

PLANNING COMMITTEE



11 JANUARY 2017 - 1:00PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon(Chairman), Councillor S Clark(Vice-Chairman), Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor D W Connor, Councillor A Hay, Councillor D Laws, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor W Sutton.

APOLOGIES: Councillor Mrs Davis and Councillor Mrs Newell

Officers in attendance: Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning, David Rowen (Development Manager), Rebecca Norman (Senior Development Officer), Tim Driver (Legal Services) and Sally Taylor (Member Services)

P45/17 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes were confirmed and signed.

P46/17 F/YR15/0726/F LAND SOUTH OF CREEK ROAD FRONTING, LAMBS PLACE, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE. ERECTION OF 9 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 2 X 1-BED FLATS, 2 X 3-STOREY 3- BED, 3 X 2-STOREY 3-BED AND 2 X 2-STOREY 2-BED DWELLINGS

This item was withdrawn from the committee meeting by the Agent Peter Humphrey.

P47/17 F/YR15/1109/F LAND NORTH OF 19 TO 29, CHAPEL AVENUE, WISBECH ST MARY, CAMBRIDGESHIRE ERECTION OF 4 X 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLINGS WITH DOUBLE GARAGES AND PADDOCK FACILITIES INCLUDING STABLE BLOCKS

Members considered 3 objections from local residents.

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

Rebecca Norman presented the application to members and informed them of the update received. She stated that each detached dwelling had a paddock area and currently overlooks open land with the access between existing properties. Rebecca Norman confirmed that there is an issue for the planning officers as these dwellings are in flood risk zone 3 and not been possible to demonstrate that sequential test has been met in this instance.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Peter Humphrey the Agent supporting the application:

- Mr Humphrey stated that this application was submitted in December 2015 and the site is 2

acres for 4 well designed properties with good paddocks and stables in the centre of the Village adjacent to the school playing fields and that the application is supported by the County Council, North Level Drainage Board have no objections and the Environment Agency advises that the development can be carried in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment.

- Mr Humphrey confirmed that Wisbech St Mary is a growth Village and the site has been in front of this committee before for 20 dwellings. The recommendation was, and Mr Humphrey read the conclusion from the planning officers report 'The proposal is for residential properties on the edge of a growing village and the site lies within flood zone 2 & 3 for residential development and should be steered away from in accordance with flood responses set out in LP14 of the Local Plan of NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), however proposals provide 50% formal housing which is double the required set in the local plan and there is a demand for affordable units in the village. It was therefore considered that the application provides wider sustainable benefits contributing to meet the identified community need and thereby satisfy the exception test. The Scheme to be considered to be acceptable in terms of layout, careful design and can ensure that no resident amenities are harmed. It is considered that the proposal complies with the policies of the development plan and considered recommended that outline planning permission is granted'. Mr Humphrey stated that this was subject to a viability assessment which they did submit but didn't want to built them but was looking to see what the officers thought appropriate and clearly officers were happy with 20 affordable houses on this piece of land.
- Mr Humphrey stated that as the committee have also approved 50 slightly to the west and whether those of floor level is exactly the same floor level as the 50 already approved and in the bigger vision they are offering a footpath around the site to the north which will then link the western end of the village to the existing community centre, the playing fields and the school so that children do not have to go near the road. Mr Humphrey stated that they consider that community benefit should be considered by the committee. He added that clearly the application is in front of members because members can make the decision which he feels is an on balanced decision.
- Mr Humphrey confirmed that they have submitted 3 sequential tests because the goal posts have been moved by the planning department during the course of the application and dare I state that if it had been determined within the 8 week period would not have had to have 3 sequential tests.
- Mr Humphrey concluded that the site is a windfall site, in the middle of the village, adjacent to the school playing fields, meets the Council criteria and helps the target for the 5 year plan and is within the growth of the village. He added that he will seek before the inconsistencies and what has been approved with the history that members give serious consideration to approve.

Questions for Mr Humphrey

- Councillor Miscandlon asked for clarification of the area of the site as Mr Humphrey had stated the site was 2 acres. Mr Humphrey replied yes. Councillor Miscandlon confirmed that he believes the site calculates at 1.35 hectares which is 3.3 acres. Mr Humphrey confirmed that Councillor Miscandlon is correct and apologised.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification from Mr Humphrey that he submitted 3 sequential tests because of an 8 week period had expired. Mr Humphrey confirmed that it was in fact that if the application had been determined within the 8 weeks it should have been from December 15 there was a lot of moving of the goal posts with the planners and did not know what methodology to use and that the Chief Planning Officer had to make changes and the requirements had to be changed during the course of the application.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated her concerns with the change of policy and requirements during the application submission period and asked for clarification from officers. Nick Harding stated that some case history pre-dates officers and in terms of recent history, upon request from the agents in connection with an alternative site, not this particular one of which the agent was seeking clarification as to what methods he should use to undertake a successful sequential test and that was duly provided. However during the intervening period having provided that information there was important case law and also the County Council progressing a document recently been adopted by the authority and it is those two things that had the effect of requiring planning officers to change the methodology that had previously been issued.
- Councillor Sutton stated he understood about the methodology but it is still in flood zone 3 and to be consistent would have to go through as before. He also stated that he is concerned with the density of the dwellings and the potential paddock land and he understands that the grazing head per acre for sheep it would be 2 sheep per acre, cattle would be 1 per acre and asked for clarification on horses but would have thought a horse would want at least an acre of grazing and this is way short of that and if that is the case then the requirement would be no more than two dwellings with paddocks. Councillor Miscandlon confirm that the recommendation from the British Horse Society is 1 acre per horse per annum. Councillor Sutton is what he expected and therefore there is not enough land fit for the purpose of a paddock.
- Councillor Connor stated that the site is in flood zone 3 and that it is not the Council's Policy to encourage to build on flood zone 3 and reiterated that there is not the minimum requirement for 1 acre per horse.
- Councillor Mrs Hay stated that she is also concerned that this site is in flood zone 3 but that Mr Humphrey had mentioned the another application and her understanding was this was in flood zone 1 and therefore not the same.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Connor that the application be:

REFUSED as per the officers recommendation.

(Councillor Bucknor stated that he attends the Wisbech Town Council planning meetings but takes no part in the decision making)

**P48/17 F/YR16/0704/O
LAND WEST OF 27 – 31 CEMETERY ROAD, WHITTLESEY
ERECTION OF 20 DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS
COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS AND LAYOUT)**

Members considered 8 objections from neighbouring residents, the Doctors Surgery and the Town Council.

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

Rebecca Norman presented the application to members and informed of the update received. She mentioned the issue with Muntjac deer on the site and that this species is not protected however if

they are present on the site there is a duty of the developer that these are removed in a suitable manner. Rebecca Norman confirmed the viability and update had been submitted and assessment with the findings accepted and the overall contribution is £100,000 split between Fenland District Council and the County Council under section 106 agreement.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Councillor Chris Boden objecting to the application:

- Councillor Boden referred to the layout plan which is for outline planning permission for 20 dwellings but unusual at an outline application in that both access and layout are committed and with the layout the house type is also effectively committed even though it is not part of this application. He stated that he is rather disappointed with this because he was hoping he could be able to support this application even if it was with slight reservations of which he will mention shortly. This site is suitable for residential development and in fact that has been permission on this site since 2006.
- Councillor Boden stated he has 4 particular problems with the application as it is in front of us. First which is minor is about access and there is a problem from Cemetery Road and the reason that it would be too close to the junction with James Gardens has to Cemetery Road, that any car which is parked between the two outside of number 31 Cemetery Road would obscure the view from both roads and might be difficult for cars coming out of New Road to see cars coming out of James Gardens and would ask that a condition for double yellow lines be put in within 10 meters of the junction.
- Councillor Boden stated that having 20 houses which are 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses instead of the 13 2 bed bungalows is a significant intensification of use of this site. However he fully accepts that the number are within the overall limits that are set by central government and in the local plan. He added that for this particular site, which has a strange shape, using it as intensely as here and theoretically possible according to the numbers creates problems both for residential amenity to the north of the site and for the adjacent Doctor's surgery to the south of the site. Councillor Boden would like to suggest to the members of the committee that this over intensification even if the numbers are satisfied that this particular site cannot handle that level of intensity of the use of the land.
- Councillor Boden confirmed that the site is basically rectangular in shape which is being developed with the northern half of the site borders James Gardens where there are 7 bungalows and if you look at the detail members will see that the plot sizes for the 7 bungalows in James Gardens tend to be larger than the pairs of semi-detached houses which are proposed adjacent to James Gardens. He added that this shows the difference that there will be in the intensity between bungalows and this proposed gardens.
- Councillor Boden stated that the southern half of the site borders the Doctors surgery and car park and to one site the Fire Station. Mr Boden stated that clear that the 8 two storey houses adjacent to James Gardens will not be visually in keeping with the 7 bungalows on James Gardens itself and will look strange and there are 8 houses lined up against James Gardens. He added that as the plans shows it would be clearly difficult to avoid significant overlooking of 18 James Gardens in particular.
- Councillor Boden stated that as far as the Doctors surgery is concerned to the south, this surgery was built there very carefully to maximize the privacy of the consulting rooms for Doctors. He added that it was expected that the adjacent site would be occupied by bungalows. He added that as from the site plan there are 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 that directly overlook the surgery and specifically the ground floor consulting rooms and the distance from the new houses to the surgery windows will be only 14 meters, which he considered is catastrophic because a need of high level of confidentiality as in the letter from the Practice Manager.

Questions for Councillor Boden - there were none.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Justin Mills of Contour Planning Services the agents supporting the application:

- Mr Mills confirmed that his client is Tesco and hopes that the committee recommend to approve as previous application and that the officers report covers all the issues. He confirmed that negotiations that have taken place between Tesco, planning and County Highways officers of which discussion have focused on scale of development, the nature of the proposal combination, potential impact on neighbouring properties, local roads and the section 106 contribution.
- Mr Mills stated that the number of properties being proposed the planning officers of advised that the scheme is acceptable despite being denser than the last planning permission for 30 bungalows as approved on the site which the permission has now lapsed. He added that the justification for increasing the density is based on a number of factors: First: members may not be aware but prior to the bungalow scheme being permitted the site was in fact subject to a planning permission of 38 flats and this planning permission clearer gives a denser two storey development that had already been accepted on a large part of this site by this council. Second: Since the bungalow scheme was approved the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) was introduced and developments to make most effective use of land, particularly land that which is close to transport opportunities as well as local shops and services. This means that denser developments are now being actively encouraged in urban locations particularly sites close to the town centre such as this one. Thirdly: despite the proposed increase in density the application is still well below the average of 40 dwellings per hectare which Fenland Council achieved last year with this site being 32 dwellings per hectare. He added that in comparison the flatted scheme that was permitted on this site was considerably more dense than the proposal. Fourthly: contrary to what has been suggested by the housing objectors the site is not in an area which is for low density and the fact that the 20 properties which were identified by Fenland's officers as neighbours to the application site only 5 are bungalows and the wider area is predominantly two storey.
- Mr Mills stated that the design and layout issues the proposed development incorporates a number of measures which are concluded to help reduce the impact on neighbouring properties and these include careful siting of the proposed houses, use of boundary fencing and the separation distances between the new houses and adjoining properties. He added that in relation to separation distances the proposed layout exceeds the minimum distances which architects and planners are required to follow and as result of such measures that your officers have advised him that the scheme will not have a detrimental impact on adjoining properties and measures can be introduced at a reserved matters stage to further again potential concerns.
- Mr Mills stated in regard to the concerns from the medical centre the planning officers have advised members that the separate distances and use of boundary fencing will afford the potential impact. He added that furthermore it is common in most medical facilities to use privacy blinds on external windows and this would be an entirely appropriate low cost issue where the medical centre to remain concerned.
- Mr Mills stated in response to the local Ward Councillors comments that the site would be more suitable for elderly accommodation he reminded members that the application before members is for market housing available to all age groups and that the planning officers have confirmed that this type of residential development is entirely policy compliant.
- Mr Mills confirmed that the Local Highways Authority have raised no objection to the application and furthermore the level of parking accords with the Council's standards therefore believe that parking will not overflow out of the site.
- Mr Mills concluded that he can confirm that in accordance with the viability of the Council Policies on viability that a full viability assessment has been undertaken and this demonstrates that his client can make a contribution of £100,000 and viable to provide affordable housing on the site or to contribute to community sums. He added that the officers have taken a thorough investigation of this assessment and therefore the proposed scale of development does not represent over development of the site and will not lead to

detrimental invasive around properties and attractive properties, update to standards and the scale of section 106 contribution is appropriate and for these reasons he asks members to follow the officers recommendation and approve the application.

Questions for Mr Mills

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that there is another development near to the town centre and close proximity to this site and the developer listened to the neighbours in Nursery Gardens adjacent to the site and comprised for bungalows on the Nursery Gardens boundary and asked if Mr Mills had considered this option. Mr Mills stated that not considered this because listened to the housing team. Councillor Laws asked Mr Mills as the developer had he considered that this would be a proposition. Mr Mills stated that he could not comment as this has not happened but could say that Tesco did not implement the bungalow scheme previously did not implement it. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she is still concerned and perhaps there are other reasons.
- Councillor Connor asked Mr Mills if the entrance site is being adopted by Highways. Mr Mills confirmed that this would be designed to Highways standard.
- Councillor Mrs Hay asked for clarification where the bin storage would be on this site and whether the road is wide enough to accommodate the refuse lorry. Mr Mills stated that residents would have their own bin storage and the access road has estate road has been tracked for a refuse vehicle and no concern.
- Councillor Sutton stated that on the entrance can see the logic of the fears concerning this and should the committee decide that the whole site is acceptable but want to put a condition would that be considered. Mr Mills stated that the entrance in Cemetery Road conditions requires that the access details be agreed with the County Council. Councillor Miscandlon asked for confirmation of this from the officers. Rebecca Norman confirmed that this would be the case that Highways have requested a number of conditions which do include details of the access so there is an opportunity to request conditions.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she has a number of issues in respect of this application. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if members can look at the overall area of this section of Cemetery Road and just beyond the Cemetery is another development called The Paddocks and that development and is all bungalows. She added that she appreciates what the agent has said having discussions about this application. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that this is an outline application but if approved members will be approving the layout and access and leaves just housing design.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that the Cemetery is directly opposite this site and frequently, in particular at weekends there are vehicles parked from the top of the junction at Bassenhally Road to the roundabout on the Cemetery side and this is a busy road that takes through traffic from the largest estate in Whittlesey, leads directly onto A605 and also access to a school. She added that this is a busy road and gave an example of having to park in Whittlesey and having to walk to the Cemetery as there were no parking spaces in the road.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that in the report officers had already indicated that there could be a problem with overlooking and design issues with certain properties in particular James Garden and personally feels that bungalows should be built on that boundary with bungalows throughout the site to match the street scene similar to The Paddocks would be far more sensible approach. She added that the Doctors surgery is on one side of the boundary with James Gardens on the other side.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that there have been no comments from Middle Level in respect of surface water disposal.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that the members need to listen to the Town Council and their

decision to refuse this application and the volume of objections concerning this site. She added that this is a town location which lends itself to bungalows for the simple reason Whittlesey has a number of new developments with family and starter homes on Feldale which is 460 properties with potentially another application for 160. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that already approved Showfield and Snowly Park and considers that there is a lack of bungalows in Whittlesey. She stated that she would refuse the application.

- Councillor Connor stated that he has concerns with this application as members are being asked to make a planning decision to agree access and layout but also to give the officers delegated powers to deal with the viability and is concerned. He stated that the viability assessment states in paragraph 9.111 in the report that the agent has agreed to pay a contribution of £100,000 split between Fenland District and County Council, however LP5 of Fenland District Housing Strategy says affordable housing will be required on site being 5 dwellings but if an applicant makes financial contribution it would be the equivalent of 5. He stated that a plot usually makes between £70,000 and £75,000 and if this is added up it should be nearer to £350,000 to £375,000 and not the £100,000 on offer. He stated that he feels that the Council must not sell themselves short but accepts that this site is right for development.
- Councillor Connor clarified that members must determine the application as it is in front of them today and for the reasons of overdevelopment, lack in content of the application and selling ourselves short he would not support this application.
- Councillor Connor stated that if a planning application is approved he asks that the details of the full application come back to this committee for approval.
- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification of the type of properties being built in the new developments in immediate area of the site of which was confirmed by Councillor Mrs Laws a mixture development but that the Paddocks are all bungalows. Councillor Sutton stated it is not ideal but has all the amenities space and less than the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) says that can built and members would like to see bungalows but these are not on offer and need to come up with a proper planning reason to refuse.
- Councillor Murphy agreed with Councillor Sutton's comments and need reason to refuse and if it went to appeal in his opinion would loose.
- Councillor Mrs Laws suggested LP16 as a reason which states 'enhances local setting, improves character of local build on street scene and settlement pattern' She added that even if considered this as a mixed development similar to Elm Park and the boundary on James Garden be mindful of overlooking it could be a mixed development.
- Councillor Mrs Hay confirmed her agreement with Councillor Mrs Laws and vary the houses being built to existing bungalows and if this was considered for James Gardens would not have a problem with the application.
- Councillor Miscandlon reminded members that being asked to approve at this moment is outline and the design of the houses is a reserved matter. Councillor Mrs Hay stated that this application is asking members to approve the layout. Nick Harding confirmed that members had raised a number of points and wished to clarify these. Nick Harding stated with regards to the issue with the viability as committee members are aware officers work on viability information which is submitted in the background and do not normally present the details workings out of that and if members have concerns and wish to potentially refuse this application on the viability position then would recommend a decision on the application is deferred and reconsidered by a future committee meeting so that you can see the detailed information that has been submitted by the developer and agreed with planning officer. He added reason he has suggested this is because in making the decision to refuse the application you do not currently have the data in front of your to make a properly informed decision from a factual point of view. Nick Harding clarified the issue of whether should put bungalows on this site that have to bear in mind that in an appeal situation would have to demonstrate that there is a definite need for bungalows on this site which is going unmet and does not feel that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it is essential on this site. Nick Harding clarified on the issue of overlooking and that potentially is a reason to utilise to refuse this application and referring to Mrs Councillor Laws comments on what is

said in the officers report with regard to 2 plots the look to the back gardens of the bungalow and what officers are approving are the footprint and location of those plots and not being asked to approve the design at this stage, potentially putting in a reserved matters application for a two and a half or three storey house which would tower over that plot and note of caution but treating these plots as every day semi-detached and a satisfactory arrangement could be established given the proximity.

- Nick Harding confirmed the relationship with the surgery officers are satisfied that there is adequate separation distance and an existing track which leads along side of the surgery so potentially a loss of privacy already. He added that through conditions and fencing can be put in place on those properties which rear elevation look towards the surgery to resolve that issue.
- Nick Harding stated that issues concerning the main road of which the access is proposed and accept on street parking as a consequence of visiting the Cemetery but this happens in a number of locations but cannot necessarily use this as a reason to reject what is a perfectly safe access in terms of its visibility and junction design.
- Councillor Bucknor asked for clarification that if this outline application is accepted can this come back to committee for the final decision. Nick Harding asked if Councillor Bucknor was referring to the reserved matter or the full planning permission and stated that in theory the committee could make a resolution to require that but the only note of caution that not aware of a technical ability to put a flag on this so that as and when reserved matters or full application 3 years further that the officer will get notification that it automatically comes to committee.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he is sure members would make sure that this application comes back to the committee but cannot see a solid planning reason to go against and his request would be that if approved that it does come back and those areas of concern are dealt with in a proper and satisfactory manner.
- Councillor Sutton stated that his Doctors Surgery has parking right outside of the consulting rooms and a path running along the side and this is similar to other surgeries so it would be up to the surgery to make sure that patients have privacy.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked officers to clarify how you would demonstrate that bungalows are required. Nick Harding stated that evidence would be through research being undertaken to identify the detailed nature of housing need in the area. Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification that who would undertake the research. Nick Harding confirmed that Fenland does not currently undertake such a detailed assessment. Councillor Mrs Laws confirmed that you do not know if bungalows are required or not. Nick Harding confirmed that is correct but that equally they do have the evidence that a housing scheme is unacceptable because it fails to provide bungalows. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she thinks that Mr Harding has given the members a way to refuse from the overlooking perspective and asked Mr Harding for clarification. Nick Harding stated that this is not exactly a reason and clarified that if the committee does not feel that the overlooking issue could be satisfactorily be resolved through the design of houses or boundary treatments and then potentially members could refuse the application on that basis. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that would like to challenge the highways report and have done a desk top study and that this is a main throughway. She added if members decided to approve the application there is no going back and these will be houses and this is the layout and would recommend to refuse the application on overlooking grounds.
- Councillor Sutton has listened to Councillor Mrs Laws comments and confirmed that this site has had planning permission for bungalows and not built. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that there has been planning permission for two storey and not built. Councillor Sutton confirmed that the application before them is what they need to make decision on today but in his opinion he cannot see where it could be defended refusal and added that he would like to defer the application. Councillor Connor agreed with Councillor Sutton and proposed that the application be deferred on overlooking matters and viability. Councillor Mrs Laws confirmed that she would second Councillor Connor's proposal to defer.
- Councillor Sutton stated that committee members are not financial experts and the viability

is worked out by experts and should trust their advise as only a few weeks a viability assessment whereby development did not want to give anything but the officers managed to secure viability. Councillor Connor agreed with Councillor Sutton that members do not know the costs but would still like this application deferred so that members can have the information on this. Councillor Laws and Nick Harding both confirmed that this is an option that has been offered to members. Nick Harding asked for clarification from members that a proposal has been put on the table but if members wish for a deferral asked members to give refinement that the report needs to come back so that members can assess the viability and in terms of the overlooking for the officers can go away and see if can identify that potential overlooking can be mitigated.

- Councillor Miscandlon as Chairman confirmed that members are not deciding on the type of houses and deciding on layout and access. Councillor Miscandlon confirmed that members have been given an option to defer on specific grounds on the 106 viability and the overlooking issue clarifying the proposal from Councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Mrs Laws to defer application for those reasons only.
- Councillor Bucknor asked for clarification is that the layout of the houses cannot be designed not overlooking even if they are 2 storey and his understanding that it is committed and should it be a refinement of conditions. Nick Harding confirmed that in bringing the report back to members for those units that are adjacent to the surgery and what can look at is the mitigation proposal and could condition 1.8 meter fences and identify the separate distance and first floor window design to give members the satisfaction that overlooking is not likely to be an issue. Nick Harding confirmed that would be a similar exercise in respect of the two plots that overlook the rear garden of the bungalow and conditions in relation to those two plots.
- Councillor Bucknor stated that this is not the usual permission. Councillor Connor stated would like to defer and go back to the agent in respect of bungalows where there are issues.
- A discussion took place with members concerning overlooking and layout issues and whether to defer the application as already proposed.
- Nick Harding clarified that the proposal is to bring back details of the viability information for members to consider and for officers to address the overlooking issue.

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

DEFERRED for further evidential information on 106 viability and overlooking and to be brought back to the Planning Committee.

(Councillor Miscandlon, Councillor Sam Clark, Councillor Bucknor, Councillor Connor, Councillor Mrs Hay, Councillor Mrs Laws, Councillor Murphy and Councillor Sutton declared an interest as they had all been lobbied on this item)

(Councillor Miscandlon and Councillor Laws stated that they attended the Whittlesey Town Council planning meetings but take no part in the decision making)

P49/17

F/YR16/0885/F

LAND EAST OF 3, WEST STREET, CHATTERIS, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY, 3-BED DWELLING INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDING

Members considered 7 objections from residents and an objection from the Chatteris Town Council.

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

David Rowen presented the application to members and confirmed that there had been no update.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Matthew Hall of Morton & Hall the Agent supporting the application:

- Mr Morton stated that the officer's report sums up the application site and that the original builders yard was in development for 2006/7
- Mr Morton confirmed that the site is in flood zone 1 and that the area of the dilapidated building will provide adequate parking and a third garden once demolished.
- Mr Morton concluded that the materials are to be agreed in the future and hoped that the committee agree approval.

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

- Councillor Connor stated that he noted on the site visit that the area looked a mess and this proposal will only enhance the area and suggest that go with the officers recommendation to approve.

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

GRANTED as per the officers recommendations and subject to the conditions

1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. If during development, contamination not previously identified, is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with
3. Prior to the commencement of development samples and trade descriptions of the external facing and roofing materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail.
4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a scheme for hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
5. Prior to commencement of development details of existing ground levels (in relation to an existing datum point), proposed finished floor levels and floor slab levels to the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter retained in accordance with the approved details.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any Order or Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), planning permission shall be required for the following developments or alterations: i) the erection of a freestanding curtilage buildings or structures including car ports, garages, sheds, greenhouses, pergolas, or raised decks (as detailed in Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A and E); ii) the erection of house extensions including conservatories, garages, car ports or porches (as detailed in Schedule 2, Part1,

Classes A and E); iii) alterations including installations of additional windows, doors, including dormer windows or roof windows (as detailed in Scheme 2, Part 1, Classes A and B); iv) alterations to the roof of the dwelling house (as detailed in Schedule 2, part 1, Class C); v) the erection of any walls, fences or other means of enclosure to the site (as details in Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A).

7. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved the proposed on-site parking areas shall be laid out in accordance with the approved plan and thereafter retained for that specific use.

(Councillor Murphy declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8 and will take no part the decision making and left the room whilst it was discussed)

(Councillor Micandlon, Councillor S Clark, Councillor Bucknor, Councillor Connor, Councillor Mrs Hay, Councillor Mrs Laws, Councillor Murphy and Councillor Sutton declared an interest by virtue that the applicant is known to them, an ex-councillor and they have been lobbied by him)

(Councillor Mrs Hay stated that she attends the Chatteris Town Council planning meetings but takes no part in the decision making).

P50/17

F/YR16/0900/F

**PLOT 1 LAND NORTH OF 169, RAMNOTH ROAD, WISBECH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY 3-BED DWELLING INVOLVING THE
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDING**

Members considered objection from the Wisbech Town Council

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

David Rowen presented the application to members and informed them that no update had been received.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Peter Humphrey the Agent supporting the application:

- Mr Humphrey stated that a phone call was received from one of the planning officers who stated would be writing this application up for approval and informed his client, however over Christmas we received the agenda with recommend to refuse. .
- Mr Humphrey referred to the site and if members looked at the bigger picture of the site it has one house already built on it and an there was an approval for 3 which expired in 2008. He added that under the Freedom of Information request did not come back with the answers and was not conclusive that could still built the existing 4 bed house on the site but his client does not want to do that. Mr Humphrey stated that his client has asked them to present a decent 3 bed bungalow and planning officers have said that we are shoehorning this in and would like to confirm to planning officer that this is equivalent 1- per acre and do not considered this to be shoehorning in.
- Mr Humphrey stated that this property is in flood zone 1 and currently used as a roofing contractors business and yard. He added that there is no restriction on the storage of

materials and they can come and go as they wish but his client would like to stop using as a contractors yard and build a bungalow on this. Mr Humphrey stated that his client will sell the yard off as an existing yard and can be used by other people but do not want this and would become an inherent problem. He added that this simple bungalow gives the answer as there are only 2 dwellings on this site and planners have already approved 3 and in his opinion that common sense does not come into the planners recommendation.

- Mr Humphrey stated that in his opinion his client is being penalised for other houses that the committee or officers have already approved close to his boundary and is it his clients problem if planners have allowed properties to be build adjacent to him. He added that his client have put in for permission for a bungalow rather than a house so not overlooking and that the bungalow offers 163 square meters of garden which is 63% of the plot and that is not shoehorning it in. He added that the proposed bungalow is 1.5 meters away from the boundary and does not consider that this is classed as close to the boundary as stated by planning officers.
- Mr Humphrey stated that in his opinion that the members are being mislead by the officers and that this was a balanced application clearly because the officer phone to say it would be approved and for some reason someone does not want it approved and does not agree to the recommendations on the report. He confirmed that there are 6 letters of support from immediate neighbours and would therefore ask that members ask officers what it is all about and why was recommendation to approve turned to a recommendation of refusal and do you want to continue the builders yard there or the bungalow to replace it.
- Mr Humphrey stated that if members are concerned about the gable of the bungalow his client is happy to put a hip rood on to reduce the impact.

Questions for Mr Humphrey

- Councillor Connor asked Mr Humphrey to clarify why he thinks over Christmas officers changed their views on the application. Mr Humphrey stated 'perhaps they did not get the presents they wanted' Councillor Miscandlon as Chairman called to order and stopped Mr Humphrey as this question cannot be answered by Mr Humphrey and only the officers can answer this question and what was said by Mr Humphrey is a supposition of what happened.
- Councillor Connor stated with respect of our officers are top class but will be asking the officers to reply to the questions.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked Mr Humphrey to clarify that he is prepared to redesign the gable. Mr Humphrey confirmed that yes he would and this would not be an issue.

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

- Councillor Connor referred to his previous questions and asked officers why they changed their view on this application. David Rowen stated that the situation that there was an email from the case officer to Mr Humphrey's office on 28 November and set out what was a balanced judgement although there was a possibility of the application being refused. Nick Harding confirmed that Mr Humphrey had been in touch with him since he had forwarded a copy of the email from the case officers to his officer and that Mr Humphrey had contacted him to say that there was a call from the case officer J Thomas but unfortunately he cannot confirm this is the case officer is on leave and unable to ascertain the situation.
- Councillor Bucknor asked officers if it is common practice to advise applicants on an application. Nick Harding stated that the system that encourage case officers to use is that they should not be indicating to the agents whether or not the recommendation is for approval or refusal until such time that it was been vetted through the line manager as we do not want to happen a refusal of the situation. Nick Harding added that very occasionally even after it has been through case management with a line management faults do

- occasionally happen but try to reduce the changes of a return as much as possible.
- Councillor Bucknor stated that the reason for asking because of the issue from the agent it looks as if the system is not working and that officers need to abide by the process.
 - Councillor Mrs Laws asked about the workshop and what is in situ at the moment if that workshop is sold and the residential property does not take its place is the agent correct that there are no conditions attached to that for example traffic movements, working 7 days a week or is it just the responsibility of the present owner that they are mindful of the neighbour. David Rowen stated that without researching the original 1982 permission he could not say what conditions are there but notwithstanding the planning issue there are controls on how companies or businesses operate from an environmental health perspective and other legislation.
 - Councillor Mrs Hay confirmed that whether or not the threat goes ahead to sell the site as a builders yard that members are here to decide on the application on its merit.
 - Councillor Murphy confirmed his agreement with Councillor Mrs Hay but added that it is often put to members that 'if don't do this they are going to do that' and this has nothing to do with planning. He added that in his opinion this is a rude way of going about business and that members should not be put in such a position.
 - Councillor Mrs Laws stated that members are aware that conditions have changed.
 - Councillor Mrs Hay stated her proposal to go with the officers recommendations.

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

REFUSED as per officers recommendation.

(Councillor Bucknor stated that he attends the Wisbech Town Council planning meeting but takes no part in the decision making).

**P51/17 F/YR16/0932/O
LAND NORTH WEST OF DRUMMOND LODGE, SPENCER DROVE, GUYHIRN,
CAMBRIDGESHIRE.
ERECTION OF 4NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN
RESPECT OF ACCESS ONLY)**

Members considered a representation from the Environment Agency.

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

Rebecca Norman presented the application to members and informed them of the update. She confirmed the site is accessed via a private drive with some residential, paddocks and agricultural land along the driveway. The development site shows that there are parts in flood zone 1, 2 and remaining in flood zone 3. The highway safety is acceptable but the site not considered suitable in respect of LP3 or RECAP (Refuse Collection Standards) guidelines.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Mr Matthew Hall of Morton & Hall the Agents supporting the application:

- Mr Hall confirmed that the applicant had put in pre-application for a development in another section of this site and he was advised it was in flood zone 3 and would not be supported, therefore his proposals to move the development to be 80% in flood zone 1 and referred to the plan on the screen shows the extent of the flood zone 2/3 and that 80-90% of the site is

in flood zone 1 and not as in the report 1.8 predominantly in flood zone 3. He added that had looked at the flood zone area and sited the development predominantly in flood zone 1.

- Mr Hall confirmed that he has had a flood risk assessment carried out by Geoff Beal which has been approved by the Environment Agency. He added that the Environment Agency are not objection and neither is the North Level Drainage Board.
- Mr Hall confirmed that a community consultation has been carried to adjacent properties and the Parish Council and support has been received as the officers report advises that this is required.
- Mr Hall confirmed that prior to submitting the application obtained pre-application advice from the highways and agreed a layout as on the plan and no objections from the highways office.
- Mr Hall stated that before submitting the application concerning the roadway which is a private tarmac road and speaking with the refuse driver and since the road was constructed the refuse truck uses this driveway to serve all properties and turns to return to the main road. He added that it is proposed to extend the existing tarmac driveway to allow greater room for manoeuvring for vehicles and that the refuse truck would still be able to use this roadway and would comply with the RECAP (Refuse Collection Standards) guidelines.
- Mr Hall stated that in October planning committee there was an application for 9 dwellings in March and was approved off a private drive although there was in total 25 houses on this private drive.
- Mr Hall stated that this site and surrounding sites was originally in Fenland's local plan 1989-2001 and in the officers report and as heard it states that this joins the main settlement of Guyhirn. He added that in the report it states that this proposal is considered to be in keeping and Parish Council support the application.
- Mr Hall concluded that the proposal was moved to a lesser flood zone following pre-application advise and that there is no objection from the Highways, Environment Agency, Drainage Board and community consultation shows support for the proposal.

Questions for Mr Hall:

- Councillor Mrs Laws asked Mr Hall to clarify where he obtained the information about the flood zone areas. Mr Hall confirmed that instructed Mr Geoff Beal to carry out a flood risk assessment and the information was in his report and also that the surrounding area was obviously in flood zone 2 and that information was from the Environment Agency.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws asked form clarification from officers if they were in agreement that this development is in a flood zone 1. Rebecca Norman confirmed that the latest data on their maps from the Environment Agency and this shows that just under 50% is in flood zone 2 and 3 and that plot 4 and some of plot 3 are in a high risk flood zone 3 area.
- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification from officers that if the application was for 2 dwellings in flood zone 1 would it have been recommended for approval. David Rowen confirmed that even if the application was only for plots 1 and 2 within flood zone , it still does not necessarily cover the other planning concerns that officers have and would be unlikely that that would be sufficient for officers recommendation to be favourable.

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

REFUSED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Bucknor stated that he attends the Wisbech Town Council planning meetings but takes no part in the decision making).

P52/17

F/YR16/0945/F

**LAND SOUTH OF PROSPECT HOUSE, BURROWMOOR ROAD, MARCH,
CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

**ERECTION OF AN AGRICULTURAL STORAGE BUILDING INCLUDING THE
FORMATION OF HARDSTANDING AND THE WIDENING OF EXISTING ACCESS**

Members considered objection from the planning officers and letter of objection in relation to the impact.

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

David Rowen presented the application to members and confirmed that there had been an update. He confirmed that the application is for a storage building and agricultural depot for business with hard standing area in front of the building. He confirmed that a letter of objection had been received as part of the update in respect of the impact of this building.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Councillor Jan French in support of the application:

- Councillor Mrs French confirmed that she is in support of this application and local business which is an agricultural/horticultural business. She confirmed that the application is for an agricultural building on agricultural land and should be supported. She confirmed that the business grows over 400,000 roses a year and sells in the region of 160,00 - 170,000 roses a year and under a two year rotation of the land.
- Councillor French confirmed that the building is required to store roses when they have been lifted and stored in a controlled environment until delivered to the wholesale customers. She added that timing is crucial due to when the roses are lifted and need to be stored in a controlled environment otherwise they will spoil.
- Councillor Mrs French referred to the Fenland Economic Development Strategy 2012 - 2031 and sure that members are aware and have read this document but she read out some highlighted areas in how Fenland supports and encourages businesses to start, stay and grow in Fenland and promote the open for business message.
- Councillor Mrs French confirmed that this is a family run business and not a 'fly by night' and produces fantastic roses which go to Chelsea Flower Show and have won awards.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that it is her understanding that originally the applicants wanted to put the building on another part of the site but speaking with planning officers they have taken their advise and moved twice to where officers have suggested.
- Councillor French stated that in her opinion this kind of application should be supported as over the past few years there have been many approvals from this committee which included a retail parks on grade 1 & 2 agricultural land in Westry; approval of poly tunnels at a nursery in Whittlesey Road; new premises for Middle Level Whittlesey Road; a Crematorium in Knights End Road plus all the wind turbines across the fens. She added that any issues on the impact could be dealt with using landscaping and asked for members to support this application

Questions for Councillor Mrs French.

- Councillor Bucknor asked for clarification as to where the applicant goes the roses. Councillor Mrs French confirmed that the business has to rent land across the whole of Fenland because of the way roses have to be grown on a 2 year cycle otherwise the land is contaminated and will not produce so not viable to buy land to grown on but purchased land with hope to the agricultural building on for storing in a controlled environment when lifting the roses prior to selling. Councillor Bucknor asked for clarification if this building is in the

centre of the growing area. Councillor Mrs French confirmed that this is probably the case as the growing land rented is across the whole of Fenland.

- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification in Councillor French's presentation on the location of the 12 poly tunnels she mentioned. Councillor Mrs French confirmed that the poly tunnels are in Rings End and that this has set a precedent and approved.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification concerning the rotation of crops and the business owner looking for a suitable building and what form of security would be used. Councillor Mrs French could not answer this but assume that CCTV and additional fencing and would be a question probably for the agent.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Gareth Edwards the Agent supporting the application:

- Mr Edwards stated that his clients are building a permanent home for their business to grow and that the land associated with this parcel will also allow his client to have a trial ground as part of the site. He added that this company has grown since it started trading in 1999.
- Mr Edwards clarified that rose growing has 3 main stages over the growing period which starts with the planning of the stock in March and budding is during June to August with 2 years later the growing rose bush is lifted.
- Mr Edwards confirmed that the company employs a core staffing of 3-4 people throughout the year which rises to 9 at budding time. He added that the additional employees are all local people and some of which are family members.
- Mr Edwards confirmed that due to processes and chemicals used a field needs to be free from rose growing for a 5 year period after lifting which is why it is not cost effective for rose growers to grow on their own land. He added that it has been difficult for his clients to purchase a small parcel of land for the erection of a building primarily used to store the rose bushes from October when they are lifted until the last bushes are delivered in January/February. He added that whilst the rose bushes are in the building there are carefully watered and monitored to make sure they stay fresh before delivered to wholesalers and garden centres but do not sell to the public with most of deliveries are carried out by the applicant to maintain customer contact.
- Mr Edwards stated that his clients roses are grown in the grounds of Balmoral Castle and on numerous occasions at Chelsea Flower Show.
- Mr Edwards referred to the plan on screen that initially the building was close to the by-pass in flood zone 1 but after meeting with the planning officer on site and taking the officers advice agreed the location of the building which is now in flood zone 3 closer to the neighbouring properties. He added that have offered screening suitable for the open nature of the site and prepared to accept any landscaping conditions, fencing.
- Mr Edwards stated that it should be noted that the drawing shows opposite to the site there is a recently extended commercial workshop which has a size of 18 meters by 18 meters and his clients building is 12.5 meters by 24 meters. He added there is also an agricultural building opposite closer to the by-pass which is approximately 18 meters by 11 meters.
- Mr Edwards stated that behind this proposed building is the location of what was planned to be the new building for the West Anglia College which was due to be 3 storey in places and whilst he notes this was not approved he could only assume that given its size it would make this proposal miniscule in scale.
- Mr Edwards stated that the applicant lives approximately half a mile from the site and at present their storage is in Parson Drove, however the present store is a short term arrangement which if unable to get planning permission for this building his client are in danger of having to close their business as there is no other land available to build on. He added that there is support of all the standard consultees and the only objection came from when the building was moved to this location on the site to please the planners.
- Mr Edwards concluded by stating that Fenland is 'open for business' and here is a well run small family business looking to erect an agricultural building on agricultural land in Fenland

where it would be appropriate. He added that he asks for common sense to prevail to support this application and allow his clients business to move forward and blossom and prepared to accept any conditions that the committee feel appropriate.

Questions for Mr Edwards:

- Councillor Murphy asked for clarification as to where the roses are grown. Mr Edwards confirmed that his client lives on Whittlesey Road in March and over the past 17 years rented land in Turves, Guyhirn and Rings End is where they are going next and start planting in March on the land in Rings End which is behind the poly tunnels mentioned earlier by Councillor Mrs French and his clients also have land rented in Parson Drove.
- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification whether the building is for storage of root plant, flower, machinery or cold store and is the client producer of flower or root. Mr Edwards confirmed his clients process which starts with the root coming from Holland on HGV delivery which goes to all rose growers through the whole of East Anglia which goes into the store and held there until physically planted into the ground, wherever the land is rented. Mr Edwards stated that the budding takes place in the summer and then lifting of the bushes 2 years later as a crop and sold as a crop and no processing in the building which would be used to storage and subject to what variety is required and stored as and when needed to be delivered. Councillor Sutton stated that he understands that the building would be to store the root as comes in from Holland until planting and used storage. Mr Edwards stated that when the stock plant comes into storage it is not usually held more than two weeks and stated that there is no refrigeration on site it would be purely an insulated building and controlled the temperature with standard dryers similar to grain store dryers.
- Councillor Mrs Hay asked Mr Edwards if there would be extra employment. Mr Edwards confirmed that Mr & Mrs Griffin his client employs themselves and 2 other staff and their daughter is also a part time worker but this would allow them to move forward and could increase the number of plants they grow with the storage capacity.
- Councillor Hay stated that there are couple of letters of support from people in Spalding and Norwich and asked if his clients are dealing with people more local or have they thought of building in Spalding or Norwich area. Mr Edwards stated that his clients are born and lived in March and Mr Griffin from Guyhirn and Mrs Griffin from Ramsey and therefore the core area of the business and workers they use are from this area which ideally they wish to stay here. Mr Edwards confirmed that his client supplies all over the country to Garden Centres and as far as Scotland but this site is only half a mile from their house and that small parcels of agricultural land is very difficult to buy.
- Councillor Sutton stated that the applicants live on Whittlesey Road is there any room for this type of building next to the house. Mr Edwards stated that the area is mostly residential all around where his client lives and cannot build.
- Councillor Sutton enquired if there would be roses grown on this land or is it the wrong type of soil. Mr Edwards stated that this land gives his client options to allow them to have some trial grounds if they wanted, although they have not had trials grounds before this would enhance the business and with the soil being less heavy on this site it would be suitable for trial grounds.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification on security on the site as the owners live half a mile away would they be concerned about the business and machinery and any intrusive security systems installed. Mr Edwards confirmed that his clients would install CCTV and no different to his security at his office on the A47 with CCTV and alarm system. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if his client are happy for business to be there. Mr Edwards stated that there would be no need for added security.

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

- Councillor Bucknor asked for clarification from officers if the building location on the site was recommended because of noise issues. David Rowen stated that discussion took place

where the building could be on the site which had certain limits as there is a gas pipeline that runs through the land which restricts siting. The possibility was considered in terms of the building being more adjacent to Burrowmoor Road but the problem with that it is then in front of some residential units. This position was potentially slightly more prominent and while probably not the best position in the site perhaps the least worst position within the site.

- Councillor Murphy confirmed that the area of land rented was in Parson Drove, Guyhirn and Turves and would have thought that a suitable site in that area where grown and not on the March by-pass and it is open countryside and putting more traffic on the A141 and surrounding area. Nick Harding referred to Councillor Murphy's comment and to clarify what the agent mentioned is that the applicant has found it very challenging to find suitable sites of small parcels of agricultural land on which to site this building so it may not be in their minds the best place but are struggling to find somewhere suitable and managed to secure a site and should be borne in mind in terms of the determination of the application.
- Councillor Sutton stated that would like to support this business particularly a couple working hard but has concerns about the building and suddenly a security risk and got to have a house built next door and have those concerns and leaning towards the applicants position and in terms of the traffic on A141 this will go along the A141 to Parson Drove but wont take much to lean the other way.
- Councillor Bucknor asked for clarification concerning control over the colour of the building as it may be one reason why objections as a building in the middle of a fields and maybe some colour could mitigate the problem. David Rowen confirmed that the submitted plans indicate that the wall cladding will be in a green leather colour and that is something can deal with and if members were to grant would suggest a green colour would be most appropriate in this location.
- Councillor Mrs Laws clarified that the Council have a mission statement which says Fenland is 'Open for Business' and it has been difficult for this applicant to find an area of land of size and suitable for their means and appreciate it is not far from where they live although they rent land is all over it would not make a difference. She added that her fears about security have been alleviated and the colour of the building is complementary to the area with possible future employment of a growth opportunity for this family business and would recommend to grant.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he had looked at the application several times during the week and give and only one objection from the area. He added a building in the countryside and this is in Fenland and we see buildings in the countryside and I will go against officers recommendation on the basis does not believe it will be an eyesore and recommend approval.
- Nick Harding asked for clarification of proposal for recommendation and if that it would be with officers being given delegated authority to place conditions.
- Councillor Sutton stated that there have been given conditions in the report. Nick Harding clarified when members are going against officers recommendation they do not have a set of conditions available for today and would seek delegated authority so that officers can make decision as per committee proposal to issue planning permission. Councillor Sutton confirmed would request delegated authority to officers in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice Chairman. Councillor Laws stated that do not want conditions that are detrimental to this business.

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

GRANTED with subject to the conditions for delegated authority to officers in conjunction with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee.