

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**19 AUGUST 2015 - 1.00PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Miscandlon (Chairman), Councillor S Bligh, Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor A Hay, Councillor Miss S Hoy, Councillor D Laws, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor C C Owen, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor D Hodgson (Substitute for Councillor Connor).

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor S Clark (Vice-Chairman), Councillor D W Connor

Officers in attendance: S Manley (Development Manager), Mrs S Black (Team Leader), Mrs K Brand (Senior Development Officer), Ms A Callaby (Development Officer), G Taylor (Development Officer), (R McKenna (Principal Solicitor - Litigation), Miss S Smith (Member Services and Governance Officer)

## **P27/15      MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 22 JULY 2015**

The minutes of the meeting of 22 July 2015 were confirmed and signed.

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

## **P28/15      F/YR15/0492/EXTIME CHATTERIS - LAND EAST OF LLANCA, HUNTINGDON ROAD ERECTION OF 6 HOUSES COMPRISING; 3 X 4-BED TERRACED, 2 X 4-BED SEMI-DETACHED AND 1 X 4-BED DETACHED WITH 2 TRIPLE GARAGE BLOCKS (RENEWAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR10/0339/EXTIME)**

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 Application reference should read YR13 not YR15 as quoted;**
- During the Committee site visit Members queried whether an off-site affordable housing contribution was explored in the viability assessment (in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision);
- It should be noted that the viability assessment did not consider the likelihood of an off-site contribution explicitly; however it did provide a robust assessment of the development funding and from this it was concluded that there is no scope to provide any contribution in this regard, either on or off site.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that members had visited the site on the Site Inspection, the Town Council raise no objection and taking this into account she feels that it is appropriate to tidy up the site and she supported the officers recommendation.

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

Members vote recorded as: 11 in support of the recommendation.

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

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

**P29/15**      **F/YR15/0432/O**  
**MANEA - LAND NORTH WEST OF CEDAR LODGE, THE OLD DAIRY YARDS,**  
**WESTFIELD ROAD**  
**ERECTION OF A DWELLING**

Members considered two letters/emails of objection and one letter of support.

Officers informed members that:

- This site was the subject of an appeal which was dismissed on 24 July 2015 on the basis of highway safety and in the interests of biodiversity.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the local council participation procedure, from Councillor Buckton, District Councillor. Councillor Buckton stated that the application should be granted. He stated that in his presentation he would focus on the grounds given in the report for refusal of the application. Councillor Buckton stated that the objections in the paperwork raise issues regarding the additional traffic and he pointed out that this application is for a single dwelling and not commercial use. Councillor Buckton pointed out that there are businesses down the track including a building business and a hairdressers, there is a varied traffic flow already and reiterated that this proposal is for a single dwelling and this will not have a significant impact or consequence on proportionality. Councillor Buckton stated that there is an objection raised that the access is inadequate the resident is not able to maintain the boundary as a result and he stated that this is not relevant and stated that this is a better access than others in Cambridgeshire where there is parking on either side of the road.

Councillor Buckton pointed out that last October the Parish Council had supported the proposal and he had spoken with the Parish Council on Monday to question why they had changed their stance to objection and they had been unable to provide him with a reason. Councillor Buckton stated that he was baffled that Policy LP12 had been sighted as a reason for refusal pointing out that this is wrong as there is public support for the proposal. Councillor Buckton stated that throughout the preapplication process no guidance is being used to support the refusal and this has perplexed him. Councillor Buckton pointed out that Westfield Road is not a busy road, traffic travels slowly and the road is considered to be adequate by existing users, with Fenland District Council bin lorries turn in and travel the length of the Dairy Yard Track and pointed out that if it is considered safe for lorries it is safe for additional cars.

Council Buckton stated that the applicant has owned the land for many years and the proposal is in keeping with the area, pointing out that other applications in the old Dairy Yard have been approved and asked that in the interests of equity and decision making that the committee approve the proposal on this occasion.

Councillor Mrs Laws commented that she was perplexed that the Parish Council had altered their opinion, was approval and now object to the proposal. Officers responded that they had not had a

response from the Parish Council recently, in the original 2014 submission they did raise concerns regarding access issues and did raise objections on this application. Councillor Buckton responded that he had attended the Parish Council meeting as an observer when they objected to the proposal and he could not see what was different about this application to last time as it is the same.

Members were to have received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Feary, a supporter of the application. Mr Feary confirmed that he would not be speaking at this meeting.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Barber, the applicant. Mr Barber thanked members for allowing him to speak and he found it a bizarre situation that his application should be recommended for refusal as this joins all other approved applications. Mr Barber stated that he was born and bred in Manea, he knew many Councillors but had not approached them for help and just wanted to be treated fairly. He stated that this is the last piece of land in the Dairy Yard and this proposal would enhance and finish the roadway and asked for fairness. Mr Barber pointed out that Mrs Goude knows the history of the village and he would like to thank the people who had supported him at this meeting and asked members to be fair and approve the application.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Goude, the applicant. Mrs Goude stated that she had not expected to be at the committee, she had some land in the same area and had the same experience of over 30 years trying to establish outline planning permission and she had many objections to the plan for her site. Mrs Goude stated that the road has been used in excess of over 70 years by traffic, it is a bridleway and Dairy and large vehicles have used it, the gun club have used it and clarified that it has always been used as a roadway. Mrs Goude clarified that it is a very dangerous bend and there is no opportunity but to slow down and in the other direction from Westfield Road it is very clear that traffic can be seen from a long distance. Mrs Goude stated that she fully supports Mr Barber's application and hoped that members would give him the same consideration and approve his application.

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

- Councillor Bucknor asked officers if consultation had been carried out regarding the 15% threshold. Officers responded that the Council consults local residents who have a common boundary with the site and the expectation would be support from the Parish Council and local residents immediately around the site;
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked officers if Middle Level have commented and was there a report. Officers responded that despite Middle Level saying they would comment they have not responded during the consultation period;
- Councillor Owen commented that the Appeal refused on Highway grounds and he stated that a coach has driven down the track and asked how many vehicles are expected to use the access and he could not see what was objected to;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she agreed with Councillor Owen, stating that her husband was born in Manea and she was well aware when the old Dairy was in use that very heavy vehicles used the track with no problems and she could not remember any accidents happening and she did not agree with the decision to refuse the application;
- Councillor Cornwell commented that he had lived in the village from the age of 4, the track had always been there and served all the existing properties and reminded members that the accesses are not to the same current highway standards. Councillor Cornwell asked officers when the last planning permission was agreed for a proposal in this road. Officers responded that a development to the north of this site had been granted planning permission in 2014 to which Councillor Cornwell responded that in that time the road had neither got worse or better. Officers responded that the recommendation was to refuse on

highways grounds, members overturned that and this has been acknowledged in the Inspectors report;

- Councillor Owen commented that he would approve the application on the grounds as applied for the number of dwellings on this application, there is no reason for refusal except on the basis of highways. Officers responded that this would go against the Planning Inspectors decision which was very recent and gave clear guidance regarding the highway and advised that members should consider this decision and look at the safety implication. Councillor Owen questioned why members were being asked to consider this application if the decision has been determined in respect of the appeal as members are considering it based on the evidence submitted;
- The Chairman clarified that at the time this application was submitted the appeal against the original application was running in tandem and he reminded members that there are highways issues there and they have not been resolved and the Inspectors words are clear that there are highway issues to be considered. Officers reminded members that they would be going against officers recommendations and the Inspectors report of 24 July 2015 that had dismissed an identical application and they should be mindful of that decision. The Legal Officer reminded members the Inspectors decision given on page 61 of the report was very clearly determined on visibility splays and requested that members be mindful of giving the reason for approving on grounds of visibility splays as the evidence indicates otherwise;
- Councillor Sutton commented that it is one thing to disagree with officers recommendations and different with the Inspectors decision and on this occasion he would agree with the officers decision;
- Councillor Hodgson asked if it was being suggested that members should not vote for this proposal. The Chairman responded that they were being told nothing of the kind and the application should be considered on its own merits;
- Councillors Mrs Laws commented that she could see why members were looking at inconsistencies and other approved applications and reminded them that they were considering this application and were not looking at just highways issues but LP12 as well and these are the two points that stand out for refusal. She commented that this is a hard decision after hearing the speakers and the Appeal Decision being so recent;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that there is no record of any accidents in this area. The Legal Officer responded that he accepted that there has been no accidents, however, traffic will be slower and would increase risk to highway safety.

It was proposed by Councillor Owen, seconded by Councillor Mrs Newell that the application be Granted, which was not supported by a majority on vote by members.

Members vote recorded as: 2 in support of the recommendation to Grant, 8 against the recommendation Grant.

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

#### **Refused, for the following reasons:**

- 1. The Old Dairy Yard footpath/vehicular access is considered to be inadequate to serve the development in its outline form proposed by reason of its restricted width, lack of passing places, restricted visibility at its junction with Westfield Road. The outline proposal would therefore be likely to result in stopping and manoeuvring of vehicles on the highway to the detriment of highway safety and increase the chances of pedestrian/vehicle conflicts along this access. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the Policies LP15 (C) and LP12 (Part A, Criteria K) of the Fenland Local Plan (May 2014) and to the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework;**

2. Policy LP12 requires that if proposals within or on the edge of a village, in combination with other development built since April 2011 and committed to be built increase the number of dwellings in the village by 15% in growth villages then the proposal should have demonstrable evidence of clear local community support for the scheme and if, despite a thorough pre-application consultation exercise, demonstrable evidence of support or objection cannot be determined, then there will be a requirement for support from the relevant Parish Council.

The proposal, in combination with the number of built and consented dwellings within the village of Manea since April 2011, would exceed the 15% threshold set out in Policy LP12 Part A of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 and there is no evidence within the submission of a thorough or proportionate public consultation to demonstrate that there is public support for the proposal. In addition the Manea Parish Council does not support the proposal. Accordingly the proposed development would be contrary to Policy LP12 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014.

Members vote recorded as: 9 in support of the recommendation, 1 against the recommendation, 1 abstention.

**P30/15**      **F/YR15/0513/F**  
**CHATTERIS - LAND NORTH OF 1 STOCKING DROVE**  
**CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR THE USE AS A VETERINARY**  
**PHYSIOTHERAPY REFERRAL PRACTICE INVOLVING THE ERECTION OF A**  
**SINGLE-STOREY BUILDING**

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 one letter of support from a neighbouring resident and two letters of support from persons residing outside the district.

Officers informed members that:

- Further comments received from CCC Highways Transport Officer as follows:
  - "I have had a look at the proposed site location and it would appear to be very remote from the existing settlement with very little option for access by non-car modes of travel and therefore I am of the opinion that this is not the best location for the development. If this development were to come forward then they would need to show how the site could be connected in to the existing walking, cycling and Pedestrian networks";
- The latest comments have been fully considered in accordance with Local and National Planning Policy.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Andrews, the applicant's agent. Mr Andrews requested that members should consider granting the application as he believes there are material considerations that are not addressed and the report does not acknowledge the positive aspects of the application. He pointed out that officers recommendations are based on unsustainability, the reason being locality to proximity of town, access to public transport which highlights that facilities are not completely understood. Mr Andrews stated that it was key to overcome the issue of lack of public transport the design process

and parking layout has been acknowledged with highways and off-road turning areas will provide turning safely in forward gear for clients and employees. There will be storage for bicycles in the rear of the building and this will address sustainability for commuting on road and cycle routes. Mr Andrews stated that the Applicant, Mrs Calvert is passionate to set up her own business, she has a continuing relationship with the vets and animals will be transported privately or in own vehicles and treated for conditions, he feels that there is a business case, the business is sustainable, she has years of experience of referrals and successful treatment of animals and this site would be perfect without distraction.

Mr Andrews referred to the Dick White Veterinary Referral Centre which is 6.4 miles from Newmarket and from the nearest town. Mr Andrews stated that the Chatteris proposal is 0.9 miles from the London Road Junction and is in a good location and the site has been selected based on this information. Mr Andrews pointed out that officers argue that there is better land in terms of location, he believes that being closer to the town centre would not fit with the future expansion of Chatteris and this proposal makes the practice future proof, taking into account the design and making it environmentally friendly. Mr Andrews stated that timber cladding will be used which is renowned for its durability and solar power all contribute to the sustainability of the business. Mr Andrews thanked members for listening to his presentation.

Councillor Owen commented that this application seems to hang on access to the site, with people walking and cycling with animals to the facility and asked Mr Andrews what proportion of clients will walk or cycle with poorly animals. Mr Andrews responded that visits are on an appointment system and referral based on 45 minutes appointments with a 15 minute turnaround. Mr Andrews stated that there are 4 parking spaces for employees and visitors and cycling offers a sustainable alternative with the lack of public transport being acknowledged, providing an alternative to driving. He pointed out that most patients will mostly visit by car.

Councillor Mrs Laws commented that the client is working in this job at the moment and is looking to work by herself, has a business plan and she applauds the proposal and asked if the practice is just for small animals as this is an agricultural area and was Mrs Calvert looking to treat livestock as looking at the size of the site this could not be considered and it could only be based on small animals. Mr Andrews responded that the whole site is not being taken over, the entrance will house the proposal, with an exercise area inside and an outside environment. Councillor Mrs Laws asked how many would be employed as a result of the business. Mr Andrews responded that Mrs Calvert would be alone initially, she is involved in education schemes with on site training being provided. Mrs Calvert would be employing one other person and this would grow with the education schemes and training. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if there would be any overnight stays. Mr Andrews confirmed that the business would be purely a day clinic only and the applicant has a list of referrals already.

The Chairman referred to overnight stays and confirmed that he was well versed in the medical care of animals and asked Mr Andrews what would happen when animals did require an overnight stay. Mr Andrews responded that this is not a veterinary but a referral practice and would work in connection with veterinary practices, with referrals for physiotherapy only, clients will visit the practice and then leave, the animals would visit to better their ability and to aid their recovery.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that the proposal is supported by the Town Council, and the District Council generally do support new businesses, the question is regarding officers recommendations, the only concerns raised had been answered, there will be no overnight facilities, small animals only as the site is not large enough, the applicant has demonstrated that referrals are in place and these need to be considered and she pointed out that the Council do normally support new business;
- Councillor Sutton commented that he has concerns relating to the location, there is alleged

peace and quiet, he had researched 40 different veterinary surgeries and had found that none of them were in a rural location like this and he believes that officers recommendation is correct;

- Councillor Owen commented that it had been reiterated that these facilities would receive clients from referrals, it is not an accident and emergency hospital. He had noted that the objection from CCC Highways was how the business would connect to the town. Councillor Owen pointed out that he lives opposite a veterinary practice in the High Street and he had not seen one occasion where clients had biked or walked their animal to the vet. Councillor Murphy responded that he walks his dog to the vets;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that it is Chatteris that is being referred to and stated that there are no areas available in the town to suit a business like this, there is a shortage of land for housing, she believes this is an ideal location. Councillor Mrs Newell pointed out that she had lived in Chatteris for a number of years and stated that people do walk long distances and pointed out that it would be likely that clients would take their animals in a car for treatment;
- Councillor Cornwell commented that this is a Drove, is not normally classed as a highway and anyone walking or cycling would likely have to avoid agricultural equipment and pointed out that this is sometimes used as an alternative to Ireton Way and he did not have a problem with a rural industry being established in such a rural area. He commented on its proximity to a settlement and pointed out that when looking at other items on the agenda this proposal is much closer to a settlement than one that already has Outline planning permission. He pointed out that this business would not be that remote in a few years time, this is a rural type business and seems to fit and the need has been established. Officers responded that a Business Plan has been submitted which does not overcome the concerns raised and it is not a robust business plan;
- Councillor Mrs Hay commented that public transport had not been mentioned and pointed out that wherever you go in Chatteris if people take sick animals to the vets they go by car, sometimes parking illegally and stated that there is no room for this practice in Chatteris itself and this is an ideal site;
- Councillor Sutton commented that this business would be suitable in the town centre for physiotherapy and this proposal is in the wrong place and responded in answer to Councillor Cornwell's comment that is not a rural business and could only be considered as such if it were treating farm animals, these are domestic animals and this is not a rural business;
- Councillor Bucknor commented that there is other land around where the site is located and asked if the rest of the field is under the same ownership. Officers responded that ownership extends beyond the submitted plan, being 0.2 hectares in total and planning permission had been granted for paddock land in 2013.

It was proposed by Councillor Sutton that the application be Refused as per officer recommendations, this proposal was not seconded or supported by members.

Councillor Mrs Laws asked members to be mindful that if the proposal were to be approved they need to ensure that this is designated as a business location and not for housing development. Officers responded that members should consider the application as is in front of them, pointing out that a separate application would need to be considered by the Planning Committee and the application before members at this committee is the one to be determined, purely for business.

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

**Granted with Delegated Authority given to the Head of Planning in discussion with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Ward Member to formalise a suitable list of conditions.**

Members do not support officers recommendations to refuse planning permission as they feel that

the proposal appears suitable in accordance with the application.

Members vote recorded as: 9 in support of the proposal to Grant, 1 against the proposal to Grant and 1 abstained from voting. Councillor Bucknor requested that his abstention from voting be recorded.

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

(Councillor Mrs Hay stated that she is a Member of Planning Committee at Chatteris Town Council, but takes no part in the discussion or voting thereon)

**P31/15**

**F/YR10/0804/O**

**CHATTERIS - LAND SOUTH EAST OF CHATTERIS, LONDON ROAD  
MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT UP  
TO 1,000 DWELLINGS, EMPLOYMENT (B1, B2, & B8), LOCAL CENTRE (A1, A2,  
A3, A4 & D1), PRIMARY SCHOOL, PLAYING FIELDS, LANDSCAPING AND OPEN  
SPACE, NEW HIGHWAYS AND ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT**

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:

- This application was considered at Planning Committee on 3 September 2013 with in principle agreement for 1000 houses, authorising officers to negotiate terms of S106 list of conditions;
- The purpose of the report is to update the progress made towards the previous resolution, this is for a 5 year housing land supply and needs to move forward as a priority by negotiation and talking with consultants;
- The Local Plan does show how policies have changed relating to SPG and S106, householder waste contribution has been removed and is no longer sought from the developer and is paid by the householder when they move into properties to pay for the bins;
- Public Open Space (POS) is being negotiated. The applicant has advised that they consider that the figure of 16.16Ha for the calculation of POS is incorrect as they believe this figure would be 15.46Ha. Whilst both figures are in excess of the level of POS sought through the Council's SPG, the calculations are based upon the master planning work undertaken thus far. To allow the figure to be clarified and to enable the application to progress it is proposed to amend the Heads of Terms in relation to this figure to read:
  - **A maximum of 16.16Ha (minimum of 15.46Ha) for Public Open Space and structural landscape areas;**
- Education has been a problem, with Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) increase of £2m for building schools pushing affordable housing from 14% to 7% and this has been addressed through renegotiation with them;
- Ecological conditions are over one year old and a condition will be required for the ecological survey to be updated prior to any works being started on site;
- Viability is a different issue, the site has secured £600,000 through the education requirement, there has been some reduction in household waste and the Council's view for viability of the site is borderline. The developer has taken a commercial decision and they can deliver the site;
- Part of the process raises concerns that 14% affordable housing can be delivered, the



developer has given an undertaking that they can deliver 14%, there are phases and there is a review mechanism, there would be a review of the mechanism if there is an uplift in the housing market and this would allow the possible lift to affordable housing. If review of the development reveals abnormalities, this would allow the figure to go down and the developer would have to show adverse costs and this would allow the Council to consider and review;

- Highways Team have realised £150,000 for the local Green Travel Plan and CCC would like some payment for certain elements of the Market Town Transport Strategy, for public transport and cycle maps;
- The proposal can now move forward and negotiate S106 detail and the recommendation from officers is that the application be approved with Outline permission and Delegated Authority given to the Head of Planning, in agreement with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman subject to the completion of a signed S106;
- **Phasing Plan** - Condition 03 should read:
  - 3. Prior to the submission of any reserved matters a phasing scheme for the delivery of the entire development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The phasing scheme shall **broadly** be in accordance with the approved Anticipated Phasing Plan and shall include:
    - a) Details of the intended number of market and affordable dwellings for each phase of the development together with general locations;
    - b) Phasing of key infrastructure, including surface water drainage, green infrastructure, conversion of the Grade II listed tithe barn, community facilities and access for pedestrians, cyclists, buses and vehicles;
- The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing scheme. Reason - To ensure adequate and timely provision of infrastructure and affordable housing to support the proposed development in accordance with Policy LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan, 2014;
- The reason for this is that the application has been submitted in outline form which does not seek to approve the layout of the development at this time. The purpose of the condition is to ensure that the development is brought forward generally in accordance with the anticipated Phasing plan but recognises the need for some flexibility at the detailed stage when the reserved matters change;
- The omission of the word 'Broadly' inadvertently imposes specific control over the layout which is not being applied for at this time. For this reason the condition is recommended to be amended as above to address this issue.

Members were to have received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ms M Whitehead, the applicant's agent. Ms Whitehead declined to speak on this occasion.

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

- The Chairman made comments in relation to the Construction Plan on page 87 of the report and appropriate construction access. He commented that there is a consensus that the Ireton Way/A142 is a much more acceptable access to this site, in terms of commercial vehicles required to bring building materials onto site. He pointed out that the London Road access is more restricted and requested that officers speak to the developer regarding the better access. Officers agreed that an informative could be included regarding the preference for access to be via A142;

- Councillor Mrs Hay raised concerns, saying that she had lived in Chatteris for 38 years, there are two dentists in the town that do not take National Health patients, one surgery is at capacity and there is no mention of a Health Centre in this proposal. Officers responded that the National Health were consulted and no requirements were placed on the scheme to make provision for a Health Centre;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she sits on a Patients Alliance Forum and could remember that there was a request put forward for a new Health Centre and stated that patients are currently waiting up to 3 weeks for an appointment;
- Councillor Owen commented that on page 122 of the report Affordable Housing is mentioned as being 25% and it is now 14% and asked if this would be 'pepper potted' or what is the proposal for the siting for affordable housing. Officers responded that this detail would be in the S106, in consultation with the Housing Officer, it would be 'pepper potted' and not ghettoed and confirmed that affordable housing would be spread throughout each phase;
- Councillor Owen asked for clarification on the sum for education. Officers responded that £2m was for the provision of a Junior School, with the actual figure for education being increased to £5,984,000, being an increase of £600,000 for education;
- Councillor Cornwell raised concerns over who had been consulted from the health service, commenting that it has undergone massive changes and he asked for clarification as to who in the health service had been consulted with on the application. Officers responded that patient groups have made comments, to which Councillor Cornwell asked why this had not been reflected in the report and stated that the Commissioning Group is not the consulted body it is the Local Commissioning Group and this should be noted as an important area of change. Officers confirmed that there is a local centre provided as part of the Master Plan and there is opportunity for a Health Centre as part of that. Councillor Cornwell raised further concerns that the right body is not being consulted. Officers responded that reference to the response from Health officials had been included in the previous report and confirmed that there is capacity within the Local Centre to accommodate a Health Centre if approached by a health care provider. Councillor Cornwell asked how do Local Commissioning Groups know about major applications like this one to be able to react in a timely fashion with a developer. The Chairman pointed out that on page 113 under the heading 'Key elements of the scheme' there is provision for a local centre 'with opportunities for a health centre'. Officers confirmed that there is provision for a local centre and statutory consultees will be consulted with on any subsequent phases, they will then have the ability to respond to developers to deliver the facility;
- Councillor Cornwell commented on the standard of the development in relation to room sizes and asked if members could be assured that within the detail of each phase that the development was of an aesthetic and decent standard. Officers responded that there are conditions in place for rooms with a design document being submitted for continuity, this is there to ensure a high quality design is achieved. Councillor Cornwell commented that the conditions may be there but are they delivered and asked if there was a design group. The Chairman reminded Councillor Cornwell that a design group could be discussed outside of this planning meeting;
- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that architectural flair is required, to many houses look like boxes and members should consider the legacy that is left behind when applications have been approved. She commented regarding the NHS and reminded members that they should be mindful that doctors are in commercial business and may not want to expand, the PCT is gone, she is on a PPG Group, practice doctors have differing views and it is important moving forward to get a contact to promote health centres. Councillor Mrs Laws commented that social housing should be integrated throughout the site;
- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that she was not aware of the review mechanism and asked if there is a cut off after a number of properties. Officers responded that at each phase of the development, the developer will enter into 14% as per S106, as each subsequent phase an open book review will be carried out and if there is an uplift in the market the provision of 14% would be reviewed. The starting provision is 14% and would

only be reduced if there were additional costs over the viability or huge development costs and for this phase affordable housing may need to be reduced;

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented on conditions for HGV vehicles using the site, ie no Sunday working which would cause noise pollution. Officers clarified details of the operations. Councillor Mrs Laws commented that a lot of work had been done by officers and thanked them for a very detailed report;
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that there was no mention of archaeological excavation. Councillor Miscandlon responded that Excavation and Archaeology are mentioned on page 102 of the officers report and covered in Condition 38 on page 95. Councillor Mrs Newell commented that the Town Council has mentioned the provision of a health centre in its consultation response on page 103;
- Councillor Cornwell commented on restrictions on premises and asked if there was any provision for control on fast food premises on school routes. Officers responded that such restrictions have never been adopted policy on the Local Plan;
- Councillor Sutton asked if members have to accept viability at 14% and if things are poor on a phase if there is any way to catch up if things are really good. Officers responded that there is a review mechanism based on the S106 appeal, if an application comes forward with affordable housing the developer can challenge and ask for that number to be reduced and each phase will be subject to this form of open book review process. The review mechanism gives flexibility and enables affordable housing to pick up where possible.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Laws, seconded by Councillor Murphy and decided that:

**Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, in agreement with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and Ward member, to grant outline permission in accordance with the Schedule S106 Heads of Terms and updated conditions and the inclusion of an informative regarding the preferred routing of construction vehicles via Ireton Way and the A142.**

Members vote recorded as: 11 in support of the recommendation.

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

*(Councillor Mrs Hay stated that she is a Member of Planning Committee at Chatteris Town Council, but takes no part in the discussion or voting thereon)*

## **P32/15      APPEAL DECISIONS**

Officers informed members of Appeal Decisions as listed, dating from 15 April 2015 to 6 August 2015. Members were advised that a List of Appeal Decisions will be provided at each monthly Planning Committee for information. This information has been provided at the request of the Chairman and Councillor Sutton.

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

- Councillor Bucknor requested information in relation to the number of applications going through at committee. The Chairman advised that this will be included as an additional item each month;
- Councillor Bucknor raised concerns regarding location information on reports and asked if this could be included as a Google Earth link as some plans are not explanatory or as a map reference;
- Councillor Owen commented that members would like to know the proportion of items being considered at committee and those delegated;
- Councillor Bucknor commented that he requires the information regarding committee and delegated decisions so that he can give a positive answer and pass the information to

people when asked;

- Councillor Sutton commented that the Appeal Decisions shows that Inspectors are taking note and supporting the Local Plan.

3.05pm

Chairman