

PLANNING COMMITTEE



1 MARCH 2017 - 1:00PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon(Chairman), Councillor S Clark(Vice-Chairman), Councillor M G Bucknor, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor Mrs A Hay, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor Mrs V M Bucknor(Substitute) and Councillor D Hodgson(Substitute).

APOLOGIES: Councillor D W Connor and Councillor Mrs F S Newell

Officers in attendance: Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), David Rowen (Development Manager), Tim Driver (Legal Services), Mike Freeman (Section 106 Officer), Paul Smith (Section 106 Officer) and Sally Taylor (Member Services)

P57/17 **PREVIOUS MINUTES**

P58/17 **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 this application which had been deferred from a previous Planning Committee held on 11 January 2017 to allow for further information in relation to the impacts on the existing neighbouring dwellings and viability.

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 outline application to members and referred to the matters of access and layout consideration. Confirming that this application was deferred from the January Planning Committee meeting for further consideration on issues of viability and the relationship with surrounding properties. He confirmed that further plans had been submitted by the applications illustrating the nature of the properties in the vicinity on James Gardens to the north of the site, Elm Park and also the relationship with the Doctors surgery. David Rowen clarified the distances from the properties to the Doctors surgery are 16.5 meters and the distance for James Gardens are between 24 to 29 meters and the relationship between properties on James Gardens/Elm Park are approximately 14 to 15 meters with one at 12 meters. He added that the one relationship which was giving members concern was number 15 James Garden and confirmed the distance is 10 meters. A similar relationship between a property on Elm Park and James Gardens is approximately 9.5 meters. Additionally a cross-section showing a conventional two storey property at Plot 15 with sight lines shows that with appropriate boundary treatment overlooking of James Gardens could be limited. David Rowen confirmed that design details are not for consideration at this point in time and will be subject to the reserved matters application, if members were minded to grant outline planning permission, and further more detailed consideration would be able to given to that particular relationship at that point in time.

David Rowen confirmed the other matter related to the viability of the site and the development was due to provide a Section 106 contribution of £100,000 after the viability assessment had taken

place with no affordable housing contribution and a summary of the financial status is in the report. He added that council has invited the section 106 officers Mike Freeman and Paul Smith who are here to answer any detailed queries on the viability. David Rowen confirmed that the overall officers recommendation remains as in January and should be granted subject to the Section 106 agreement.

- Councillor Miscandlon clarified to committee members that this item, when previously before the committee, was deferred on 2 specific items and it therefore must be accepted that the others items on the agenda on that day which were not highlighted are therefore acceptable in real terms. He added that the committee are only discussing the 2 deferred items.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Councillor Mrs Kay Mayor as District Councillor and she declared an NPI as she is related to the owners of number 4 James Gardens and presenting today as one of the District Councillors of Bassenhally Ward and in support of the Whittlesey Town Council's unanimous decision to recommend refusal of the application.

- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that the proposed application is for outline with an indicative plan showing 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes, all of which are two storey. She added that this is not in keeping with properties adjacent to the site in James Gardens, which are all bungalows and in the immediate vicinity numbers 37 and 39 Sanctuary Road are bungalows and number 17 to 23 Elm Park are also bungalows. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that the proposed two storey dwellings will have a significant impact on the privacy of the existing properties, especially number 16 James Gardens.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that with these proposed 20 dwellings comes a potential for 40 vehicles and confirmed that Cemetery Road is an extremely busy road with vehicles coming from the A605 to the south and Drybread Road estate and Bassenhally Road from the north. She added that Cemetery Road is reduced to a single lane a lot of the times, especially opposite James Gardens where the proposed site entrance is. This is due to people parking when attending the cemetery and on occasions it has been known that visitors to the cemetery also park in James Gardens.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that currently there is a local and national shortage of bungalow properties, currently only 2% of new homes built are bungalows and this site would be ideal for bungalows as indicated in the application papers. It is close to the town centre and all local amenities.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that currently in Whittlesey there are 4 large developments under construction totalling over 700 properties and none of these are bungalows and 2% of this number would equate to 14. She added that if the site is developed as bungalows there would be no detrimental effect on adjoining properties and this will still meet the housing needs of the area.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that previous planning applications for this site have been approved for bungalows and although the residents and Town Council are not against the land being built on. She suggest that the planning application should be for bungalows, perhaps similar to the planning application submitted for this site in 2005 which was for 13, 2 bedroomed bungalows with 2 parking spaces allocated for each dwelling.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor confirmed that in 2010 Tesco Ltd made an application for a food store on the site which was refused and the previous approved bungalows were not built out but there was an extension of time allocation which was approved for a further 3 years in 2011 for this development.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that when Mr Mills of Contour Planning presented to the Whittlesey Town Council it was suggested that they should consult with the residents of James Gardens, and they did. She added it was further suggested that the indicative plan, which is enclosed within the application, should be revisited and Mr Mills assured he would go away and do that. She added that Contour Planning had already spoken to Fenland District Council and received pre-application advice prior to that presentation and the plan

that members have before them today has not changed in any way, shape or form. She stated it begs the question why do they come to Town Council to carry out a presentation and seek the Town Council's views.

- Councillor Mrs Mayor suggested that the applicant has not taken on board or considered the views and objections of the neighbouring residents and the Town Council.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that the application in front of members today is one of the most detailed outline applications that Whittlesey Town Council has seen and it indicates that if members approve this application with the indicative plan they will be approving 20 two storey dwellings and in effect approving a full planning application, not an outline, with conditions and Section 106 already agreed.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated in conclusion she would respectfully ask that members listen to residents and Whittlesey Town Council to refuse this application in its current form.

Questions for Councillor Mrs Mayor

- Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification on the parking issues as Mrs Mayor stated that on the application in 2013 that there were 2 allocated spaces for each property. Councillor Mayor confirmed that was correct.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Mr Justin Mills of Contour Planning the agent for Tesco and supporting the application.

- Mr Mills clarified the issues raised in the deliberations at January's Planning Committee and there was a suggestion that existing bungalows in James Gardens are overlooked which appeared to be the basis of concerns raised. The committee were concerned about the two storey proposed houses and that they would have a detrimental impact on those residents. He added that as the officers have pointed out that suggestion was incorrect and the reality is that there are several bungalows that are currently overlooked by existing two storey where Elm Park joins and those comparative distances already discussed with the distances that members have already accepted being closer to current residents.
- Mr Mills stated that no doubt when previewing Elm Park houses members were satisfied that the appropriate standards of separate distances and garden sizes were acceptable. He added that members must have concluded that there would not be harm in residents in James Gardens. He stated that in members deliberation on our application there should be no difference, particularly as members have been presented with evidence confirming that the opportunity for overlooking would be minimal and would not give rise to any significant harm. Mr Mills stated that consequently if members were to refuse our application due to members perceived concerns regarding the impact of that development on James Gardens that members would be taking this decision despite having already accepted a closer relationship between existing two storey houses in Elm Park. Mr Mills reminded members that the application before them is an outline planning permission and whilst it sets out the proposed development it does not fix the design of the individual houses, consequently members need to be very careful in their consideration on this issue since as members are not being asked to determine the heights of the houses, nor where the windows are being located, such details would be provided at the reserved matters stage and the information will be presented to your officers. He added that we show indicative sections and that is only indicative because decisions have not been made as to what it is going to be. In this regard your officers had advised me that when reserved matters application is submitted they will pay careful attention to the design and layout of plot 15 and in particular to plot 16 to ensure these houses do not cause detrimental harm. To further assist you on this matter Tesco have agreed to planning permissions requiring minimum heights for boundary treatments to mitigate against future concerns.
- Mr Mills stated that with regard to affordable housing national and local planning policies allow us to test whether this can be put on and with the viability approach it is appropriate in this instance. He added that Tesco's viability experts have prepared a thorough and robust

assessment which has also been tested by the Council's viability officer, someone employed by the Council, to advise member on such issues. The Planning Officers have sought clarification and re-testing by our expert and following testing the planning officer has agreed that affordable housing contribution is not required. Whilst members are entitled to seek clarity and an explanation on this issue, because that is members right. He added that members would be given advise and without any evidence saying that the tenable experts are wrong, indeed an inspector who would look at this would give you little sympathy if this matter was to end up at an appeal.

- Mr Mills stated that despite the lack of affordable housing contribution Tesco is offering a 106 contribution of £100,000 towards social and community, such as education, health and open space and planning officers are advising members that this level of contribution, which has been achieved using the appropriate calculation tools that the County Council and Fenland use, is acceptable.
- Mr Mills summarised that there is clear evidence, which has been presented to members, which demonstrates the concerted relations with potential overlooking and impact on adjoining neighbouring properties are unfounded. He added that there is no justification for members to refuse the application as those perceived impacts, which are yet to be subject to detail design and reflects existing separate distances which members have already approved in this area. Mr Mills concluded that the technical experts advice is that it is not right for Tesco to give the affordable housing contribution and in regards to members acceptance of all the planning issues at this planning committee, there are no sound reasons for members to object to our client's application. Accordingly I ask that members approve as per the officers recommendation.

Questions for Mr Mills - there were none.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws reminded Mr Mills that committee members take advice from their officers and do not need to be reminded that they need to be very careful. She requested this comment is recorded in the minutes.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that the Whittlesey Town Council were contacted and that an approach that was made by the agent. She added that the agent was asked to reconsider and come back to the Town Council, confirming she was at that meeting but took no part in the discussion. She added that the Town Council is mindful of the residents and as a member of this planning committee she thinks it is important to draw attention to the fact that the voices of people do count, the parish and town councillors input counts and were are asked for their recommendations, which clearly on this application they have given that. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that there are bungalows in Elm Park and the influence was with the proposed dwellings which backed onto James Gardens bungalows and why suggested bungalows and not houses. She added that this area is bungalows and she thinks that the developer should consider, if not all the site, but the boundary of James Gardens be bungalows or chalet bungalows.
- Councillor Miscandlon reminded members that 106 Officers are here if they wish to discuss any issues with the 106 document.
- Councillor Mrs Laws confirmed that members have been given the information of the Section 106 in considerable detail. Councillor Miscandlon stated that the Section 106 Officers must be commended on the document provided which is very detailed.
- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification on the £100,000 split between Fenland District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council and if officers know exactly where the money would be aimed at, should the planning application go through, for example is it to go to affordable housing pot, could it go to recreation or could it go to Whittlesey for a decision.
- Mike Freeman, Senior 106 Officer confirmed that the £100,000 that would be available with review of the viability in conjunction with the County Council who have also looked at the viability and that this will be split a 50/50 split but how that is spent is up to the Council to

- identify the priorities and where the contribution can be spent.
- Councillor Mr Laws suggested that this application be refused.
- Councillor Miscandlon confirmed that had a proposal from Councillor Mrs Laws that this application goes against the officers recommendation for acceptance if it is to be refused. Nick Harding stated that it is important that the reasons behind the proposal are made clear. Councillor Miscandlon asked for a seconder of which Councillor Mrs Davis is prepared to second but asked members for specific reasons on the refusal recommendation. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she still maintains that it fits into the policy on overlooking issue, although that tried to be demonstrated to be over ruled, she does not think that the proposed development is compatible and over intensification of the area as well. Nick Harding clarified that the proposal on the table is for refusal on the grounds of the units facing the bungalow developments would result in an overlooking and overbearing relationship for reason one, the second reason is overdevelopment of the site of which members are suggesting to go for a vote. Nick Harding clarified that as has been indicated in Mr Rowen's presentation this application is outline, albeit that the access and the position of the dwellings is to be fixed, should planning be granted, therefore in terms of the decision members make is to have regard to what is seen on the drawings where the physical dwellings are in relation to the existing development. Nick Harding added that Mr Rowen has identified what the separation distances are and in comparison to relationships between existing properties and other existing properties on the basis that the separate distances are not uncommon and members have approved these before. Nick Harding stated that he could not recommend that the application is refused on the grounds of poor physical overlooking relationship between the proposal and existing development. Nick Harding added that in terms of the overdevelopment of the site and referred to Councillor Mrs Laws statement in relation to the overlooking of the scheme and that members need to look at whether or not the scheme design internally is an unsatisfactory arrangement as the garden sizes are adequate, the relationship of the plot ratio i.e. the built element of each plot in relation to that which remains garden land and that meets with the policies, adequate car parking which meets Fenland policies as well and therefore he is not convinced that would have a strong case to say this developments constitutes overdevelopment.
- Councillor Miscandlon asked members for clarification in view of the highlights which Mr Harding has brought to the members attention and would they wish to still continue with the vote for refusal. Confirmation was yes. Councillor Miscandlon confirmed he has had a proposal from Councillor Mrs Laws, seconded by Councillor Mrs Davis for a refusal of this application and asked for a show of hands for those who wish to refuse this application . There were 2 for and 4 against and Councillor Miscandlon confirmed that this proposal fails and is therefore requiring a second proposal.
- Councillor Sutton proposed that members go with the officers recommendation with the addition of the concerns on the overlooking on plots 15 and 16 and that an informative is put on that this committee is very concerned about the overlooking, asking that the agent/developer will seriously look at this when coming back at reserved matters. Councillor Mrs Laws asked for the reserved matters to come back to this committee if the vote is to approve. Councillor Miscandlon asked the Senior Planning Officer could the reserved matter be brought back to this committee. The answer was yes.
- Councillor Miscandlon confirmed that there is a proposal from Councillor Sutton to go with the officers recommendation and asked for a seconder, Councillor Bucknor confirmed as seconder and asked for a show of hands which was 5 for and 2 against and confirmed application approved with additional conditions.

Proposal by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Bucknor and decided that the application be:

GRANTED as per the officers recommendation and subject to the reserved matters coming back to the planning committee.

(Councillor Miscandlon and Councillor Mrs Laws stated that they attend the Whittlesey Town

Council planning meetings but take no part in the decision making)

(Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she had been lobbied by the land owner on item 5)

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

(Councillor Mrs Hay and Councillor Murphy stated that they attend the Chatteris Town Council planning meetings but take no part in the decision making).

P59/17 **F/YR16/1014/F**
LAND NORTH EAST OF GOLDEN VIEW, NORTH BRINK, WISBECH,
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF 2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS

Members considered the level of support received from residents 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.

David Rowen presented the application to members in respect of 2 dwellings in the open countryside adjacent to the river and in flood zone 3 of which planning permission was previously granted for 2 mobile homes and erection of ancillary buildings in 2015. When considering the 2015 planning application it was considered that the applicants met the definition of gypsies/travellers and the 2015 application was granted on that basis. However later in 2015 the Government published new planning policies on travellers sites, which changed the definition for planning applications and removed the provision regarding gypsies/travellers who have permanently ceased a nomadic way of life, and were in effect excluded from that policy. Consequently this application is to be assessed as an application for housing in the countryside. The principle of which is unacceptable. In addition insufficient evidence has been put forward that the site is sequentially acceptable in terms of flood risk. He concluded by stating that the introduction of 2 permanent dwellings in this location in conjunction with existing development in the area would in effect suburbanise the area and be out of character.

Tim Driver the legal representative clarified the legislation which relates to this application. In 2011 the Equality Act was passed and it established 'the public sector equality duty' as in section 149 of that Act. This Act was a consolidation of all the anti-discrimination legislation starting with the Race Relations Act and covers all in one comprehensive piece of legislation. The specific duty in section 149 was different as it establishes a duty, which in fact the Human Rights Act does not do and what that duty is. There is an awful lot of it and will not go through it all but basically the duty is to have due regard to the need to do 3 things; eliminate discrimination and other prohibited conduct; to advance equality of opportunity; to foster good relations. This applies basically to the consideration of what are called persons who share relevant protected characteristics and those are: range of age, disability, but in this instance race and gypsies in particular are clearly recognised as being a race. The points that Mr Rowen has referred to in planning policy terms of having permanent residence are not relevant as far as this particular duty is concerned. The duty is the aim, taken from a case, to integrate consideration of the advancement of the equality in day to day business and applies to every decision including the decision in this instance. He explained that what the committee has to do is have due regard with the need to, in this instance, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations and that is between persons who share relevant protective characteristics, which on the face of it, the applicants do fall within that as gypsies. He added that the duty does not actually require this committee or any public authority to do anything

specific or not to do any specific as long as this committee have due regard as to what has just been said. This means it all has to be done, as it were, in the open as in this committee and to be recorded in the minutes. He also added, although he does not think it is particularly relevant here, but the duty even goes so far (taken from the Race Relations Act) to permit certain types of positive discrimination. The Race Relations Act was one of the items carried forward into this duty and in the Equality Act. He concluded that it was necessary to bring the committees attention to this and it will be recorded in the minutes, whatever the committees outcome in their deliberations, that the committee do need to take this into account.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Councillor Gavin Booth as a neighbouring District Council and in support of the application.

- Councillor Booth confirmed that he is here today as a neighbouring Ward Councillor and has been asked to come before the committee because one of the applicants lives in his ward in Parson Drove and that this site is on the boundary of Parson Drove and Wisbech St Mary.
- Councillor Booth stated in his opinion that this application should be approved as it has been widely support by neighbours, the Town Council and himself. He added it should be recognised that permission has already been granted for this site last year and already been undertaken as in the report.
- Councillor Booth referred to 4.3 in the report concerning the Environment Agency and they have requested a condition be applied to any planning application that is approved which is on file but they have not raised any concerns regarding sequential test, all they have done is recognised that an application could be passed and indicating the conditions that would be applied which replicate what was agreed in last years application. He added that officers do make reference to the sequential test, however the Environment Agency do not appear to raise this as a concern.
- Councillor Booth stated that there is a flood risk assessment as indicted on page 15 of the report which mentions that this development is within flood zone 3, however in the report it highlights that the flood risk is a 1 in 200 year chance and if this were to happen not only would we be worried about this potential development but also Wisbech and all across the district. It would mean that all the flood defences have actually failed and need to take this into consideration when applying a pragmatic approach to planning applications. He added that the assessments do not actually record what the flood risk would be taking into account the flood defences and there has been a considerable sum spent recently on flood risk defences around the Wisbech area and particularly to the south barrier bank.
- Councillor Booth referred to 8.17 in the report which recognises the development is taking place and he thinks that this is saying that the committee need to give integration to the impact of the development and where it can become somewhat subjective around what impact on the local environment is. He added, in defence of this application this end of the road near Bevis Lane has quite a large amount of development which members would have seen on their site visit. This area has development and he has been told by locals that in Bevis Lane it is not unknown for development taking place and has been for some considerable time.
- Councillor Booth referred to page 18 of the report, in respect of the view and that this development would be seen from the A47, however you can see the other properties along this road from the A47 and that the screening which is being proposed by the applicant would match and be very similar to current screening in the style of a cottage type development. Therefore the actual physical impact would be mitigated. He added that there have been plenty of applications recently in the open countryside.
- Councillor Booth asked members to think about this development and that the same access still applies. He added that based on upon these considerations he urged that members support this application.

Questions for Councillor Booth - there were none.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Rose Wilson the application supporting.

- Mrs Wilson stated in January 2015 she applied to Fenland District Council for her parent's property and confirmed that they are Romany Gypsies. She added that the family have lived here all their lives and are part of the local community.
- Mrs Wilson stated that they have done everything that the Council have asked as part of the application but they have hit a stumbling block which is condition 7 of the planning permission which states that the mobile homes had to have a safe refuge. She stated that Billy had already bought his mobile home prior to the planning application and thought that this was ok. However when she contacted the manufacturer on his behalf and showed them the planning permission they refused to build this home because they said it is not made as a refuge and would not support adults and children should a flood occur. She confirmed that they had looked into buying a second hand mobile home because the safety of our families comes first and that condition was put on the planning permission to ensure compliance with policies LP16 and 14. Mr Wilson confirmed that she had contacted the previous planning officer Alison Callaby explaining what had happened and advised her of the emails from the companies and her concerns on safety. She confirmed that Alison Callaby emailed her back and clarified that she could remove the condition, to which Mrs Wilson replied that by that this puts our families at risk and want to comply with policy LP16 & 14. Mrs Wilson stated that the advice given was to contact Elizabeth Montgomery from the Environment Agency who advised her of the measures needed to be put in place for a new build in the area and that this is why they are at this stage. Mrs Wilson referred to policy LP12, LP3, LP5, LP12 part d and e and that it also states in the policies that applications for mobile homes would be considered in the same way as permanent homes. Mrs Wilson confirmed that Bill had told her to just apply for a day room, however she feels that this is stereotyping that all travellers just live in trailers and have a day room.
- Mrs Wilson confirmed that there are no objections in respect of the current application from the people consulted and no objections from the Town Council. Mrs Wilson stated that they are an established local gypsy/traveller family and have lived nearly all our lives here and being part of the local community. She referred to the statement made by the Town Council referring to recent ground conversions and that the proposal would be enhancement.
- Mrs Wilson stated that there are 3 new developments within 3 miles of the proposed site and it would not be an additional burden on the education or health services as we have lived here all our lives. She added we are not an additional, we are an existing. All our children are in school and my eldest goes to grammar school, which is a first in our families history.
- Mrs Wilson referred to Graham Smith's report and that in her opinion it was in support of what had been done and she feels that they have done everything that Fenland has asked. Mrs Wilson stated that the recommendations for refusal point 1 was because of policy LP12 but in that policy there is also part e which states that applicants are advised to consider permanent. She added that as they already have planning permission for mobile homes and referred to condition 7 which she mentioned earlier, she believed that they could change residence from a mobile to a chalet bungalow.
- Mrs Wilson referred to point 2 of the report which refers to LP14 flood risk and confirmed that they have already demonstrated that they are willing to do work with Fenland and the Environment Agency. She added that they are already residents, it is their home and just want it to be safe.
- Mrs Wilson referred to point 3 of the report which refers to the opinion of the local planner that the addition of 2 houses will increase the urbanisation of the area. She stated that there are two recent conversions next door to them and referred to other newly built close by.
- Mrs Wilson referred to the report which mentions the nomadic way of life and that they were not asked if they were nomadic. She added that Billy and herself both have trailers and both travel to work throughout the year with Billy travelling all over the country for work and

stock car racing as this is the gypsy way. She clarified that she works for the travelling community.

Questions for Mrs Wilson - there were none.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws asked officers for clarification on the Environment Agency flood maps as her understanding is that they do not recognise the improvements to south bank area and the Internal Drainage Board pumping station improvements. Nick Harding confirmed that the Environment Agency does not recognise the improvements and that the government policy requires planners to use flood maps as if no defences are in place of operating sequential tests. Nick Harding added that if you were to go onto the Environment Agency website you will see this information, however the same maps where the information is available also show where areas are protected from the defences and this information is not constantly updated.
- Councillor Mrs Davis referred to comments about this development being in open countryside and would make a suburban impact, however she had noted on the site visit that there is a bungalow on one side which is established and could see further dwellings nearby. David Rowen confirmed the site is in the Local Plan as being in the open countryside and when you look at the nature of the area, while there are groupings of development in the countryside you have gaps in between those and both visually and in terms of settlement hierarchy it is within the open countryside.
- Councillor Davis asked for clarification on the previous application which was for the mobile homes and referred to ancillary buildings and what these are. David Rowen confirmed that the ancillary buildings were for a garage and store for each plot.
- Councillor Sutton proposed to go with the officers recommendation as no sequential test done, which is required by the policies as agreed recently. Councillor Mrs Hay seconded.
- Councillor Miscandlon asked for a show of hands for those in favour of going with officers recommendation for refusal of this application - 6 in favour, none against but one abstention.

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

REFUSED as per the officers recommendation.

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

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

(Councillor Mrs Hay and Councillor Murphy stated that they attend the Chatteris Town Council planning meetings but take no part in the decision making)