

PLANNING COMMITTEE



25 MAY 2016 - 1.00PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon(Chairman), Councillor S Clark(Vice-Chairman), Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor D W Connor, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor A Hay, Councillor D Laws (arrive 1:12pm), Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor M Davis.

APOLOGIES: Councillor C C Owen

Officers in attendance: Nick Harding (Head of Planning), Hannah Edwards (Legal), Gavin Taylor (Senior Planning Officer), Rebecca Norman (Senior Planning Officer), Jane Webb (Member Services & Governance)

P1/16 TO SIGN AND CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF 27 APRIL 2016

The minutes of the meeting of 25 May 2016 were confirmed and signed.

P2/16 F/YR15/0290/F LAND SOUTH EAST OF ORCHARD LODGE, JOBS LANE, MARCH ERECTION OF 20 X 2-STOREY DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 11 X 4-BED WITH DETACHED GARAGES AND 9 X 4-BED WITH MIP ANNEXES AND INTEGRAL GARAGES

The Committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy & Procedure (minute 19/04 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 from Dr Robert Wickham, Agent.

Dr Wickham stated they had worked with officers on the application over a period of nine months. In favour of the application:

- It would add to the variety of the housing mix in March and other sites of a similar character had sold well.
- It had been agreed that a purpose built affordable home would be provided for a particular need in the community and the design had been altered to meet that need.
- It was a sustainable location in a market town and in accordance with the Development Plan and with National Planning Policy Guidance
- All local concerns could be dealt with by conditions including the matter of planting and fencing

There were no questions for Dr Wickham from Members.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

Councillor Mrs Hay commented that one of the objections received had stated that number 8 of the development was too close to 15 Saxon Way with it being only 18m when it should be over 20m; was this correct? Officers stated that on the rear elevation that faced 15 Saxon Way there was only a first floor window which was obscure glazed as it served a bathroom therefore there was no concern with regard to overlooking. Nick Harding, Head of Planning explained that with regard to separation distance what is looked at is the window to window relationship and where there is a bathroom window or no windows then a reduced separation distance below the normal 20m was permissible. The distance in this case was 15m between the two properties.

Councillor Mrs Newell asked if Middle Level Commissioners had commented on the application. Officers stated that nothing had been received from Middle Level Commissioners. Councillor Cornwell stated he was under the impression that Middle Level were not statutory consultees; Councillor Miscandlon stated he was correct, they were not statutory consultees but consulted through courtesy.

The item was proposed by Councillor Connor and seconded by Councillor Bucknor and resolved that the application be:

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

(Councillor Mrs Laws arrived at 1:12pm, having given her apologies that she may be late.)

(Councillors Mrs Clark, Cornwell and Bucknor, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been lobbied on this application.)

P3/16 **F/YR15/0907/F**
LAND WEST OF CEDAR WAY ACCESSED FROM, GROVE GARDENS, ELM
ERECTION OF 11NO 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES

The Committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy & Procedure (minute 19/04 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).

Nick Harding, Head of Planning, stated he would like to inform Members with regard to the report that the Parish Council had a number of concerns. One related to the issue of the threshold limit in relation to the village and the Parish Council's view that Fenland should not have included a scheme within the figures which involved the demolition of a sheltered housing scheme. However Fenland had identified it was a scheme to demolish 21 units and be replaced by 21 dwellings and therefore it was felt that the proposed development had not eaten into the growth allowance but the Parish Council disagreed with this methodology. The other concern from the Parish Council was the issue of the community land as there were three areas of encroachment into it; one was the access road but this was always part of the proposal, secondly there was a surface water drainage feature which was a metre deep drainage pond which would effectively remain dry for the majority of the time which was compatible with the use of community land and thirdly a very small turning head which was so small it was not thought to have a significant impact on the use of the amenity land. Nick Harding stated that Members would have seen at the site visit that the land was in poor condition and the applicant had indicated they were willing to incorporate the land into a new agreement therefore Fenland was confident that the condition of the area would be improved, adopted and maintained thereafter.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation from Councillor Stokes, Elm Parish Council.

Councillor Stokes stated he was an Elm Parish Councillor and explained that the application had caused the Parish Council a number of problems since they were first consulted on it last year under F/YR15/0514/F - an application for 20 dwellings on the same site. One of the Parish Council's objections on that occasion was that Fenland District Council had advised them that the target under LP12 had just 11 dwellings remaining before exceeding the limit thus the application would have exceeded the limit. This resulted in the developers resubmitting the current application for 11 dwellings only. The Parish Council had been given various contradictory figures from Fenland District Council regarding the threshold as in January 2016 they were told it had been exceeded by 22 dwellings but on 22 March and 4 May this figure had changed again to 29 dwellings still available. Councillor Stokes stated that Nick Harding had attended their Parish Council where he admitted that mistakes had been made in the figures. The increase to 29 dwellings appeared to be due to a decision made that the building of 21 dwellings at Begdale Road should not count towards the threshold figures. Elm Parish Council objected to this decision and asked for the correct balance available under the threshold (ie 8) to be the figure upon which planning decisions are made. The Head of Housing had stated that the one room bedsits at The Dale should be classed as two or three bedroomed flats but this was clearly nonsense. The Dale is reported to be an "empty and boarded up old style housing complex with Roddens saying it was unsuitable and no longer fit for purpose"; even Councillor Sutton was reported to have said of the new development: "I was particularly pleased that these new homes are on my own patch in Elm and the scheme is geared towards helping people maintain their links with this community". An empty building pulled down and replaced with accommodation designated for families and not the vulnerable and if this was planning law then an amendment was needed and they would be consulting their MP regarding it. The Dale redevelopment was in essence a new development and not a reinstatement of that which was there. Clearly Roddens/Circle Anglia agree with the Parish Council as it stated that of the 379 dwellings completed, 21 were located at The Dale and a further 24 at Napier Court. If the Head of Housing was correct then Roddens should reduce this claim to build 379 dwellings by 45. He respectfully suggested to Members that Roddens were correct and the Head of Housing was wrong and that Elm has only 8 dwellings available which would mean that this application should fail due to exceeding the threshold by 3 and the fact that due consultation had not been carried out by the developers in accordance with FDC guidance. He also pointed out that neither the village threshold's evidence report dated February 2013 nor the Fenland Local Plan dated May 2014 made any provision to the treatment of rebuilds. The other major concern of Elm Parish Council was that relating to the site of a proposed new redevelopment along Cedar Way; under the original planning application of 2002 a Section 106 agreement was signed in May 2003. On the original plan there was a right of way into the community land and this does not extend over the whole grass area and the northern boundary of the community land was on the northern side of Grove Gardens. The Parish Council believe this will reduce the community land by 25% and this was not acceptable; this point was made in a response to Fenland District Council in October but had received no reply nor a reply to the question as to whether the developer had applied to have the terms of the 106 Agreement altered.

There were no questions asked of Councillor Stokes.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation from Lewis Smith, Agent.

Mr Smith commented that Councillor Stokes had mentioned the issue of how the threshold numbers had been calculated. In 2015 an application had been submitted for 20 units and was refused; they were informed that there were insufficient numbers available in the village therefore they resubmitted an application for 11 units that was at today's meeting. Subsequently they had been told that a review of the figures had indicated there was capacity for 20 units and therefore the original proposal was submitted and is currently under consideration. They understood that the figures had been reviewed again and the 20 unit scheme would be contrary to the Local Planning Policy LP12. On this application, his clients Kier Living Limited were the original builders

of the adjacent development off Grove Gardens and Cedar Way in 2003; that development included a road connection through to this current site and the land was used in part as the construction compound for that earlier development. The application site lies on the edge of the settlement but was effectively surrounded by existing housing together with Atkinsons Lane and formed a logical extension to the village. The proposal seeks to extend the existing development in a proportionate way with a built form and dwelling designs that would be comparable with the surrounding character. As part of the original development, an area of land for community use, was proposed in addition to the usual communal space requirement and these areas of land are due to be adopted by Fenland District Council and once the committed sums have been agreed and the invasive pond weed has been cleared then that adoption process can be finalised. They had submitted an ecology survey that concluded there were no ecological features of note on the site and the Drainage Strategy details how surface water will be dealt with. Members will note that there are no technical objections to the application and an Economic Viability Assessment is currently being considered by the Council and would be the subject of a Section 106 Agreement. The application complied with the Local Planning Policy LP12 which promotes development where it will support sustainability and not harm the character of the settlement and where it does not increase the numbers of dwellings in the village by more than 10%. He hoped therefore that Members would support the application in accordance with the Local Plan and grant planning permission.

Questions were asked of Mr Smith as follows:

Councillor Cornwell stated the previous speaker queried the use of the garden of Plot 1 as not being part of the access to the back road and asked if this meant there would be a loss of community land; was this correct? Mr Smith stated that there may be a very small part of that land that would be lost but it was minimal.

Councillor Sutton stated he was District Councillor for this area and asked if assurance could be given, if they received permission, with regard that Section 106 Agreements would be completed and not dragged on. Mr Smith stated that the Council had their assurance and the Agreement was presently going through the necessary legal due diligence; there has been a need to sort out the invasive pond weed but this was being progressed.

Members asked questions and made comments as follows:

Councillor Murphy asked for clarification as to where the Council stood with regard to the threshold figures. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, explained that the Council are confident with the figures produced in April but as time passes new planning permissions are granted and old planning permissions that are not implemented fall by the way side and therefore the figure against the threshold will move up and down over time and this was why the recommendation made to prospective developers where the threshold is close, it is recommended that they go through the community consultation exercise as a precautionary measure just in case someone leap frogs ahead of that development and takes up the spare capacity; this would be future proofing their application if this tactic was taken. Councillor Murphy asked if the Council were on the right side of the law if they were questioned. Nick Harding stated he was confident in the threshold calculations that have been published on the Council's website.

Councillor Cornwell asked if the Council were convinced that the threshold would not be exceeded if this application was approved to which officers gave their assurance that the current figures were correct. Councillor Cornwell stated with regard to the design encroaching into areas where maybe it should not and asked what material affect did the current layout really impact on the previous application. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, explained that plan now showed part of the land was now occupied by both a road and the front garden on Plot 1 and therefore in his opinion it did not matter whether the area occupied by the front garden of Plot 1 was used for access purposes or a front garden, if used for access purposes then it would not function as amenity land. The surface

water feature was a shallow excavation in the land and in many ways it was like the pond in the earlier phase of the development which formed part of the open space; it was acceptable then to have a pond as part of the open space and in terms of logic he could not see why the surface water drainage feature would not be the same. The small area of the turning head was the only other small area of encroachment.

Councillor Mrs Laws apologised for arriving late to the meeting and commented with regard to the 106 Agreement; it seemed like the developer had failed on the initial 106 Agreement and therefore she was concerned that with drafting a new 106 Agreement it would not be enforced. What guarantees would there be that the applicant would comply with the requirements of the second s106 Agreement if they had already failed on the first. Were the Council intending to enforce the obligations the applicant had failed to deliver on previously if made a requirement of this new development. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, stated he had not looked at the original 106 Agreement in detail but the area of failure has been with the adoption of the open space therefore whilst the developer is at fault in that regard equally the Council has not been chasing and pursuing that adoption. He stated that the applicant was willing to enter into a new legal agreement which would replace the existing legal agreement and the Council has the ability to tighten it up and incorporate timelines into the Section 106 and undertake a commitment to enforce that new legal agreement if needed. Councillor Mrs Laws stated this was essential if the planning permission was agreed.

Councillor Connor asked with regard to the objections received as to where they were from in conjunction with the site. Officers stated an objection had been received from 42 Henry Warby Avenue which was south of the site, there were also some received from Grove Gardens. Councillor Connor asked how many were in proximity of the proposed site. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, explained Officers were not in a position to be able to inform Members of this detail as that information as held on the computer system that they did not have access to at the meeting.

Councillor Sutton updated Members stating it was true that the Council had not chased the 106 since the arrival of the pond weed but had been seeking to progress the matter prior to the arrival of the weed.

The item was proposed by Councillor Bucknor and seconded by Councillor Mrs Laws and resolved that the application be:

GRANTED as per the recommendations with the report (attached).

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

**P4/16 F/YR16/0091/F
LAND EAST OF HORSEWAY FARM, HORSEWAY, CHATTERIS
CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING GARAGE TO 3 X HOLIDAY LETS**

The Committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy & Procedure (minute 19/04 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 from Paul Jolley, supporter.

Mr Jolley stated he had previously been a Councillor and had been part of the original Fenland

Tourism Group and had seen tourism throughout the Fens grow; accommodation has always been top of the list as there is a need for all kinds of accommodation from camping to bed and breakfast to hotels. There were a lot of people who had moved to this area in the last 25 years that have family come to visit and they require accommodation to stop and visit the area. He believed this application fitted everything; he understood what the Officers had stated with it being out in the open but this was a rural area. This area was not on a regular bus route but in his opinion many of the Fen towns are not. With this type of application it was very difficult to meet the criteria of the Local Plan but if there was not a need for this accommodation then the applicant would not be submitting his application; he believes that he can fill the accommodation several months a year. There is a similar place in Doddington which was 89% full throughout the last year; Cambridgeshire as a whole last year brought in over £100million. He stated he realised it did not meet all the policy requirements but this application needed support to help tourism grow therefore he asked Members to support this application.

Questions were asked of Paul Jolley as follows:

Councillor Murphy asked if the garages were built for holiday lets. Mr Jolley stated he thought they were already there.

Councillor Connor stated he was aware there was a bus route albeit not a great one. He asked whether, if this application was granted the holiday lets would be continually used for 12 months of the year or whether there would be a break clause included. Mr Jolley stated he expected a break clause to be included within the conditions.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

Councillor Cornwell stated the original plan did not show any buildings where the garages now were and therefore asked if they were new builds. Officers explained the block was new with planning permission granted in 2014, essentially the existing farm house was rebuilt and a subsequent application was submitted to extend the residential curtilage of the dwelling in order to facilitate a garage for additional parking which was what had been erected so far. There had been a pause on what had been erected as there is no door fitted but essentially what had been built at this time in terms of scale and external appearance respected the garages as granted in 2014. Prior to 2014 there was just a brick wall in place that fronted onto the road. Councillor Cornwell asked if the building had been used as a garage. Officers stated that cars have been parked in the buildings when they had visited the site.

Councillor Mrs Laws commented that it was interesting that planning permission had been granted for the erection of a garage involving demolition of the existing building in October 2014 and then in June 2014 there was the change in the agricultural courtyard to extend the residential curtilage and today another application was being discussed concerning the same site and buildings; she commented as to how quickly this had moved along to possible tourist accommodation. Councillor Mrs Laws stated she promoted tourism but having looked at the site and its history she did not believe she could support the application and would have to go with the Officers' recommendation as it was not suitable.

Councillor Cornwell asked if there was a business case to support the change of usage. Officers explained that the policy did not require a business case but he had spoken to the agent about the possibility of providing some justification but nothing had been received. Councillor Cornwell stated if this had been a brand new building application to support tourism then presumably a business case would be required. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, explained that if Members were faced with a planning application for a residential property in the open countryside then it would be normal practice for a business case to be put forward to state that an agricultural business which could financially support and justify the presence of a residential property on the site but the policy is not the same for this form of development. Councillor Cornwell asked if there

was a problem with Fenland's planning policy and if there was then this needed to be looked at to clarify this type of situation. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, explained that as the Officer had stated there was a series of criteria against which development proposals for tourist related developments are assessed and those policies steer development towards settlements and in that context a business case would not be needed; in this situation it is in an open countryside location which was not supported by policies. Councillor Miscandlon agreed with Councillor Cornwell and stated that the Officers and various organisations would take a look to see if there was a need for an SPD to be drafted to clarify these types of situations for all.

Councillor Mrs Newell stated that years ago there were two farm cottages on this particular site and these had not been mentioned.

Councillor Mrs Hay stated that in view of the fact that it was only 18 months since permission had been given to build garages, she thought this was an opportunist way of trying to change it into residential use and as such she could not agree with the application.

The Legal Officer explained that there had been several observations by Members as to the history of the applications on this site, not least that there was a garage application in 2014 and Members had felt this had moved on quite quickly to the change of use to holiday lets. The Legal Officer reminded Members that they should not speculate as to any future intention of the applicant; any land owner was free to change their mind as to how they wished to use their land and that the applicant should not be penalised for having a change of mind as to how he wished to develop the land. Members should consider the application before them today and the change if use of the garages for holiday lets and whether it was suitable; the should not speculate as to any possible future use of those holiday lets.

The item was proposed by Councillor Mrs Laws and seconded by Councillor Bucknor and resolved that the application be :

REFUSED as per the recommendations within the report (attached).

(Councillors Mrs Clark, Mrs Newell, Cornwell, Mrs Davis, Connor, Bucknor, Sutton, Mrs Laws, Mrs Hay, Murphy and Miscandlon, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been lobbied on this application.)

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

(Councillor Sutton declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by virtue of knowing the applicant, and withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon.)

P5/16 **F/YR16/0122/F**
LAND WEST OF THE OLD RECTORY, THE WALNUTS FRONTING, ELWYN
COURT, MARCH
CREATION OF 3 X DWELLINGS INVOLVING: ERECTION OF A 3-STOREY 4-BED
AND A 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLING, AND THE CONVERSION OF EXISTING
COACH HOUSE TO A 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLING

Councillor Miscandlon informed Members that this item had been withdrawn.

P6/16 **F/YR16/0136/O**
LAND WEST OF ROWDE HOUSE, BAR DROVE, FRIDAY BRIDGE
ERECTION OF 3NO DWELLINGS AND FORMATION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR
EXISTING DWELLING (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 & Procedure (minute 19/04 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 from Chris Walford, the Agent.

Mr Walford stated within the last two or three years there had been residential development approved on both sides of the site and this made the application clear infill and an obvious development to go forward; it complied with the Local Plan for Friday Bridge which promoted infill within the village. The proposal utilises an existing access into the site and this would be upgraded to highways specification; highways have no objections to the proposal and are happy that the previous two applications either side which have had numerous road workings, passing bays and the infrastructure on the road had sustained the developments. He stated there were three properties to the east where there had been drainage issues with Middle Level but these were extensively addressed and that he had met with Middle Level prior to this application whereby everything had been agreed in principal and they would be making a very detailed application with discharge consents upon approval if this was granted. In principal it would discharge to the drain on the opposite side of the road which was to the east, very similar to the development next door therefore they would make any necessary upgrades to the drain that would be needed; Middle Level saw no problems with this. He asked that Members support the application.

There were no questions asked of Mr Walford.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

Councillor Mrs Laws asked if Fenland District Council had received any communication from Middle Level. Officers stated they had not; they had been consulted on this application, in addition the Council had also consulted County's Flood Authority who had viewed the submitted information and for this outline application they were satisfied that a suitable scheme could be met.

Councillor Sutton stated that it was regrettable that anything had been approved along the road as it was not up to scratch, never had been and never would be and Members now found themselves in a position whereby this application complies with policy at the moment however the earlier permission was granted against officer recommendations and this shows the problems that have been created as a result.

Councillor Murphy asked if infill, as a technical concept, still happened as he was under the impression this had finished several years ago. Officers explained that the Policy LP3 Small Villages made reference to residential infilling therefore that applies to all villages and developments in those areas would be considered on their merits but would normally be restricted to residential infilling. Councillor Sutton added that the Policy also stated that it would be in an otherwise built up frontage and that was the point he was trying to make.

Councillor Connor stated he was pleased to see that there was a drainage scheme 'more or less' agreed.

Councillor Mrs Laws commented that County Council Highways were on board with this but stated, in her opinion, at times they did not help and therefore asked if Officers were satisfied with everything that had been received from County Council Highways that the details of the plan and layout was acceptable. Officers stated that Highways had considered this and have given regard to the previous approved schemes and Officers had prepared conditions to secure all the passing bays were added therefore between the two developments there would be an additional two

passing bays and two areas where the road is widened because of the access and therefore consider these do help with the state of the road albeit there was no pavement.

It was proposed by Councillor Connor and seconded by Councillor Mrs Davis and resolved that the application be:

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

P7/16

F/YR16/0218/F

LAND NORTH OF VICTORIA HOUSE, GADDS LANE, WISBECH

ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY 5-BED DWELLING WITH DETACHED GARAGE

The Committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy & Procedure (minute 19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Officers presented the application to Members and informed them that no updates had been received.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation from Alex Patrick, the Agent.

Ms Patrick stated there were no objections received from any other compulsory consultees and the proposal promotes flexible, working practices by providing the potential to work from home. This improves further the sustainability of the development as working from home significantly reduces movement to and from the site, in addition this flexibility would also support the local facilities. The design has received favourable feedback from the planning officer, the proposal would not obstruct the natural Fenland landscape, the site offers uninterrupted views of this but does not detriment neighbouring properties. They had worked with the natural landscape and building development that currently exists. Within the last three years approvals have been granted for site much more rurally set than this proposal; it is set just 1.3 miles away from the nearest comprehensive school and 1.5 miles from the nearest public school and only 2 miles from the town centre. Recently planning approvals were given to rural sites for dwellings of the same classification at Guyhirn, Gorefield and Wisbech St Mary; not within the main settlement and infill plots. She believed granting these recent applications demonstrated that Fenland District Council accepted of the sustainability of rural areas to the west of Wisbech and this proposal would enhance and complete the street scene and support the villages existing facilities and services ultimately improving the sustainability and sense of community within the location. The precedent has already been set in Wisbech St Mary and Gorefield which was justified in accordance with paragraph 55 of the NPPF. In short, she believed the planning committee should decide this application on its own merits.

No questions were asked of Ms Patrick.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation from Samantha Turnbull, applicant.

Mrs Turnbull asked Members to consider approving the application to allow them to build their family home on the plot for a number of personal reasons. She had spent her teenage years growing up at Victoria House which was her family home until recently when it was purchased by her in-laws. Her husband had also lived there with her for a number of years. They both know the neighbours and the area well and some of the neighbours were family friends and were delighted to hear they were hoping to move back. Her husband and her feel that they belong there and both consider it to be home. Her in-laws purchased Victoria House in the hope that she and her husband could build their house on the land and be next to them and her husband's grandmother who resides in the annex; this was due to the practical reasons that they were not

getting any younger and having them close would be a comfort and a help but also because they wanted to be close together especially as her own little family unit was about to grow again. Her in-laws have no use for the plot of land in question and in time this would be most likely to become wasteland and an eyesore. She stated she was an Ofsted Registered Childminder with families that live in Leverington using her services; the schools she picks up from include Leverington School and by building on this plot she could continue to childmind in the local area without disrupting the families that use her services and causing them to look for childcare elsewhere. They had designed their house to accommodate her childcare business and benefit the children that would attend. Her husband also worked from home as a project manager in the utility sector and they had designed their house to accommodate his work needs. The style of house that they dream of might not be possible to be built if they had to look at a plot elsewhere. They felt that the house fits in well with the area and that they fitted well into the area and this was where they wanted to raise their children and build their forever house to settle in and where they wanted to call home.

No questions were asked of Mrs Turnbull.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

Councillor Cornwell stated he could not see the difference between this application and the one at Friday Bridge as the planning principals were exactly the same. Nick Harding, Head of Planning, explained that the key difference was that the previous application was in a defined settlement whereas this was not and was classed as an 'elsewhere location' and the policies for new residential developments were much more stringent in the elsewhere/countryside locations as opposed to within or adjacent to a recognised settlement.

Councillor Sutton stated he agreed with Councillor Cornwell and that there was only one way this could go and that was to go with officers' recommendations.

Councillor Mrs Davis stated she had listened to the speakers and whilst she was sympathetic the policy was the policy.

The item was proposed by Councillor Sutton and seconded by Councillor Mrs Davis and resolved that the application be:

REFUSED as per the recommendations within the report (attached).

2:35pm

Chairman