

PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 13th January 2016

Agenda No: 5

APPLICATION NO: F/YR15/0792/F

**SITE LOCATION: Land North of Hollingworth House, Hockland Road
Fronting Cat's Lane, Tydd St Giles.**

UPDATES

2 further representations have been received from previous objectors raising concerns over:

- The biodiversity survey that has been carried out;
- The timing of the tree survey;
- The timing of the ecological survey;
- The timing of the traffic survey resulting in it not being representative of the traffic in the area;
- There has been a lack of support from local residents and the Parish Council;
- The site is backfill;
- Some trees were felled in July 2015;
- The application will set a precedent;
- Concerns that Policies are not being adhered to.

Resolution: Grant as per pages 43 – 46 of the Agenda.

From: Peter Newman [<mailto:pete@cashbacs.co.uk>]
Sent: 11 January 2016 17:50
To: Rebecca Norman
Subject: Reference F/YR15/0792/F

Dear Ms Norman,

Further to the above application being recommended for approval, I would like to add further comments, that limited space on the web portal prevented me making.

I am astounded and dismayed that you have recommended this application for approval, bearing in mind not only does it contravene Fenland District Council's own policies regarding backfill, but the way that the applicant has blatantly disregarded proper protocol. The applicant had tree's felled prior to any biodiversity check being made, in an attempt to make the application more favourable.

There are a number of questions which stand out in this application,

1. How can a biodiversity check be made after work has commenced?
2. Was there actually a biodiversity check made, the supporting documentation has no reference to this application at all
3. Why was the tree survey made after tree were felled and not prior to the felling?.
4. Why, when and I quote " The applicant was made aware of the need to carry out an Ecological Survey of the site as part of the pre-application advice process, however no such survey appears to have been submitted with this application. I therefore consider that the application site has not been adequately assessed for the presence of protected species.", made by Mr J D Fisher of Peterborough City council Planning Services was ignored, and carried out after work had commenced. Is this acceptable?
5. The traffic survey ... again the information supplied was not representative of a typical day. I cannot believe that this survey can be taken seriously due to the limited time of operation and the time of day. I could take a traffic survey on the M25 , at 2am- 4am and state it is a quiet road. It is hardly a representative survey. I also bring into question the average speed of traffic on that road as not being correct and has been concocted to hoodwink the council into favouring the application.

There are so many points I could bring to the table in regards to this application, ranging from destroying a natural wooded canopy across Cats lane, to backfill. The Parish council does not support the application, and more to the point, there has been no letters of support. Tydd St Giles is designated by the very council you work for as a small village, and the last time I checked, we had already met and exceeded our quota for new builds. According to FDC policies, all applications over the quota should be brought to public consultation, yet this does not appear to have happened.

Tydd St Giles Parish has been designated as a neighbourhood plan area and is currently working on producing such a plan. The message given out currently by recommending this application, (and please excuse me if I have this all wrong) , is that if FDC and its officers are willing to pick and choose which of its own policies to adhere to, then why would it adhere to a neighbourhood plan?

I believe the land in question is the rear garden to Hollingworth House and as such is behind the house, making this a backfill, again against FDC policies.

I do have photographs and witnesses showing the trees already cut down on the 21 July 2015, long before any supposedly biodiversity check being made and prior to the tree survey, and months prior to the Ecological Report.

In my opinion and it's only my opinion, that this application has exploited the planning process to their own gains, against specific FDC policies and local residents views, and by being recommended for approval will set a precedent for future applications. With this in mind, I would presume that should I or any other persons in the village with correct access and land, decide to apply to build a house to the rear of an existing property would also receive the officers support.

As you can see from the letters of objection, the local villagers are very passionate about the village and over the last few years there has been numerous applications passed, some which enhance the village and some which don't. We all agree that the village needs to grow, but at a steady rate and in the right places. Over the last couple of years, Kirkgate has been inundated with new builds, and the quiet country road now has increased traffic.

Please do not take this email as a personal attack on yourself as that is not my intentions. There is a lot of frustration in regards to this application due to its location, and unfortunately by being recommended for approval, only fuels the frustration, and that frustration is aimed at FDC policies that were meant to protect the village from haphazard applications, not being adhered to.

Best Regards

Peter Newman
Managing Director

Cashbacs
International
Limited

The Boathouse Business
Centre
1 Harbour Square
Nene Parade
Wisbech
Cambridgeshire
PE13 3BH

Support	01945 427030
Sales	01945 580615
Fax	01945 427039
Mobile	07791 873340
Email	pete@cashbacs.co.uk



This e-mail and any files attached to it are confidential and intended for use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me immediately by reply and delete this e-mail and any attachments from your system. It is possible for data that is transmitted by e-mail to be corrupted or intercepted. For this reason, Cashbacs International Limited does not accept any liability for a breach of confidence which may arise through the use of this medium.

Cashbacs International Limited registered in England, Number 2130078
Registered Office The Boathouse Business Centre, 1 Harbour Square, Nene Parade, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, PE13 3BH
VAT registration number: 479 1217 29

Additional comments for planning application F/YR15/0792/F

12 January 2016

Firstly I would state that the level of transparency in this process leaves a lot to be desired, whether that was intentional or not. The planning portal has been very sporadically and haphazardly updated, and a number of key documents are not available for public viewing (for example the Local Highway Authority's conclusions to the flawed speed survey). How can supporters of or detractors to the application comment or make representations without access to vital documentation?

Furthermore, the very limited timescale given to submit additional comments before the planning committee meeting will not allow many interested parties (including myself) time to do so thoroughly. The letter from Ms Norman advising of the "Grant" recommendation was delivered on 08 January 2016, a mere three working days before the deadline.

- The site is clearly backfill not infill, the applicant wants to build in a neighbour's rear garden. I understand infill to be plugging the gaps in otherwise built up frontage. There is no built up frontage along Cats Lane; Hollingworth House faces and accesses onto Hockland Road, Shallon is the solitary house along Cat's Lane.
- The Parish Council's objections have not been given sufficient merit or been addressed thoroughly by the planning officer. The Parish Councillors represent the villagers, and live in the community themselves, so their decision should be an overriding factor in this process.
- The fact the applicant felled numerous established trees prior to submitting the application, to undoubtedly gain an advantage in the process, has been ignored. The bio-diversity of the site cannot now be measured as it is no longer intact.
- Likewise the questioning of the timing and detail of the speed and traffic survey has been ignored. The survey carried out does not reflect the weight and frequency of traffic along Cats Lane at crucial times.
- I would question the comment made by Ms Norman that development in Tydd St Giles is under the 10% threshold, given the amount of new builds (and recently granted planning permissions) in the village. This is also, I understand, the view of the Parish Council. The assessment referred to by Ms Norman should be made available for scrutiny.
- Granting this application will set an unwarranted and unwelcome precedent for future development in a quiet, rural community.

I would like to thank the committee for taking the time to read this document, and sincerely hope this application is given the close scrutiny it warrants.

W P & S L Wilcox
Greenacre Lodge
Hockland Road
Tydd St Giles
PE13 5LF