway exists on the north side of Church Lane this route does not link constructively to the village infrastructure to the west and extension of the network thereto would be an unreasonable cost burden in relation to the scale of the development proposed;
 - the lack of the footway link will limit practical/safe access to the main settlement and to the limited public transport available. The site is therefore likely to be wholly reliant on the use of the private car for access to services including employment, shopping, health and education;
 - the Council should be mindful of the adequacy of the local infrastructure to cater for additional general needs and the suitability of the location development in terms of sustainability;
 - if the Council are mindful to approve the application the highway team needs to be advised so they can request appropriate conditions;

- Newton Parish Council have responded as follows:
 - Newton Parish Council attended an open meeting which Maxey Grounds had called. There were a few objections, the main comment was about the distance the houses were from the road and maybe should be a bit further back. If the Village Hall has an event where the people are unable to park then they park on the green edge beside the road;
- Newton Village Hall have responded as follows (in summary):
 - support the concept of residential development on this site and believe that the current proposal represents an acceptable solution;
 - have concerns about parking provision. The Village Hall car park has just 7 spaces so users of the hall park along Church Lane for almost every event;
 - the current width of the road would make access to and from the proposed properties very difficult with vehicles parked opposite their driveways;
 - we have identified the following mitigation measures which we ask be considered within the development proposals: widen Church Lane to accommodate parking on the north side for the Village Hall; replace the proposed grass verge outside the new properties with a more robust surface to facilitate car parking for the Village Hall; widen the access track to the agricultural land to accommodate overflow parking for the Village Hall; create an overflow car park for the Village Hall within the proposed development.
- To date no amended plan has been received incorporating any of the above suggestions;
- Comments have been received from the County Archaeology Team who advise that (in summary) the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential for medieval deposits. They therefore consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through a condition;
- the threshold for Newton is currently 196 dwellings, there are currently 191 dwellings, this proposal would not take Newton over the threshold, if this application and the following application were to both be approved Newton would be over its threshold.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Humphrey, the applicant's agent. Mr Humphrey stated that he had met with the Head of Planning to express his concerns about using both the old and new policies and that the reasons for refusal resulted from policy being in transition. Mr Humphrey stated that he disagreed with the reasons and if we progress in accordance with CS12 the application meets all the criteria. He pointed out the quality of agricultural land, asked members to look at the site, it is on the edge of the village and suitable for residential development as going out of the village the red meets blue boundary. There is a Church, Abbey Green, farms with large detached properties, Rectory Cottage is a large barn style dwelling, the existing form is large houses and asked why four dwellings could not be accepted on this piece of land. He stated that it is not open countryside and one reason given for refusal was flooding although a letter had been received from the Environment Agency who have no objection in principle to the proposal, he therefore questioned why this has been given as a reason for refusal, it is infill and in line with paragraph 55 of NPPF - to promote sustainable development in rural areas, this will enhance the area and may support services in a nearby village. Mr Humphrey stated that he totally disagreed with the reasons for refusal of the application and requested that members make the call as the application is acceptable. Mr Humphrey stated that he was very frustrated that the recommendation was for refusal when it fulfilled all the necessary criteria.

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

- Councillor Hodgson commented there was a public meeting involving the Village Hall Committee and the Parish Council and he feels that it was a good to move the access and make provision for overflow car parking;
- Councillor Murphy commented that this is not infill, it is a field and there is no infill policy and officers have made the right decision;
- Councillor Hodgson requested clarification on the Village Hall location and roads/drains;
- Councillor Owen commented do people want big houses, this is in a field and has a view and is on the curtilage of the village, the best bits have been chosen to get the best from the development;
- Officers responded to the question raised by Mr Humphrey regarding planning policies stating that the local plan is there to be referred to and it is correct that officers do so, the issue is the character and nature of the locality and asked members if they would be happy to see the change as this is Grade 1 agricultural land;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that this is not complete infill, there is access into a field through the development, with a driveway either side and she has an issue with that and feels that officers have made the correct decision.

Proposed by Councillor Murphy, seconded by Councillor Stebbing and decided that the application be:

Refused, Subject to the expiry of the consultation period for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed development, which is located outside the main settlement, will be situated within open countryside and has not been justified as essential for a worker to live close to a rural enterprise. In addition the proposal would result in ribbon development along this part of Church Lane. As a result the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 55, Policies E1, H3 and H16 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and Policies CS12 and CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy - Submission Version September 2013;**
2. **The proposal, by virtue of the design and layout, would not enhance the character and appearance of this rural location and is not innovative or outstanding. In addition the proposal is out of keeping with the existing character and form of the surrounding area and nearby dwellings by virtue of its overall scale and design. It is considered that the scale and form of development will be visually intrusive and will not assimilate into the rural landscape. The application is therefore contrary to Policy E8 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan, Policies CS12 and CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy - Submission Version September 2013 and Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework;**
3. **The site is located within Flood Zone 2. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is acceptable for housing development in sequential terms when compared to other available sites in the wider area which have a lower probability of flooding. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS14 of the emerging Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy - Submission Version September 2013.**

P177/13

F/YR14/0076/F

NEWTON - LAND WEST OF BRAMLEY HOUSE, CHURCH LANE - ERECTION OF 4 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS

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:

- As an amendment to page 113 of the Agenda, the site comprises Grade 1 agricultural land;
- Comments have been received from the Local Highway Authority as follows:
 - the site lies adjacent to the existing built form of the village within the 30mph speed limit and has connectivity to the existing footway link. Accordingly there are no objections in principle;
 - plans require amendment. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m are required and should be demonstrated clearly on the site layout;
 - upon receipt of a suitably amended plan, conditions are required relating to access construction, parking and turning provision, temporary parking facilities for the construction period, access drainage, provision of visibility splays and restriction of gates at the access;
- Newton Parish Council have commented as follows:
 - The Parish is happy with this planning application as long as the developers' put in a street light;
- Comments have been received from the County Archaeology Team who advise that (in summary) the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential for medieval deposits. They therefore consider that the site should be subject to a programme of archaeological investigation secured through a condition.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Humphrey, the applicant's agent. Mr Humphrey asked if developments are built in Wisbech will they all be on Grade 3 land, he does not think so and is disappointed that two opportunities for Newton to have a small amount of growth, opposite the existing village, are being recommended for refusal with as a visual impact and Flood Risk being given as reasons for refusal and it is supported by the Environment Agency. He also commented that either development is wanted in villages or not and asked what sites will officers recommend for approval. The Head of Planning commented that applications have been approved over the last year and he was unhappy with the comments made by Mr Humphrey.

Officers responded that the National Policy Framework is clear on flood risk and the Environment Agency does not override national policy and other sites should be considered for development where mitigation of flood risk is not required.

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

- Councillor Hodgson commented that the road does not narrow and asked officers why one area is Flood Zone 2 and one Flood Zone 3. Officers responded that this is due to the modelling of the Environment Agency;
- Councillors Mrs Mayor raised concerns that the Environment Agency are not proactive with reference to flooding and recent events;
- Councillor Bucknor commented that all members have to work with is the Environment Agency;
- Councillor Owen commented on earlier applications and building dwellings in fields and he believes the proposal is part of the existing village conurbation and on the basis that flood conditions could be met he does not see anything wrong with the application as it stands;

- Councillor Bucknor commented that he was in semi-agreement with Councillor Owen as it could be said to be part of the rest of the development, however he is worried about the possibility of flooding and that would be the only reason he would have to refuse it, if he could be assured flooding was not a problem and if the development is sustainable;
- Officers responded that the lines on the plan would seem to indicate that the proposal fills a gap, however the aerial photograph shows it as a separate area with agricultural character, being part of a field incursion into open countryside, the photograph demonstrates that houses are at a distance and that design and character would also be a valid reason to refuse in addition to flood risk;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that it is a field with a corner cut off it;
- Councillor Owen recommended approval on the basis that appropriate conditions are put in place to overcome flooding concerns. Councillor Quince commented that it is within the curtilage of the village. Officers advised that appropriate wording would be 'complies with existing built form, and form and character is appropriate';
- Officers provided a list of possible conditions if members were mindful to grant the application: start date, materials, soft and hard landscaping for boundary, archaeological, foul water drainage, access for construction vehicles, drainage, visibility splays and approved plan.

It was proposed by Councillor Owen, seconded by Councillor Quince to Grant the application which was not supported by members.

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

Refused for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed development, which is located outside the main settlement, will be situated within open countryside and has not been justified as essential for a worker to live close to a rural enterprise. In addition the proposal would result in ribbon development along this part of Church Lane. As a result the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 55, Policies E1, H3 and H16 of the Fenland District Wide Local Plan and Policies CS12 and CS16 of the Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy - Submission Version September 2013;**
2. **The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is acceptable for housing development in sequential terms when compared to other available sites in the wider area which have a lower probability of flooding. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS14 of the emerging Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy - Submission Version September 2013.**

4.25pm

Chairman