

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**4 MARCH 2015 - 1.00PM**

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

Officers in attendance: G Nourse (Head of Planning), S Manley (Development Manager), R McKenna (Principal Solicitor - Litigation and Planning), Mrs S Jackson (Senior Development Officer), Mrs K Brand (Senior Development Officer), Mrs S Black (Senior Development Officer), Mrs R Norman (Senior Development Officer)

## **P83/14      MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 4 FEBRUARY 2015**

The minutes of the meeting of 4 February 2015 were confirmed and signed.

**\* FOR INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL \***

## **P84/14      F/YR14/0754/F MANEA - LAND SOUTH EAST OF WILLIAMS WAY - ERECTION OF 2 X 2-STOREY, 4-BED DWELLINGS WITH ATTACHED GARAGES AND 2 X 3-BED CHALET BUNGALOWS WITH DETACHED SINGLE GARAGES**

Members considered 2 letters/emails 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 deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- During the site inspection, Member's queried whether the road would be adopted or not. A section of the access road would be adopted by the Local Highways Authority, with the remainder being built to adoptable standards, but remaining private. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal and there is ample parking and turning available within the site. The future upkeep of the road may be secured through a maintenance plan and can be conditioned as follows:
  - *Prior to the commencement of development a management plan for the future upkeep and maintenance of the access road/drainage and street lighting systems shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the details contained therein shall be in force in perpetuity;*
  - *Reason - In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety and in accordance with Policies LP15 and LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan;*
- Members also queried the surface water disposal for the site. The surface water disposal from this development would be connected to the existing Middle Level Commissioners drain. All works would have to comply with Building Regulations and any discharge consent applications would need to be agreed with Middle Level.

Mr Humphrey, the applicant's agent declined to speak regarding this application as he believed it had been suitably summarised by Planning Officers.

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

- Councillor Keane commented that Middle Level seemed dissatisfied with drainage for the site in paragraph 4.3 and asked if there were any further updates on the drainage system. Officers responded that the applicant needs to apply for discharge consent, the application for consents is ongoing at the moment. Councillor Miscandlon pointed out that further information regarding the drainage system had been provided by officers in the last paragraph of their update;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that she understood Councillor Keane's comments as this had been raised as an issue on the site inspection. She commented that the update did not provide any more information than contained in the report on page 33. Councillor Mrs Mayor pointed out that an allowance has to be made for maintenance of these drains and this had not been identified in the papers provided. Officers responded that all works would have to comply with building regulations. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked officers to point out the drains position as it is now shown on anywhere on a map. Officers responded that these details can be conditioned before the development commences. Councillor Miscandlon referred the question to Mr Humphrey as the applicant's agent who confirmed that the drain is at the entrance to the site, with a further extension already built to the west of the road and both will drain into the Middle Level drain at a later point;
- Councillor Owen commented that all utility services are content with the proposal and recommended approval of the application;
- Councillor Sutton commented that there were no major issues with the application, he pointed out that the Parish Council had raised concerns that the site would constitute over-development. He commented that the amenity space is as it should be however he had a problem that the Highway Authority says the road would be built to an adoptable standard, but only part would be offered for adoption and he could not understand why roads would be built to an adoptable standard and then not adopted and asked for clarification regarding this point. Mr Humphrey responded that the roads that were built and adopted would require a bond equivalent in cost to the road for maintenance and that the road built to an adoptable standard could be used by refuse lorries. Councillor Sutton stated that unadopted roads cannot be allowed as it will cause future issues and if a bond is required developers should take this on board;
- Councillor Connor commented that he agreed with Councillor Sutton and pointed out that there are roads in Chatteris and Manea which had not been adopted, stating that this is a developers and agents problem and road adoption should be enforced to stop problems in the future;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she believes the Local Highway Authority are unreasonable regarding the cost of the bond. The Highways Officer from CCC was in attendance and responded that there is another route for developers to get roads adopted, a Section 37 would expect a works inspector to inspect the road as it is constructed to an adoptable standard and then tested again at a later stage. He pointed out that the alternative would be a Section 38;
- Councillor Sutton commented that given the developer is not paying towards social housing, education then it should be insisted that the whole road is adopted. Officers responded that non adoption of the road was not a reason for objecting to the application, as long as the road is meeting standards with signage, visibility splays and safe for public use, adoption would be outside planning control. He pointed out that the Local Highway Authority mechanism is for a Section 37, if the developer wishes to keep the road as private it would not have to be adopted. Councillor Sutton stated that there is a weakness in planning control and he would like to make the point that the road should be adopted.

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

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

**P85/14      F/YR14/0885/F  
CHATTERIS - LAND EAST OF 119 LONDON ROAD FRONTING MARIAN WAY -  
ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY 3-BED DWELLING WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE**

Members considered 2 letters of concern.

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 applicant has now specified brick and tiles for the bungalow which are:
  - Sandtoft double pantile brown tiles and
  - Caprice Sanfare multi bricks
  - therefore condition 3 on page 45 of the agenda should be deleted
- Local residents have raised concerns relating to possible damage to property during construction of a new dwelling. The agent has confirmed that No. 9 Marian Way was constructed using pile foundations due to the previous presence of large trees. However it is proposed to use augered piles and cast in situ cap beams to ensure there is no vibration from the piling and hence there should be no damage to neighbouring properties.

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

- Councillor Connor commented that in his view all piling action causes vibration and asked if neighbours would receive compensation. Officers responded that they cannot insist on construction methods and confirmed that augered piling does not cause vibration;
- Councillor Mrs Newell asked why there was a need to pile in that area as it is the highest point in Chatteris and pointed out that a previous development had caused considerable damage to a nearby property. Officers responded that piling would not be done if not required as it is a very expensive process and would be as a result of geological and soil survey and is outside planning control. Councillor Mrs Newell commented that someone should take responsibility if any there was any damage as a result of piling. Officers responded that this is outside of the control of the Council and would be a civil issue between the developer and the property owner next door;
- Councillor Quince suggested that a survey should be carried out on adjacent properties before and after building was completed. Officers stated that this is outside planning control and it is the developer's responsibility to ensure that there is no damage to third party properties and confirmed that this could not be included as a planning condition. The Legal Officer responded that Planning Practice Guidance provides 6 tests before a condition could be added and it would not be reasonable to impose a survey condition;
- Councillor Sutton commented that he knows about piling and confirmed that if augered piling is used that will be no problems whatsoever and asked what would happen if the developer were to use driven pile if permission were granted. Officers responded that this had been noted as an issues raised by members during the site inspection and confirmed that the update is an informative by the agent as to how the foundations will be provided and this should not form part of the decision as it sits outside ultra vires and is not a material planning consideration;

- Councillor Owen asked why a developer would change to driven pile instead of auger piling. Councillor Sutton responded 'cost';
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that this is an insurance issue and a developer is unlikely to be employed unless they had insurance which provides some assurance. Councillor Miscandlon responded that most reputable companies have extensive Third Party liability insurance as it is required by their trade.

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

**Granted, subject to the conditions reported and the deletion of Condition 3.**

(Councillors Murphy and Mrs Newell stated that they are Members of Chatteris Town Council, but take no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Murphy declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of him calling the application in on behalf of Chatteris Town Council, stating that he had taken no part in the planning discussions or decisions taken at Chatteris Town Council)

**P86/14**

**F/YR14/0908/F**

**WHITTLESEY - LAND NORTH OF 106 STONALD ROAD, FRONTING, COMMONS ROAD - ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLING**

Members considered 1 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 deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the local council participation procedure, from Councillors Mrs D Laws, Whittlesey Town Council. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she was speaking as Chairman of Whittlesey Town Council Planning Committee and their unanimous refusal of this application. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that this was for reasons of consistency and made reference to another similar application at number 60 Stonald Road where there is a long history of refusal for planning application layouts and design revisions, all decisions were upheld with the most recent planning application being refused by delegated authority on 16 January 2015.

Councillor Mrs Laws stated that a planning application went to appeal on 19 April 2013 and the decision of refusal was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate as it was out of keeping with the surrounding area which demonstrated that 60 Stonald Road does not have elastic boundaries, it had provision for opaque windows to reduce overlooking and this is very similar as the application in front of members today, with over intensification of the site she asked members to consider why a new dwelling would require opaque windows if not for health and safety reasons.

Councillor Mrs Laws pointed out that the first application for this site was F/R08/0856/O for 2x3-bed houses which Whittlesey Town Council recommended for refusal, being refused due to the lack of amenity space, nothing has changed in the opinion of the Town Council. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that a wooden shed type building had been built in front of the building line of 106 Stonald Road and wished to raise members awareness of this and asked that conifers should be removed to the junctions of Stonald Road and Commons Road and requested that Highways share local knowledge.

Councillor Mrs Laws commented that she understood that members had recently visited the site but may not be aware of the level of parking which takes place between 1.00pm and 5.00am and pointed out that this is a narrow carriageway and people park on Commons Road, on the junction and frontage which leads onto Stonald Road and creates a 'rat run' for the A605. Stonald Road is a Roman road which lends itself to speeding motorists, 9,802 vehicles use this short cut, it is a highway route to school and Whittlesey Town Council considers the proposal of tandem parking with 3-4 cars reversing to be the wrong proposal and asked that members apply consistence and refuse the application.

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

- Councillor Keane commented that the application in 2008 had been refused and asked what was the difference now. Councillor Miscandlon referred him to the reason given on page 49 of the report;
- Councillor Sutton commented that he appreciates the work carried out as per the new local plan and stated that if the application meets all the various sections of the Local Plan which it seems to then he couldn't see anything wrong with the application;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that she uses the junction on a daily basis and has grave concerns regarding highway safety with the staggered junction. She stated that the residents of 106 Stonald Road do not use their access to the north of the garden and park right on the junction, it is not a planning reason for refusal but should be policed as there are several issues in that area and she agreed with Councillor Mrs Laws regarding the comparison between this application and 60 Stonald Road. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked members to take into account the provision of access and proposal for tandem parking, one for the existing and one for the new dwelling, cars cannot turn around, cars are parked regularly along the road very close to the junction and she believes it is an accident waiting to happen. Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that the footprint for this property is the same size and the previous proposal for 2 semis and this constitutes over intensification of the site and lack of amenity space for both properties as amenity space for 106 Stonald Road will be considerably reduced;
- The Local Highways Officer responded that when the application was received with parking for 106 Stonald Road shown as on site frontage they had grave concerns, by the applicant recommending to relocate access and parking onto Commons Road with suitable visibility splays it was deemed to be safe. He commented that he had considered tandem parking however as a low speed environment onsite turning provision would not be insisted, it will improve the current poor access, forming a new access and visibility splays either side. He believes that the applicant has provided enough off road parking for their development and this should not impact on kerbside parking. He pointed out that parking within 10 metres of an intersection/junction is an offence and a policing issue. Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that the revised plan is still not right, the access shown is for 104 and 106 Stonald Road which is never used, on the site visit there was a car in the garage but it was not known how long the car had been in the garage. The Highways Officer stated that the proposal provides better parking facilities with tandem parking, their preference would be parallel parking but they have no powers to refuse the application on highway grounds;
- Councillor Quince made the suggestion for a single access with a turning space to solve the problem. The Highways Officer responded that this would remove amenity space and they have no concerns with vehicles reversing as it happens along every street in Whittlesey and residents should be driving with a level of awareness;
- The Planning Officer noted that there may be alternative ways of access and reminded members that they need to be aware of the application in front of them and to make their decision based on this.

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

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

(Councillors Mrs Mayor and Stebbing stated that they are Members of Whittlesey Town Council, are not on the planning committee and take no part in planning matters)

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

(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)

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

**P87/14**      **F/YR14/0951/F**  
**WISBECH - LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF COTTERELL WAY -ERECTION OF 70**  
**X 2 AND 3-STOREY DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 4 X 1-BED; 22 X 2-BED; 44 X**  
**3-BED AND ASSOCIATED WORKS**

Members considered 2 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 refers) during its deliberations.

Officers informed members that:

- The following consultation response has been received:
  - CCC Highways commented that the revised information received in respect of the Transport Assessment is acceptable and as such CCC Highways are able to remove their objection to the scheme. A suitably worded condition relating to the satisfactory completion of the Section 38 process on the internal road layout for the proposed development is required;
- Discussions have continued with the Environment Agency in relation to the flood risk issue on site, however it has yet to be fully resolved. It is therefore recommended that the resolution remains that delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning to grant planning permission subject to further consultation with the Environment Agency with a view to overcoming their objection, a signed S106 agreement, the conditions set out on pages 70 to 73 of the agenda and the additional highways condition;
- Resolution to Grant:
  - That delegated authority is given to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee and Ward Members to grant planning permission subject to:
    - The satisfaction of the Environment Agency and the removal of their objection;
    - S106 agreement;
    - Conditions:

1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission. Reason - To ensure compliance with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
2. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved full details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and retained in perpetuity thereafter. Reason - To safeguard the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014;
3. Prior to commencement of development full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, these works shall be carried out as approved. The landscaping details to be submitted shall include:
  1. proposed finished levels (earthworks to be carried out);
  2. means of enclosure;
  3. hard surfacing, other hard landscape features and materials;
  4. existing trees, hedges or other soft features to be retained;
  5. planting plans, including specifications of species, sizes, planting centres number and percentage mix;
  6. management and maintenance details. Reason - The landscaping of this site is required in order to protect and enhance the existing visual character of the area and to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of the development hereby permitted in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014.
4. All hard and soft landscape works including any management and maintenance plan details, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All planting seeding or turfing and soil preparation comprised in the above details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings, the completion of the development, or in agreed phases whichever is the sooner, and any plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation. All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the guidance contained in British Standards, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason - To ensure proper implementation of the agreed landscape details in the interest of the amenity value of the development in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014;
5. No drainage works shall commence until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No hard-standing areas to be constructed until the works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason - To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding in accordance with policy LP14 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014;
6. No development shall take place until a remediation method statement detailing the depth of clean imported soils for both garden and landscaped areas, and any other specific remediation measures such as gas protection measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason - To mitigate against risks of land contamination in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014;

7. No development shall take place until a scheme to secure external lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such in perpetuity and shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. Reason - In the interests of crime reduction and fear of crime in accordance with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014;
8. No development shall take place until a scheme detailing the internal road layout, demonstrating that it can be constructed to an adoptable standard, has been submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The internal roads shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall be constructed to at least binder course surfacing level to the adjoining highway prior to the first occupation of any dwelling. Reason - In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of occupiers in accordance with policies LP15 and LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014;
9. Approved Plans - The following informative is also required: You are reminded of the requirement to provide fire hydrants in accordance with the Building Regulations.

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

- Councillor Miscandlon commented that the recommendation for this application is that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning as per page 70 of the report;
- Councillor Owen asked officers if they were saying that negotiations were required with the Environment Agency to build up soil levels on site. Planning Officers confirmed that the position with the Environment Agency was to achieve a finished level of 4.8 metres and the actual that can be achieved is 4.6 metres, a 200mm discrepancy which is an ongoing discussion. Members reminded them that were they minded to approve the application planning permission would not be granted under delegated authority until the levels have been agreed with the Environment Agency;
- Councillor Owen asked officers what will the result be after negotiations have taken place with the Environment Agency. Officers responded that a level of 4.8 metres would equate to 2-3 steps in front of each property, with 3-storey buildings officers have concerns regarding the impact on neighbouring residents and this is the reason for more negotiations;
- Officers commented that 3-storey high properties be a significant height and would result in the application being presented back to committee, 3-steps would be acceptable;
- Councillor Murphy commented that he has been a member of the Planning Committee for a long time and the Environment Agency comments are always different for each application, their proposal of 4.8 metres would make the properties higher than all other properties in that area, whereas most times the Environment Agency make no comment on applications;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she agreed with Councillor Murphy and asked if there was a condition in relation to the land contamination of the former gas works. Officers responded that so far Fenland District Council have carried out remedial works, awaiting details of the topsoil taken and this is covered in condition number 6 of the report;
- Councillor Sutton commented that he did not see a problem with the application but would like to see a condition regarding a construction plan given that several Roddons sites have had major problems and this seems to be done retrospectively and he would like to see this in place prior to construction and a dialogue with neighbours. Councillor Miscandlon asked Councillor Sutton to clarify what he meant by a construction plan, it was clarified as a Construction Management Plan. Councillor Stebbing commented that traffic movement in DeHavilland Road will be a problem. Councillor requested that a Construction Management Plan be included as a condition. Officers confirmed that a condition could be added;
- Councillor Mrs Newell asked if this application was for Roddons. Officers clarified that the applicant is G B Construction Partnership Ltd and there are 10 affordable housing units on site that may be taken up by Roddons;



- Councillor Murphy asked if the Environment Agency had taken notice of the raised height of the flood wall. Officers responded that they would ask the Environment Agency where the application fails their aspirations due to all the flood measures that have been put in place;
- Councillor Quince commented he had noted the dimension of the road during the site inspection and asked if the floor levels for the properties could be taken from the road to be raised to roadway height. Officers confirmed that the Environment Agency refer to the AOD level which is lower than the road.

Proposed by Councillor Hodgson, seconded by Councillor Bucknor and decided that:

**Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, in agreement with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Ward Members to resolve the flood risk issue and Grant planning permission subject to the conditions reported and one extra condition for a Construction Management Plan.**

(Councillors Bucknor and Hodgson 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 Fenland District Council owning the land)

**P88/14      F/YR14/0990/F  
MARCH - GRANGE COTTAGE, GRANGE ROAD - ERECTION OF 2-STOREY SIDE  
AND REAR EXTENSIONS INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING  
SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSIONS AND GARAGE TO EXISTING DWELLING**

Members considered 2 letters of support.

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 public participation procedure, from Mr M Hall, the applicant's agent. Mr Hall thanked member for the opportunity to speak. Mr Hall pointed out that there are no consultee objections raised and the application is supported by the Town Council. Mr Hall stated that the design of the extension and development has taken place over a number of months. Mr Hall stated that the site has been owned by the same owner for 36 years and the site will accommodate a large extension, he made reference to an email from 16 January which states that officers believe that the site can accommodate a substantial footprint. Mr Hall pointed out that there is a large Victorian and a mock Georgian property nearby, similar to the one proposed and stated that there are other properties in March with varying rooflines and one down Grange Road. Mr Hall pointed out Ransonmoor Grange next door to the proposal which is far larger than this proposal, one larger mock Georgian opposite which was padded 4-5 years ago and the proposal does not impact on neighbouring properties. Mr Hall stated that the development is in flood zone one and there are no neighbour objections, this proposal is on a large site of a quarter acre and it has been confirmed that the site can accommodate a large footprint.

Councillor Owen asked Mr Hall if Ransonmoor Grange is a standard property. Mr Hall responded that Ransonmoor Grange has split roofs and Ravens Haven is a mock Georgian property with varying roof levels and a detached garage, being a new build 4-5 years ago.

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

- Councillor Murphy commented that he had considered the proposal whilst on the site visit and noticed that it is not contrary to but is within Policy LP16 and he cannot see a reason for refusal as it is not obtrusive, is not in the way, is in keeping with other large houses on this road and should be approved;
- Councillor Hodgson commented that there are no objections, there are two letters of support and he believes the application should be supported;
- Councillor Owen commented that these are desirable properties ie Ransonmoor Grange, they are not normal design but secluded and on the outskirts of March, with no one passing it, this cottage is exactly the same and would not cause overlooking. He commented that Ravens Haven was built 4-5 years ago is not overlooking and he could not fully understand by officers think this proposal does not meet LP16 due to it not being in keeping with the design of the property;
- Councillor Sutton commented that on this occasion he was in agreement with the ex-Leader of the Council as he feels that the design is architecturally challenged, the question is the design and he believes that officers have it right on this occasion;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she was unable to attend the site visit but had taken a ride to Grange Road to see what the problem was and stated that she would go against officers recommendations and support the application;
- Councillor Owen commented that knowing the town as he does he could not understand why Councillor Sutton was opposed to the development.

It was proposed by Councillor Sutton that the application be refused as per officers recommendations, which was not seconded and not supported by members.

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

**Granted, as Members feel that the development is adequate in location, design scale and layout and meets paragraphs a, b, c, d, e, g and h of Policy LP16 of the Local Plan, subject to suitable materials and planning conditions.**

Members do not support officers recommendations of Refusal of planning permission as they feel that the proposal meets Policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan and is adequate in location.

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

**P89/14      F/YR15/0004/F  
ELM - LAND SOUTH OF THE CONIFERS, 67 FRIDAYBRIDGE ROAD - ERECTION  
OF 3 X 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLINGS INVOLVING THE FORMATION OF NEW  
ACCESSES**

Members considered 14 letters of objection from 9 households and 1 letter with no objection or comment to make.

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:

- Amended plans have been received which show the removal of the existing hedging to the site frontage, which is to be replaced with a 0.75m high picket fence set 2.4m back from the highway edge. The plan also shows the increased footpath width. The Local Highway Authority have been reconsulted on these aspects of the amended plan and their comments are awaited;
- In addition to the above amendments rainwater harvesting tanks have been introduced to each of the dwellings to provide water to the dwellings as well as attenuate the on-site water and run-off levels.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr J Burton, the applicant's agent. Mr Burton thanked members for the opportunity to speak. Mr Burton stated that the application is supported by the Parish Council. Mr Burton commented that the application is recommended for refusal by officers as it does not meet policies LP12 and LP16 of the Local Plan and would be considered as linear development. Mr Burton stated that policy LP3 relates to Elm as a limited growth village and this application fits this criteria and is in keeping with linear frontage development. Mr Burton made reference to other applications one refused on 20 January as did not comply to LP12 and LP16, another approved on 18 July 2015 and he clarified that the area comprises linear frontage development and this development being closer to the main footprint of Elm. Mr Burton stated that the proposed design respects the existing built form and is in keeping with the form and character and is visually interesting and there are no layout or amenity issues. He noted that there is an objection from a neighbour regarding hedging but not objection from the adjacent property number 89. Comments regarding soakaways have been noted and rainwater harvesting tanks are proposed to address these issues. Mr Burton stated that the proposal complies with the NPPF, policies LP12 and LP16 and urged members to support the application with any conditions deemed necessary consistent with the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Councillor Owen asked Mr Burton which village is the proposed development intended to be in. Mr Burton responded that the development is in the village of Elm.

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

- Councillor Hodgson commented that there are a lot buildings nearby and properties are already joined up and the new ones proposed no problem;
- Councillor Owen commented that he opposed officers recommendations and would propose approval of the application as it is a progression of what is already there;
- Councillor Mrs Mayor commented that determination is required to say where one village ends and another begins, in other areas of Fenland similar developments have occurred where development is on one side of the road and not the other. She commented that two villages should not be allowed to join together and members should apply consistency in that respect and she would support officers recommendations to ensure that the two villages of Elm and Friday Bridge do not join together;
- Councillor Stebbing commented that Strathmore House is approximately 150 yards down the road and asked if this is in the village of Elm or Friday Bridge;
- Officers responded that members should be mindful to consider whether the development would cause harm to the existing locality;
- Councillor Stebbing commented that Wimblington has a new development away from the core of the village and this is similarly away from the core of the village;
- Councillor Hodgson asked if there is a gap between Friday Bridge and Elm. Officers responded that there is sporadic development and the character of the area would change if the gaps were to be infilled;

- Councillor Owen commented that it would be a different matter if the development were closing up the boundary but this development is not anywhere near the boundary of Elm or Friday Bridge;
- Officers reminded members that they should consider whether approval of the proposal would cause a change in character of the area and locality;
- Councillor Connor commented that the Parish Council are in support of the application.

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

**Granted, as Members feel that the development does not harm the character of the locality, subject to suitable conditions:**

1. **Standard Time limit details;**
2. **Materials;**
3. **Provision of visibility splays;**
4. **Highways parking and turning;**
5. **Access;**
6. **Construction Management Plan;**
7. **Site Levels;**
8. **Approved Plans**
9. **Any other conditions required by the Local Highway Authority.**

Members do not support officers recommendations of Refusal of planning permission as they feel that the proposal does not harm the character of the locality.

*(Councillor Sutton declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of him previously sitting on a Governing Body with the Agent, and took no part in the discussion or voting on this item)*

**P90/14**

**F/YR15/0009/F**

**WIMBLINGTON - 14 EASTWOOD END - ERECTION OF 2 X 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLINGS WITH DETACHED GARAGES AND FORMATION OF NEW ACCESS INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING**

Members considered 11 letters of support from 9 households and 3 letters of objection from 2 households.

Officers informed members that the following consultation responses have been received:

- Local Highway Authority - The revised parking and turning arrangements are acceptable and based on speed survey evidence provided for the earlier planning application it is considered that the central paired access arrangement is acceptable in terms of visibility. A list of highway conditions is also included within the consultation response - these relate to:
  - Pedestrian visibility splays;
  - Access crossover construction;
  - Access should be ungated;
  - Access drainage;
  - Closure of existing access;
- Local Residents/Interested parties (4 letters in total): Two additional letters have been received from one household which support the proposal as they consider:

- The existing property to be dangerous, uninhabitable and an eyesore;
- That two new homes will add to the community and bring benefits to local business and facilities within the village;
- A further letter from an earlier contributor has also been received which notes that:
  - They have on numerous occasions seen rats running across the road from the garden of the property;
  - Building is in a sad state of repair and progress should be allowed;
  - They have no commercial interest in the property but want Eastwood End to be a modern place to live and prosper;
  - They hope local comments are taken on board and give residents a ray of sunshine rather than an eyesore;
- Comments from an objector have also been reiterated noting that their objections still stand. Whilst they are not against the application to build dwellings it is the fact that the proposed dwellings are not in keeping with those on this stretch of Eastwood End and that one of Wimblington's oldest buildings is to be demolished. With these points in mind they appeal to the committee to refuse this application;
- The issues raised by local consultees have been considered in the main agenda report; however the in principle issues regarding sustainability, the loss of a non-designated heritage asset and the suburban nature of the design remain unresolved.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr B Robinson, an objector to the proposal. Mr Robinson informed members that he is the owner of 12D Eastwood End, which is next door to the proposal. Mr Robinson provided a number of pictures providing the view from his home, showing a ladder view of how shadowing would be created should the application be approved. Mr Robinson stated that the development would cast a shadow across his lounge, kitchen, dining room, bathroom and would overshadow his garden. He stated that he had no problem with development of the site he would just prefer it to be within the original footprint as the proposal is a huge building and would be a great mass of brickwork and would cast a shadow across his lawn. Mr Robinson stated that a nice cottage style property is required. He pointed out that traffic will be an issue with allocated parking in the centre of these properties as a turning point would be required, stated that huge grain lorries use the road, there is a ditch opposite this proposal and lorries cannot pull off the road. Mr Robinson thanked members for their time.

Councillor Miscandlon asked Mr Robinson to clarify where he lives, which he did.

Councillor Bucknor asked Mr Robinson if the ladder was the exact height of the proposed building to show the extent of overshadowing to his property. Mr Robinson responded that the proposed building would be higher than the ladder and the extent of overshadowing would be much greater than could be shown.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr J Burton, the applicant's agent. Mr Burton stated that the application is before committee due to the level of local support received for the scheme. He stated that Wimblington is a village in three parts and all areas of residential development are sustainable and it is defined as a growth village. Mr Burton stated that infill development is appropriate in the Eastwood part of Wimblington and he considers that the development is in accordance with Local Plan Policies LP1 and LP3, in the form and character of the area and is sustainable.

Mr Burton pointed out that the report states that the layout is suburban in nature and at variance with the area, he stated that he believes that the proposal is in keeping with the area, there are no objections from highways and the access is acceptable, the design has been revised to reduce the number of units and height on the streetscene and the neighbour. Mr Burton stated that Morton and Hall believe that the current property is beyond economic repair, it is not listed and not in a conservation area. He commented that at the previous Planning Committee where this had been considered it had been mentioned that the dwelling was occupied, he stated that this is not the case and has not been inhabited since 19 August 2013 and the property is unmortgageable. Mr Burton stated that development is supported by paragraph 55 of the NPPF, the site is not isolated and contributes to the economic growth of Wimblington, is sympathetic to the area and in Flood Zone 1, improves highway safety, is supported by the Local Plan and the NPPF and asked that members please support the application.

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

- Councillor Mrs Newell asked if members had visited the site, it was confirmed that they had not as they had visited the site twice previously.

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

**Refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. The proposed scheme, which details development located outside the main settlement of Wimblington has not been supported by sufficient justification for the introduction of further dwellings within an unsustainable location. As a result the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 55 and Policies LP12 and LP16 of the emerging Fenland Local Plan Core Strategy Proposed Submission February 2013;**
- 2. The development is of a scale and in a location which would introduce a suburban form development, which is overly dominated by parking, within a rural setting resulting in adverse harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly the proposed development is contrary to Policies LP12 (a) and (d) and LP16 (d) of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 which both seek to secure high quality development which contributes to the sustainability of each settlement and does not harm the character of the locality;**
- 3. The proposal would result in the unjustified loss of a dwelling which has been identified through the consultation process as being worthy of designation as a building of local interest by virtue of its significance and the contribution that it makes to the streetscape. Accordingly the scheme is contrary to Policy LP16 and LP18 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 which both seek to protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment of the District.**

*(Councillor Sutton declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of him previously sitting on a Governing Body with the Agent, and took no part in the discussion or voting on this item)*

3.07pm

Chairman