

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**9 DECEMBER 2015 - 1.00PM**

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

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor S Clark (Vice-Chairman)

Officers in attendance: N Harding (Head of Planning), Mella McMahon (Development Services), Rebecca Norman (Senior Development Officer), Kathryn Brand (Senior Development Services), Shanna Jackson (Senior Development Services), Alison Callaby (Senior Development Services), R McKenna (Senior Solicitor),

## **P52/15      MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 11 NOVEMBER 2015**

The minutes of the meeting of 11 November 2015 were confirmed and signed.

## **P53/15      F/YR14/0979/F WHITTLESEY - 300 EASTREA ROAD VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR11/0574/F (CHANGE OF USE OF SITE TO HAULAGE YARD AND PART CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING WAREHOUSE TO FORM OFFICE AND ACCOMMODATION FOR LORRY DRIVERS, INVOLVING FORMATION OF MEZZANINE LEVEL) TO ENABLE ALTERATION OF HOURS OF OPERATION AND TO SPECIFY THE HOURS AND NUMBER OF HGV MOVEMENTS**

The Chairman informed Members that this application had been deferred from this committee.

## **P54/15      F/YR15/0723/O MANEA - 48 STATION ROAD ERECTION OF 4 DWELLINGS INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS, LAYOUT AND SCALE)**

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

Officers presented the application to Members and informed them that updates had been received as per the documents handed out (attached).

Councillor Owen asked for clarification regarding the update received as the second paragraph ended with "considers that the site successfully completed the sequential test" and the third paragraph ended with "therefore the sequential test has not been met and as such the exception test is not applicable in this instance"; which one was correct? Officers explained that the applicant had provided further information and as the site is in Flood Zone 2 & 3 it required a sequential test to see whether or not there were sites available at a lower flood risk; the applicant believed that particular aspect of the policy had been complied with because sites within 617m of the site had been looked at but from an officer perspective it was not considered to meet the

requirements in relation to a sequential test as it would be expected that the whole of the settlement be looked at, which had not happened in this case; therefore the two paragraphs stated the two different opinions. The Chairman stated that Members needed to make an informed decision on the evidence presented.

The meeting was suspended for five minutes to allow Members to read the updates that had been circulated (attached).

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Elizabeth Dent, the applicant.

Elizabeth Dent stated that planning officers had recommended that this application be refused for four reasons: character and appearance, residential amenity, lack of pre-consultation and flood risk. In respect of character and appearance, given that this site has previously been given planning permission for five dwellings, great consideration had been taken regarding what to place on the site, especially as that part of Station Road was characterised by a mix of houses and bungalows and it was felt that the proposals fitted well. The update showed that the site was over an acre in size therefore the plots were extremely generous, being approximately a quarter of an acre each and did not feel that the development would be an extension to the village but felt it was infill development as the land was garden land and not agricultural land. In respect of residential amenity, officers were primarily concerned with the overlooking of plot 2 into the neighbouring property 48a; it was felt that the dwellings were at a significant distance to avoid overlooking (20m from dwelling to dwelling) and that this application was outline therefore the dwellings were only illustrative, this means they can be moved, windows repositioned or redesign the buildings to avoid any overlooking issues at the reserved matters stage. In respect of pre-application consultation, during the pre-application with officers they were not advised on the level of public consultation required and having subsequently told by officers that the village was over its growth threshold, they had proceeded to consult residents neighbouring the site, 30 residents along Station Road - 5 objectors, 6 supports with the remaining not commenting therefore they could not conclude there was overwhelming support or objection to the site; however they did have the full support of the Parish Council. In respect of flood risk the two plots at the rear of the site are on the edge of the flood zone, their flood risk assessment demonstrated that the site has a very low probability of flooding and if those two plots had the appropriate finished floor height then they would be acceptable and safe; the Environment Agency agreed with findings and stated the the development could go ahead on this basis. Both the EA flood map and the technical guidance of the NPPF are based on the natural flood zone only and makes no allowance for Fenland being an artificially controlled drained area which would make it extremely unlikely that the level of flooding currently shown on the EA map would occur; there is also no hydraulic modelling for Fenland, the EA are currently undertaking this modelling and they have been informed that it is expected that the extent of the flood zone would reduce, specifically within this area, but there has been no indication from the EA as to when this information will become available. There is a small amount of waterlogging at the rear of the site however this is not a flood issue but due to there being no drainage on clay soil which can be addressed by adding the appropriate drainage onto the site during development. They have also undertaken a sequential test and an exception test where eleven other sites were assessed in the village taking a pragmatic approach and took the distance from the site to the centre of the village and assessed other sites on a like for like basis, these sites were dismissed for certain reasons. The exception test also shows how the site would bring wider sustainable benefits that outweigh any flood issues. Elizabeth Dent concluded by stating a site specific flood risk assessment had been undertaken which found that proposal was entirely suitable on flood risk grounds with the EA confirming this could go ahead. They felt that the proposal was not out of character with the area and would improve the area as it had been overgrown and derelict for over 20 years. With regard to amenity issues, this could adequately be dealt with at the reserved matters stage and there was no overriding objection to the site and the Parish Council fully supported the proposal and therefore she would ask Members to vote to approve the application.

Questions asked of Elizabeth Dent as follows:

- Councillor Cornwell stated that Elizabeth Dent had commented that there were development of dwellings behind other dwellings within the vicinity of the site at Station Road, yet all the plans that Members had showed no indication of this other than ribbon development and therefore asked where they were. Elizabeth Dent stated there was one opposite and one on the same side (a bungalow behind number 34) on Station Road to which Councillor Cornwell stated that the access to that site was from Wisbech Road. Elizabeth Dent stated there was also number 31b which was behind 31a but that was on the opposite side also next door to the site there was a builders yard with large sheds in the rear.
- Councillor Connor asked if for confirmation that plots 3 and 4 were in the flood zone 3 to which Elizabeth Dent confirmed they were.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked if the Environment Agency had confirmed the Hydraulic Modelling System information was not available yet available, Elizabeth Dent confirmed this was the case. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if officers had heard of this information to which officers replied stating that they had not but if the flood zone maps changed then the policies would change in response to that information. Elizabeth Dent stated she had been advised that this information would be available in March/April 2016; Councillor Mrs Laws commented that there could be a question mark over this because as she was a Flood Warden she knew full well that this was unlikely to happen next year.
- Councillor Mrs Hay asked how many of the 9 sites looked at had been available; Elizabeth Dent stated only one was available that was currently being marketed for sale and this was deemed unsuitable due to already having planning permission and being too expensive.

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

- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that the paperwork stated that the Parish Council had been consulted on the new information but they had confirmed they were unable to comment as the next meeting was not until 14 December and therefore they had not had time to assess the new information. Officers clarified that after the report was completed, the updated sequential test and exception test information was received and this was what the Parish Council were consulted about but they had not had time to respond to that but that they did support the application therefore it was not felt this would affect the recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked if there was an appeal on this land; officers stated there was not.
- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that the view of the Parish Council was in conflict with officer recommendation and that the Manea Parish Council minutes from 14 September and then 19 October 2015 had shown there had been a change of heart yet the Manea minutes had stated that there were no planning reasons for objection, which seemed odd to her when there were a catalogue of reasons.
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that Middle Level Commissioners had stated they would be commenting and yet nothing had been received and she thought that Fenland should put more pressure on them to comment.
- Councillor Owen stated he had looked at what had been approved in 1988/89 and with the NPPF now in place, had this dramatically changed the situation. Officers stated that the key issue was that Members needed to determine the application against the Development Plan adopted in May 2014.
- Councillor Owen stated that a bone of contention seemed to be the flood zone issue and as the visit had shown there was water at the rear of the site due to a field of clay, as the applicant was willing to resolve this by raising the floor levels, which was worthy of consideration, this should overcome any concerns regarding the flood zone.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated she recommended refusal, she was not sure how much planning Manea Council have had but after reading their minutes and them changing their

view from one month to the next, she could not understand that therefore she proposed that Members went with the Officers' recommendation.

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

**REFUSED as per the officers' recommendation stated within the report (attached).**

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

**P55/15**      **F/YR15/0814/F**  
**LEVERINGTON - LAND WEST OF 1 RINGERS LANE**  
**ERECTION OF 3 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS AND CHANGE OF USE OF**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND TO FORM ADDITIONAL GARDEN LAND FOR COTTAGE**  
**TWO, RINGERS LANE**

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 presented the application to Members and informed them that there were no updates on this item.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from John Maxey, the agent.

John Maxey stated this application was only before Members because of the comments from the Parish Council regarding the condition of Ringers Lane. The extra garden land behind cottage 2 is to Cottage 2 therefore there is no risk of overlooking and the site is increased by approximately a third therefore there is more than ample garden space. The build width of terrace 3 which is about 14.5m is similar to the build width of the pair of the semi-detached opposite and will be similar in character and appearance and asked Members to vote in favour of officers' recommendations.

Questions were asked of Mr Maxey as follows:

- Councillor Sutton asked for confirmation that the extra dwelling was the same size as the existing, Mr Maxey stated it had exactly the same footprint.

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

- Councillor Owen suggested Members moved to approve the recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs Hay stated she did not feel that this fitted into the street scene as there were no other terraced properties along the line and with regard to visual impact and cars parking outside the front that it would look like a car park;
- Councillor Sutton stated that he thought the extra garden on the back was an improvement, the car parking was not ideal but with the level of demand for local residents to buy affordable housing needed to be taken into consideration and therefore he would go with the officers' recommendations.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that there were other terraced properties in the vicinity and she did not think it was out of keeping with the street scene.

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

**GRANTED as recommended within the report (attached)**

**P56/15**

**F/YR15/0828/F**

**LEVERINGTON - LAND EAST OF LANCEWOOD, 32 DOWGATE ROAD  
ERECTION OF 3 X 4-BED AND 1 X 5-BED 2-STOREY DWELLINGS WITH  
ATTACHED DOUBLE GARAGES AND DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE TO SERVE  
EXISTING DWELLING (LANCEWOOD, 32 DOWGATE ROAD)**

Officers presented the application to Members and informed them that there were no updates on this item.

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

- Councillor Bucknor asked for confirmation as to what difference 0.5m would make and could the gap be used as a continuation of the road in the future. Officers stated that it had been felt that they were too close and a marketing exercise indicated that the potential purchasers considered that the proposed properties were too close together; therefore the proposal is to push them further apart to give extra space; this was mainly to do with the windows that face internally and would give an extra bit of relief. Councillor Bucknor stated he was concerned that if they did change it into a road then it would open up the fields to the rear therefore he asked if Officers could put a proviso on the application stating that it was not to be opened up into a road. Officers stated that Members needed to be mindful of the previous decision which did not have a condition to that affect but that the site was within a conservation area therefore all trees would be protected and if an application were to come in then the issues of felling trees, the impact on buildings in terms of the noise and disturbance from traffic - this was a whole different issue. Councillor Bucknor stated the application had been changed to widen it which would mean it could be used as a road and should this not be looked at as a possible problem in the future. Officers stated that if an application came in to open this up as a road then this would be looked at and the impact assessed and it was not necessary to add a condition to the application.
- Councillor Cornwell asked if the courtyard would be a hard surface as this would mean an enormous paved area which he thought was being avoided because of the increased run off it would create. Officers stated that Condition 9 requires the details of hard and soft landscaping therefore this could be secured under this condition.
- Councillor Mrs Newell asked if a clause could be added to ensure the archaeological investigation was carried out as one had already taken place where post-medieval remains were found but another one is being asked for. Officers stated that Condition 15 asks for the archaeological investigation and therefore this is already covered.
- Councillor Sutton stated the owner and agent should be commended for moving the development back 0.5m.

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

**GRANTED as per the recommendation within the report (attached)**

**P57/15**

**F/YR15/0845/F**

**MURROW - NORTH OF 15 - 27 MILL ROAD  
ERECTION OF 5 X 2-STOREY DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 3 X 5-BED AND 2 X  
4-BED WITH DOUBLE GARAGES**

Officers presented the application to Members and informed them that updates had been received as per the documents handed out (attached).

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from James Burton, the agent.

James Burton stated that the officers' report was very comprehensive, it confirms and reinforces that the proposal complies with all relevant parts of policies LP2, LP3, LP5, LP6, LP12, LP13, LP14, LP15, LP16, LP17 and LP19. It should also be noted that there is an extant approval granted in 2014 for five large detached dwellings that can be implemented. This proposal represents an amendment to the approved scheme that is in the established settlement of Murrow and is infill development within a continued built up frontage. Mr Burton made it clear that there was no intention to develop the land to the rear of the site which would clearly be against policy and not supported; the central access is positioned to follow the route of the Anglian Water pumped main which has a 3m restriction on each side and cannot be constructed over. Following the receipt for approval of five dwellings in 2014 they have sought to improve the scheme and responded to a number of points raised by local residents, this has included reducing the scheme from 3-storey to 2-storey, improving the layout and design of the units, improving the appearance of the dwellings, creating individually designed dwellings to reflect the former character of the area, enhance the biodiversity of the site, improving drainage issues. Despite these amendments and the fact that these five dwellings can be constructed on the site at present, there are numerous objections from local residents; many of these appear to have been generated following a leaflet drop in Murrow which contained false information and was issued on Fenland District Council paper; these issues are dealt with in the officers' report but he added that the land at the rear would not be developed, the access was positioned to follow the sewer and the proposal represents an improvement in the design layout. The parish had raised concerns regarding the open drain however it is noted that this is the Fens and there are numerous open drains across the district in close proximity to residential properties that cause no issues. With regard to flood risk, the proposal has no objection from the EA and is deemed technically acceptable. In addition, the proposal meets the sequential test as it does not seek any further development on flood zone 3 land, only an amendment to an existing approval of five dwellings that can currently be constructed. This proposal represents improvement on the currently approved scheme, complies with the relevant policies, has no objections from highways, Environment Agency, IDB, Environmental Health and the Parish support the proposed design changes to the dwellings and the proposal has officer recommendation for approval.

Questions were asked of James Burton, as follows:

- Councillor Miscandlon stated that on the previous application the central road was also access for farm vehicles; who is responsible for the maintenance of that access, Mr Burton stated it would be the farmer.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that it would be sensible, for health and wellbeing purposes, if the landscaping at the front incorporated safety fencing along the drain side as it was quite a vicious drain. Mr Burton stated it was a deep drain and stated that talks with the IDB indicated a low level fence could be provided which would allow a digger arm to reach over in order to clear out the drain, which has been done on other sites. Councillor Cornwell stated it made sense to incorporate this to which Councillor Miscandlon agreed.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that Mr Burton had alluded in his presentation that information had been circulated on Fenland District Council paper. Mr Burton explained that it was a leaflet produced by an unknown person and Councillor Miscandlon confirmed that officers had seen the document. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that this leaflet had raised objections to the application; Mr Burton stated this was mainly with regard to the development of the field at the rear, which the leaflet had stated was in progress and would form phase 2 of the application, which was not true. Members asked to see the leaflet, which was then passed around the committee.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked if a safety fence would impair drainage equipment, Mr Burton explained that at other sites a 900mm low level fence was provided which allowed a digger arm to reach over the top.
- Councillor Sutton asked if the crossover was piped or a bridge; Mr Burton stated the intention was for it to be a piped crossover following discussions with the IDB.

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated she needed to ensure that the sequential test and exceptional test were carried out; Mr Burton stated further information had been submitted.

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

- Councillor Mrs Newell stated she was perturbed to see that there were 19 letters of objections from residents and that the "leaflet" should be looked into legally.
- Councillor Mrs Newell asked if wildlife concerns had been looked into regarding water voles and the drain seemed to be the parish council's problem due to safety concerns regarding the occupants and pedestrians. Councillor Sutton stated the fencing issue was no different from one side to the other to which Councillor Cornwell stated that two wrongs do not make a right and whilst a new development was in progress the Council, with regard to the health and wellbeing strategy, needed to ensure that anything approved was safe and in a manner that suits the wellbeing of the residents. Councillor Sutton added that there was also a parental responsibility for this too; it did not just rest with the planning authority.
- Councillor Mrs Hay stated that Councillor Mrs Newell had mentioned the letters of objection, but these could not be taken into account as there was already planning permission on the site, the principle of development had already been established.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated she was happy to recommend provided the extra conditions were added regarding the sequential and exceptional tests as she was concerned of flood risk. Officers stated there was a condition requiring landscaping which it could be added to.

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

**GRANTED as recommended within the report (attached).**

**P58/15**      **F/YR15/0865/O**  
**LEVERINGTON - LAND NORTH OF 118-124 LEVERINGTON COMMON**  
**ERECTION OF 6 X DWELLINGS (MAX) (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL**  
**MATTERS RESERVED)**

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

Officers presented the application to Members and informed them that updates had been received as per the documents handed out (attached).

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

- Councillor Connor commented that officers had addressed his concern with regard to Plot 1

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

**GRANTED as per the recommendations set out in the report (attached).**

**P59/15**      **F/YR15/0978/F**  
**WISBECH - PRINCES FOOD LIMITED, LYNN ROAD**  
**INSTALLATION OF A 11.00 METRE HIGH (MAX) WATER STORAGE TANK AND**  
**PUMP HOUSE**

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 presented the application to Members and informed them that updates had been received

as per the documents handed out (attached).

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Councillor Mrs Bucknor, District Councillor.

Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated she was speaking on behalf of residents who were asking for conditions. Princes is an important company in Wisbech employing just under 500 employees including taking on trainee engineer apprenticeships; making a significant investment in 2013 and therefore she was fully supportive of any improvements that mean the continuation of the company in Wisbech. Equally, the purpose of planning is to ensure we continue to improve the environment for residents and not say that they are too important an employer so it is ok to put an enormous blot on the landscape. This would not help improve the environment for residents in the area without simple but significant screening which is what they are really calling for. The report states that various other areas were looked at; the front of Lynn Road had been looked at as it was a large site but it was too close to neighbours, was visible from the park and takes away from the site elevation of listed buildings which is even closer to neighbours and within a few feet of two grade 2 listed buildings. The rear of the location had been looked at but has been stated as having poor ground conditions but she suggested that the ground conditions were virtually the same. The proposed site is directly in the heavily used part of Mount Pleasant and faces immediately opposite the cemetery which was built a century before the factory and is immediately opposite Grade 2 listed large Sexton house which for some reason has been described as a cottage, as well as the Grade 2 listed chapel. This is an industrial block with Moy Park next to it on that side of Mount Pleasant Road but immediately opposite are residential homes and residents have suggested that Princes could set the tank back further from the road, even partially build it underground, but what the residents have asked is that significant mature screening is provided to lessen the impact of this serious blot on the landscape. From the pavement it has significant impact on the street scene, as you travel into Mount Pleasant to attend to a loved one's grave, this will have a real impact and residents are disappointed of the insensitivity shown by the applicant. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated she had provided Councillor Mrs Cox with details of all the residents' concerns, not just the written concern that was given to officers, as this is in her ward, with Councillor Mrs Bucknor's being on the other side of the road where the residents live and she supports the residents' concerns. It is important that we endeavour to improve the environment for residents, we have all seen places in Fenland in the past and asked ourselves "how did this get passed?", please do not let this be one of those mistakes, it has a major impact on the street scene and she would not wish to see it opposite her house.

Questions were asked of Councillor Mrs Bucknor as follows:

- Councillor Owen stated this had been an industrial site before he was born; Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated it had only been there since 1983 to which Councillor Owen stated this was not correct and asked how many people had brought their objections to her attention as opposed to those she had canvassed. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated she had not canvassed anybody, they had written to her or telephoned her and she visited them and a resident from Sexton House made a formal complaint to the Council, two residents worked for the company and therefore reluctant to put anything in writing and there were a few elderly residents who had expressed their concerns with regard to the sensitivity about it being opposite the main cemetery.
- Councillor Connor asked how many residents had made representation through her in the form of letters or emails and why they were not present at this committee. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated some people were extremely vocal but she was dealing with residents that were employed by Princes and others who were elderly and distressed and upset about the proposal. After talking to residents, the main concern is the insensitivity of the applicant to this design and what they would like, if it were feasible, is to place it slightly underground but certainly mature screening.
- Councillor Owen asked to see the overlay showing the tank next to the existing premises

which showed it was the same colour as the existing buildings.

- Councillor Sutton stated that with the greatest respect, she had mentioned that it had been there since 1983 and he suggested that the building had been there for a hundred years therefore he did not know where she had got her information from but he could assure her that it was not correct.
- Councillor Cornwell asked how residents saw the approach to the screening; did they expect to see 11m trees from the start; what was the perception of the residents with regard to screening. Councillor Mrs Bucknor stated that perception of the residents is that it is so close to the cemetery, in an ideal world they asked if it could be moved further back and she had told them that elsewhere has been looked at but this was the only place and all she could do was to put their views forward. With regard to the tree height, at the moment it is just neat fencing to which everyone is used to but this is so prominent and so near the cemetery, you have to bear in mind the sensitivity of the people and the fact that it does detract from the street scene. If it were within the factory complex itself so that it was not so prominent on the street scene she thought that everyone would understand that but it is so close to the busy road and where residents live.
- Councillor Owen commented he did not understand how it would stand out and who it would upset.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Andrew Fletcher, representative for the applicant.

Mr Fletcher explained this was a very successful development, a half a million pound strategy to improve the environmental footprint, reduced water usage by a third and this proposal would enable water usage to be reduced further, which is all positive. This tank will give enough volume, with 100% of the site's usage will go through it which will even the flow from outside into the tank and going out to the site and that means internally water supply is not lost as currently happens. Currently, externally the water pressure varies to nearby residents and is occasionally more severe causing burst pipes; the peaks and troughs of usage will start to vary more unless this is carried out. A 100% of water usage will go through the tank and give a positive environmental impact both externally and internally. The other locations looked at were behind the spice store but that has very soft ground; closer to a lot more residents; not as cost effective due to the amount of pipework needed that would also cross the lorry ways and therefore would not be easy to maintain which was why that site was discounted. The Board suggested the front of the site as they thought it was out of the way but this caused a problem with Anglian water site. The other place was at the bottom where the machinery storage area was but this would be too close to the visual aspect of many houses; therefore they have chosen the current site which has easy access to water pipes from outside and for distribution around the site, it blends in with the area and therefore it was felt it was a good area. Noise had been considered and therefore a roof would be added which would stop any splash noise, the pump house would be fully noise proofed to make it have as little impact as possible. He thought they had done as much as they could to reduce the impact and thought they had a good solution.

Questions were asked of Mr Fletcher as follows:

- Councillor Connor stated that most of his queries had been answered but could he have assurance that they had given this full consideration as being the best site. Mr Fletcher stated they had done this, they had engineers in, carried out water consultations and experts assess that this was the best site.
- Councillor Mrs Hay asked if it were a feasible option for the tank to be set into the ground. Mr Fletcher explained this was not feasible as the maintenance needs to be carried out above the ground.
- Councillor Cornwell asked with regard to screen, had they an idea of how to lessen the impact. Mr Fletcher stated that between the site and the fence there is a footpath that is concrete and there is a water mains pipe that services the whole of the estate further on,

therefore it would be very difficult to dig into. The car park is also deep concrete, 200mm slab but outside of the site on the green verge, there is one tree but this was not their land although it would be ideal.

- Councillor Sutton asked if anything could be done in the form of artwork to soften it, was this possible. Mr Fletcher stated that anything was possible but it had been done in grey to blend in with everything else. Councillor Miscandlon suggested, as is seen on the way to Milton Keynes, that some of the large factories were colour coded from blue to grey to blend in with the sky scene, this may inspire Princes to mask the tower.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated they had a responsibility to residents but also to look at the carbon footprint and the way forward for industry. Unfortunately she thought this would be difficult to screen it and a lot of work had been carried out to investigate other areas and she could not see a way forward, apart from colour coding.

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

**GRANTED as per the recommendations within the report (attached).**

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

(Councillor Bucknor declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of being the wife of the objector, Councillor Mrs Bucknor, and retired from the meeting for the discussion and voting thereon.)

**P60/15      TPO 05/2015  
CHATTERIS - 1 ST MARTINS ROAD  
DESCRIPTION:      TREE PRESERVATION ORDER FOR 2 YEW TREES**

Officers presented the application to Members and informed them that there were no updates on this item.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton and seconded by Councillor Mrs Hay and decided that the Order be:

**CONFIRMED as per the recommendation within the report (attached).**

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

2:55pm

Chairman