

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**29 MARCH 2017 - 1:00PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Miscandlon (Chairman), Councillor S Clark (Vice-Chairman), Councillor D W Connor, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor Mrs A Hay, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor W Sutton, .

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor M G Bucknor

Officers in attendance: Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), David Rowen (Development Manager), Chris Gordon (Legal Services) and Sally Taylor (Member Services)

## **P60/16      PREVIOUS MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of 1 March 2017 were confirmed and signed.

## **P61/16      F/YR16/1160/F LAND NORTH OF, 36 NORTH GREEN, COATES, CAMBRIDGESHIRE ERECTION OF 3 X 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS WITH DETACHED GARAGES INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA**

Members had considered 5 letters of objection and the Town Council's comments which are a variance with the Officers recommendation.

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David Rowen updated the committee that this application had now been withdrawn.

## **P62/16      F/YR17/0017/F LAND EAST OF FIELD HOUSE, HOCKLAND ROAD, TYDD ST GILES, CAMBRIDGESHIRE ERECTION OF A 2-STOREY 3-BED DWELLING WITH DETACHED GARAGE/STORE**

Members considered letters of support and objection.

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 and referred to the updated report that has been circulated to members in respect of this application. The application is proposed for a detached dwelling with triple detached garage to the front and confirmed that this part of Tydd St Giles is characterised by a strong linear development. The proposed dwelling is located direct to the rear of a dormer bungalow and also adjacent to Field House, referring to the elevation plans on the screen. David Rowen stated that the site had planning permission granted in 2008 and a refusal in 2013 for this scheme. The site was also approved for a pair of semi-detached dwellings on the site in 2013. In addition to this there was outline planning permission which was granted in July last year which had the format for future consideration apart from access and referred to photos on the screen of

the site and adjacent properties. David Rowen stated that it is considered that the application results in a tandem form of development which is not in keeping with the area and will have impact on neighbouring properties due to loss of outlook/overlooking and also that the design of the dwelling is not appropriate at this site, hence the recommendation is to refuse planning permission. David Rowen confirmed as in the update report a neighbour at Lorston has requested that members attention be drawn to the relationship between the sites and their property.

Members received a presentation in accordance with public participation from Mr Barry Nicholls as applicant and agent supporting his application.

- Mr Nicholls confirmed that he will be acting as agent and applicant and wished to show members a selection of slides.
- Mr Nicholls went through a selection of photo/slides and commented on each one: Slide 1 is of a development in the Village. Slide 2 The Boatyard which is back land development. Slide 3 An appeal site opposite to his application which is similar and has been allowed.
- Mr Nicholls stated that the adjacent house is called The Smithy and has a large mass construction in relation to Field House, referring to the photo on the screen of The Smithy having showing the gable ends with a large annex.
- Mr Nicholls stated that the photo on screen showed The Smithy of which the curtilage is outlined on the photo including the large annex. He added that he has a letter of support from the owners of The Smithy.
- Mr Nicholls referred to photos on the screen of Broadgate which shows open countryside with two storey building and similar 4 units as tandem properties, concluding with a photo view from the road.
- Mr Nicholls referred to the screen photos of Church Lane which is also a two storey tandem property with a two storey dwelling behind that.
- Mr Nicholls showed a photo slide with the view of bungalows towards the road and the following photo slide of High Broadgate which is also tandem dwellings, being two storey and 4 units.
- Mr Nicholls referred to photos which show scaffold poles on a housing development of 12 homes and a development of 23 units which are all tandem dwellings in the open countryside.

It was agreed by members to extend the time allocated to Mr Nicholls to be able to show further photo/slides and conclude his presentation due to the fact there was some confusion with the photo/slide sequence.

- Mr Nicholls confirmed one slide missing which he wanted members to see and handed round a copy of the elevation plan. Mr Nicholls added that the plan shows a hip roof and not a gable end as in the officers report and that the garage windows are shown as being frosted out which is similar to the site opposite.
- Mr Nicholls concluded that he is prepared to accept any conditions concerning the front windows.

Questions for Mr Nicholls - there were none.

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

- Councillor Sutton referred to previously mention pre-app as there did not seem to be one, however he has no problem with development of the site but has a problem with the site of the garage, which is next to a drain and wonders how this will be maintained. Councillor Sutton added that he cannot understand why the developer is not working with officers on the design finding something acceptable that could be mutually agreed with both parties. He concluded that he agrees with the officers decision.

- Councillor Murphy confirmed that linear development is for frontage and not back and this is clearly back land behind two properties at the front. Councillor Murphy stated that this property is too close to neighbouring properties and out of character. He concluded that he agrees with the officers recommendation.

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

**REFUSED as per the officers recommendation.**

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

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

**P63/16**

**TPO 04/2016**

**TPO LAND EAST OF 6, QUEEN STREET, WHITTLESEY, CAMBRIDGESHIRE**  
**TREE PRESERVATION ORDER FOR 1 ASH TREE**

Members considered objections to the proposed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and in accordance with the Council's constitution this TPO must be considered by the Planning Committee.

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 relating to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on land east of 6 Queen Street, Whittlesey. The tree is in the Whittlesey Conservation Area and an application was received in October 2016 to fell this tree but the Council's Arboricultural Officer was of the view that this tree is of amenity value and that a TPO should be made on the tree. He added that subsequently the TPO had been placed on the tree but objections had been received from the owner of the site and an adjacent land owner. He confirmed that therefore it is for the Planning Committee to confirm that the committee agrees with the TPO.

David Rowen confirmed that this is an Ash tree and referred to the location on the screen. He stated that it is considered that this tree is of amenity value but the TPO would not prevent future work taking place to the tree as has been raised in some of the objections. He concluded that it is recommended to committee that the TPO is confirmed.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws clarified that as a Whittlesey Town Councillor she is aware that there is no Ash die back on this tree and that it is perfectly healthy. She confirmed that Whittlesey has lost so many trees in the Conservation Area within the town and gave example of an enthusiastic developer who has taken down a TPO near to the town centre location.
- Councillor Mrs Laws confirmed that the Town Council and many residents would like this tree kept.
- Councillor Laws stated that this tree is perfectly healthy, stands within a Conservation Area and forms part of the town centre location and street scene. She would request that members agree with the TPO.
- Councillor Connor confirmed that the Council's Tree Officer is happy and that this tree has an amenity value. He noted on the site visit that this tree adds value to the location and agrees with the officers recommendation.

- Councillor Mrs Laws confirmed that the tree does need some work. Councillor Miscandlon agreed with Councillor Mrs Laws that the tree does need some work carrying out, which was obvious on the site visit, but the owners will get advice needed from the Arboreal Officer for Fenland.
- Councillor Sutton stated that when on site he initially thought that this tree was in a private back garden and questioned would members need to worry about a tree that nobody could see, however when he walked to the memorial and looked towards the tree he could see that this is in the public realm and supports for a TPO. He added that the tree is getting out of hand and needs professional attention. Councillor Miscandlon referred to the view on the screen of which it is clear that this tree is in the public realm.

**Proposed by Councillor Mrs Laws, seconded by Councillor Connor and decided that the TPO is granted in respect of this tree as per the officers recommendation**

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

13:23pm

Chairman