

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**21 JUNE 2017 - 1:00PM**

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

**APOLOGIES:** Councillors D Connor and Mrs M Davis.

Officers in attendance: Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), David Rowen (Development Manager), Sheila Black (Principal Planning Officer), Bob Power (Legal Officer) and Jo Goodrum (Member Services).

## **P6/17      MINUTES OF 24 MAY 2017**

The minutes of the meeting on 24 May 2017 were confirmed and signed.

## **P7/17      F/YR14/0838/O LAND NORTH OF 28 -30 HIGH STREET, MANEA ERECTION OF 32NO DWELLINGS (MAX) (OUTLINE WITH ACCESS COMMITTED)**

Members considered objections.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04) refers)) during its deliberations.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws referred to the Section 106 contribution and asked for clarification as she believed officers' mentioned in their presentation £165,000 but the report states £175,000. Officers confirmed that it was £175,000.
- Councillor Sutton expressed the view he is not sure he agrees with officers recommendations as community consultation is important and the views in the parish may be different now to 2014. The Parish Council has stated that the village cannot support any more development due to the insufficient infrastructure in place and he would suggest that the application is refused wholly on the policy grounds of LP12 and the fact that the Community Consultation that took place in 2014 is still being taken into consideration.
- Councillor Laws asked for clarification of how far over on the actual percentage of how far over the development threshold Manea is. Councillor Sutton stated it is between 40% and 43%.
- The Chairman referred to the Community Consultation and expressed concern of it being out of date as it was from 2014. Officers stated that the Consultation is from 2017, but the Parish Council's representations are from 2014 when the application was first submitted.
- Councillor Sutton expressed concern that to go against a community consultation would not be right and this scheme is not supported by the Community, however he does feel the land should be developed but not without local support.
- Councillor Court commented that there had been plans to build on the site in 1994 and that application had also been refused and asked what the grounds of refusal had been at that time.? The Chairman confirmed that an application had also been submitted in 1992 which had been dismissed by the Secretary of State which was for 24 dwellings but this is a different application for a different number of dwellings.

- Councillor Murphy expressed concern over the development threshold and asked if this means no further building should take place in Manea? The Chairman made the point that Councillor Sutton's concerns are over the consultation being out of date. Councillor Murphy stated that this is a scrub piece of land that would look better with development asking whether Members wanted a scrub piece of land or the area developed and tidied up. Officers' confirmed that consultation took place this year with the public.
- Councillor Hay commented that it was imperative that up to date consultations are carried out with local councillors and asked what is the point of having consultation with the public if no notice is taken of it.

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

**Refused for the following reason.**

**Manea is defined in the Fenland Local Plan (2014) as a Growth Village and has experienced an increase in excess of 15% in the number of dwellings within the village since April 2011. Policy LP12 of the Local Plan states that applications for new residential development in such circumstances.' should have demonstrable evidence of clear local community support for the scheme (with such support generated via a thorough and proportionate pre-application community consultation exercise)'. The consultation exercise is undertaken in relation to this development has failed to demonstrate such community support for the scheme and therefore the development proposed would be contrary to Policy LP12 of the Local Plan.**

Members do not support officers' recommendation of grant of planning permission for the reasons outlined above

Councillor Miscandlon registered in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters that all Members of the Planning Committee had been lobbied on this application)

**P8/17      F/YR15/0949/F  
LAND AT CHURCH STREET GARAGE, CHURCH STREET, WHITTLESEY  
ERECTION OF 6 X 2 STOREY, 3 BED DWELLINGS INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF  
EXISTING BUILDINGS WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA**

Members considered letters of support and one of objection.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04) refers)) during its deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Stephen Hodson, the applicants Agent. Mr Hodson asked Members to confirm that they had received the documentation that he had submitted on Monday 19 June 2017 and gave them an overview of the history of the applications on site and he referred to a letter he had received from Fenland District Council in December 2015 requesting a site contamination report and where he was advised that a Section 106 Agreement was to be prepared. Mr Hodson commented that he had received an email from the Planning Officer in December 2016 confirming that the scheme would be approved and therefore negotiations began with Peterborough City Council with regard to the preparation of the Section 106 agreement and a draft agreement was produced.

Mr Hodson stated that in April 2017 an email was received from the Planning Team to say there had been a change in staffing within the Planning Department and there appeared to be an issue concerning a lack of private amenity space with both the proposed development and also with that

of neighbouring properties. Mr Hodson confirmed that the plans have been amended slightly between plots 2 and 3 which means that all proposed plots now have 33% of private amenity space. To aid privacy for neighbours the rear windows have been changed around on the second bedroom and the bathroom on plots 4, 5 and 6. Mr Hodson also referred to the reduction in vehicle movements and noise which would be reduced significantly due to the change of usage from Industrial to residential.

Mr Hodson made comparison with this development with one in Wittel Close. In his view this proposal develops a brownfield site, has Town Council approval and would result in no demonstrable harm.

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

- Councillor Laws expressed concern that although the site is ripe for development and is in a town centre location, the number of properties being proposed is too many.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he notes the differing advice the agent has been given which is unfortunate, However he feels it is far better to get the right development on the site and this application has a cramped feel and overlooking issues, with the number of homes proposed being too many.
- Councillor Murphy commented that he agrees with Councillor Sutton and feels that the proposal is over developed and would have an adverse effect on the area, the visual impact and character of the area would be affected and the proposed layout is wrong. He referred to LP16 which sums up the position perfectly.

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

**Refused, as recommended.**

(Councillor Miscandlon registered , in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he had been lobbied on this application).

(Councillor Laws and Miscandlon registered in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been present at Whittlesey Town Council at which this application had been discussed but had taken no part).

**P9/17**            **F/YR17/0203/O**  
**LAND SOUTH WEST OF THE ORCHARDS, GULL ROAD, GUYHIRN**  
**ERECTION OF UP TO 7NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE WITH ALL MATTERS**  
**RESERVED)**

Members considered objections.

The committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute P19/04 refers)) during its deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Schooling, who was representing the applicant and architect as he is familiar with the local area. Mr Schooling gave the committee a brief history of the site and advised that the following agencies had shown support for the proposal; Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue, Environment Agency and Wisbech St Mary Parish Council.

Mr Schooling stated that the applicant intends to keep the trees around the site and will be

enhancing the landscaping in order to respect the privacy of neighbouring properties. A footpath will also be added to the development for safety. Mr Schooling said that the residents of Gull Road are happy to see the site developed and the applicant plans to widen Gull Road to improve vehicle access.

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

- Councillor Murphy expressed the view that he has never seen a planning application submitted with plans for a development on a roundabout with a very narrow road and he cannot support the application.
- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that when she went on the site inspection she didn't view the site as an eyesore or overgrown and it was an area used for grazing.

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

**Refused, as recommended.**

### **P10/17      EAST CHATTERIS STRATEGIC ALLOCATION -BROAD CONCEPT PLAN**

Members considered the East Chatteris Broad Concept Plan (BCP). Members were advised of the rationale behind BCPs, introduced through Policy LP7 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014, to ensure that the large urban extensions are planned and implemented in a co-ordinated way. The BCP's sets out proposals for residential development on 26 hectares of land providing up to 350 dwellings on the site, together with associated infrastructure, open space and drainage. For the last two years a team of representatives including local authority officers and developers/landowners and their agents have been meeting to develop a BCP for East Chatteris.

Members were informed that the process has involved engagement with relevant stakeholders and a public consultation has been carried out with the residents of Chatteris. Background studies have been carried out and funded mainly by the developer to ensure the BCP is deliverable and thus ensure planning applications can be submitted confidently on the back of the BCP. Issues relating to landscaping, public open space, archaeology, heritage, drainage, ecology and highways have all been consulted on with the relevant stakeholders and in principal agreement has been reached.

Members noted that there has been one objection received from Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Assessment Team, who are raising a holding objection due to insufficient information concerning the litigation measures for the traffic impact, however the agents transport highways engineer has confirmed that these matters will be fully considered at the planning application stage and the Transport Assessment Team will be fully consulted.

Members were advised that the Public Consultation had taken place last year and has not been subject to consultation at the present time, however in the last couple of days communication has been received from one resident objecting to the proposal advising that they are looking into ways of protecting the land from development. The resident will be acknowledged and responded to in writing.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated he is very pleased to see the BCP and is sure during the next phase, any issues can be overcome and addressed. He passed his thanks to all those concerned for their work and commitment to date.
- The Chairman concurred with Councillor Sutton and agreed that we are only in the infancy of the plan and it is up to the partners to bring forward the various stages of construction. Councillor Hay stated that she had attended the public consultation and didn't hear one adverse comment on the indicative plans that they were shown and she believes that the majority of Chatteris residents will be supportive of the proposal.
- The Chairman commended the comprehensive document that had been presented today for approval.
- Councillor Mrs Newell asked for assurances concerning the archaeology aspect. Officers' confirmed that a significant agreed protection area has been identified and steps will be taken to ensure protection of this important area.

**Proposed by Councillor Mrs Hay and seconded by Councillor Sutton and decided that the Broad Concept Plan for East Chatteris be approved.**

(Councillors Mrs Hay, Murphy and Mrs Newell registered in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they were present at Chatteris Town Council at which this item had been discussed but had taken no part).

1.50pm

Chairman