

PLANNING COMMITTEE



6 DECEMBER 2017 - 1:00PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon(Chairman), Councillor D W Connor, Councillor S R Court, 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 S Clark

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), Izzi Hurst (Member Services), Rikki Parsons (Highways Officer), David Rowen (Development Manager), Stephen Turnbull (Legal Officer), Alex Woolnough (Highways Officer)

P38/17 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting 08 November 2017 were agreed and signed, subject to the following;

- Councillor Connor asked that in reference to Minute P35/17, it is noted that he took no part in the discussion or voting of the agenda item.

P39/17 '5 YEAR LAND SUPPLY' STATEMENT PRESENTED BY DAVID ROWEN

An additional item was added to the Agenda at the request of David Rowen. He read the following statement to Members;

'Today's Committee Meeting is the first since the appeal decision at Syringa House, Upwell Road, Christchurch which concluded that the Council does not currently have a five-year housing land supply. All Council Members have been provided with a briefing note about the appeal and its implications for the determination of applications for housing. Members will have seen in today's Agenda Pack that Committee Reports in relation to housing applications, now identify those policies of the Fenland Local Plan which are now considered to be out of date following that decision, and effectively silent on housing numbers, distribution as well as the assessment of residential schemes in the context of the principles of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Due to the lack of the 5-year land supply, Members when making decisions on housing applications will need to consider whether developments are, on balance, sustainable and whether the benefits of housing delivery would be significantly outweighed by any demonstrable harm that would arise from the proposal.

Officers have weighed up the balance in arriving at the recommendations presented to you.

In addition to the 5-year land supply issue, the appeal also concluded that the level of housing need in relation to affordability levels, was such that the Council cannot continue to go against Government advice in respect of seeking affordable housing on small sites.'

P40/17 F/YR17/0818/F LAND NORTH OF MEADOWCROFT, SILT ROAD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

ERECTION OF A 5.6 METRE HIGH BUILDING FOR THE GARAGING/PARKING OF APPLICANT'S VEHICLES AND STORAGE OF HAY/STRAW/TACK; RETENTION AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING HARDSTANDING (INCLUDING CHANGE OF USE OF PART Paddock TO ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE); ERECTION 1.5 METRE HIGH (MAX) FENCING TO ENCLOSE RETAINED AND EXTENDED PaddockS (INCLUDING CHANGE OF USE OF FORMER RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE TO PaddockS)

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.

David Rowen presented the report and referred Members to the update which had been circulated to them. The update informed Members that the applicant had clarified that no customers or representatives will visit the application site and therefore reason two of the Officers recommendation had been amended to reflect this.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, by Libby Coe (representative for the applicant)

Libby Coe informed Members that Councillor Steve Count was hoping to speak on the applicant's behalf today, however had to attend another meeting so was unable to. She explained that previous planning applications had caused ambiguity as to what the applicant was seeking. She clarified that the applicant wants to install the shed on site to store his lorry. She highlighted to Members that the applicant was not requesting any additional development but merely wanted to enhance the site's existing facilities. She explained that the former outbuildings on the site were dilapidated and usable and the applicant would like to rectify this by providing safe storage for him and his horse's equipment. She added that although the property sits in the country-side, the applicant is wishing to clad the shed and complete landscaping works in order to blend in with the landscape therefore causing no adverse effects on the surrounding environment. She confirmed that visitor parking is catered for on site as you would expect in any residential property, however it is not intended for use by anyone contracted to the applicant, as any such person would go directly to the site in which they are working on.

She explained that the applicant solely uses his 7.5 tonne lorry to travel to and from work in the mornings and evenings and confirmed that no additional access would be required on the site to accommodate this. She highlighted that any light maintenance of this vehicle on site would be limited and would be no more intrusive than anybody servicing their own private vehicle. She explained that although Silt Road is narrow, it benefits from straight visibility throughout and is already used by large tractors and dust carts all of which are far larger than the applicant's vehicles. She confirmed that no delivery's relating to the applicant's business will be made to the property as all materials are directly delivered to the site that he is working at. The proposed in-stepped gated access to the property will cause no disruption to the residents of a neighbouring cottage. She confirmed that no complaints had been received by the tenants of the neighbouring cottage and the tenant had commented directly to the applicant that they found it re-assuring to have people within close proximity to them. She explained that any movement from or within the site by the applicant should be considered far less detrimental to the tranquil location than the noise caused by the nearby railway line. She confirmed that this railways line causes significant noise and will only worsen due to the expansion of Whitemoor Yard, March. She highlighted that the passing freight trains travelling on the embankment, are in fact higher and far more intrusive than the proposed shed itself.

She observed that neither March Town Council, Fenland's Environmental Team, Highways, the neighbouring tenants or Network Rail (the adjoining land-owner) have objected to the application and confirmed that several Councillors supported the application also. She stated that the only objection received in relation to the application, was from the Landlord of the neighbouring cottage

who does not reside in the property and whose tenants fully support it. She explained that in her opinion, the Councils Permitted Development in open countryside such as Bankside Nursey at Rings End and the West side of March Bypass, will have far greater impact on the landscape than this application will. She stated that Fenland District Council has always supported small, local businesses and highlighted that the applicant had run his business locally for the past twenty years. She summarised by reiterating that sole purpose of the application is to provide safe storage for the applicant's equipment and horses and this will have no visual or detrimental impact to the area.

There were no questions asked of Libby Coe.

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

1. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she saw very little difference in the application proposed today and the original application submitted. She explained that there had been confusion around the purpose of the site as to whether it is used as a residential property or for business purposes. Due to this, she confirmed that she supported the officers recommendation to refuse the application.
2. Councillor Connor highlighted that March Town Council, Councillor Court and Councillor Skoulding all support the application. He explained that although the application site is down a very narrow road, Fenland District Council has always been keen to support local businesses and suggested that a Condition be added to possibly install passing-bays in the road to alleviate this issue. He confirmed that he is against the officers recommendation to refuse the application.
3. Councillor Murphy stated that the installation of passing-bays in Silt Road would be impossible as the road is far too narrow to accommodate this. He highlighted that although the applicant says that no other vehicles will visit the site, his application mentions the storage of several other vehicles on site including a JCB. He said the application goes against the Fenland Local Plan LP2 and LP16 and therefore agreed with the officers recommendation.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Laws, seconded by Councillor Murphy and decided that the application be: REFUSED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Connor declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application, by stating the following; I know Mr Purse in a former business capacity but do not socialise with him so therefore I will listen to the officer presentation, comments from other Members and make an informed Planning decision on those Planning grounds only)

(Councillor Court stated that he is a Member of March Town Council but takes no part in any Planning decisions)

P41/17

F/YR17/0406/F

LAND WEST OF 17-37, WOOD STREET, DODDINGTON, CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF 28 X SINGLE-STOREY DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED
GARAGES AND PARKING, COMPRISING OF: 11 X 2-BED AND 17 X 3-BED, AND
LANDSCAPING AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE RESERVOIR

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.

Councillor Connor stated the following: 'I would like to declare a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application as I was present at the Parish Council's consultation at the Methodist Hall in Doddington and the delivery of leaflets in part of Doddington regarding the application before us

today. I was registered to speak today as the Ward Councillor of Doddington and Wimblington, but will now not do so due to the excellent presentation by Councillor Ruth Hufton, she has admirably covered all the important and relevant issues and I totally endorse her comments and have nothing new to add. However, I will step down as a Planning Committee Member for this Item and therefore take no part in the discussions or voting and will withdraw as a Member of the Committee on Agenda Item 6'

Both Councillor Connor and Councillor Sutton moved to the public speaking area and stood down as Planning Committee Members for the duration of this Item.

David Rowen presented a summary of the report to Members. He highlighted that an update had been circulated to Members regarding maintenance of a small drain on the site. He confirmed that the officer's recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions listed on the report.

Members received a presentation of objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, by Councillor Ruth Hufton (Chairman of Doddington Parish Council)

Councillor Ruth Hufton stated that Doddington Parish Council did not support the application due to several reasons. She stated that the application goes against Fenlands Local Plan Section 3, as the sewerage network in Doddington is not sufficient to supply this development. She said that although Anglian Water have said they will make the necessary investments to increase capacity, this has not been categorically confirmed. She explained that Wood Street is a very narrow road and the proposal states that this will be widened if the application is approved. She highlighted that this would cause considerable disruption and nuisance to the residents during this period and even when the work is completed on the road, there will still be heavy congestion. She stated that the access from Wood Street on to High Street is very poor with a high fence obstructing the view to the West and a school collection point to the East. She said that currently traffic leaving Wood Street has to pull into the centre of the road to enable visibility of both directions. She explained to Members that a recent survey had shown that 67,226 vehicles had passed through Doddington between 11 October and 4 November.

She said that whilst the development seeks to attract elderly residents, the walk in to the village centre will be a significant distance for those living to the North of the development. Regarding public consultations, she highlighted that many residents were unaware of the importance of this and many comments received by parishioners subsequently, refuted the results of the first consultation. Due to this, a public forum was held in order to engage with a higher number of residents of the village. The result of this meeting was an overwhelming vote to refuse the application and she hoped that this would be considered when making the decision today. She said that the public consultation attracted a turnout of only 4/5% and therefore this should not be used in deciding whether residents of Doddington are for or against the application. She confirmed that Doddington had reached it's 15% growth target and therefore the Parish Council is against the application. She hoped that the recent announcement that Fenland's Land Supply has fallen below the required level will not result in Fenland's villages being penalised as a result of this decision. She explained that Cambridgeshire ACRE had recently completed a 'Housing-Needs' survey in the village to gauge public opinion and local requirements.

She summarised by stating that Doddington Parish Council is not adverse to development in the village however it must be the right type of development and cause as little disruption to residents as possible. She highlighted that future residents of the development would also be living in close proximity to a Pig Farm which is noisy and can smell.

Members asked Councillor Ruth Hufton the following questions;

1. Councillor Mrs Laws asked for further information in regards to the Housing-Needs survey.

Councillor Ruth Hufton confirmed that the survey highlighted that there is a requirement to build anymore 3/4 bed houses but did identify a need for 12 x Affordable Housing in the village. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if the survey had taken into account planning applications that had already been approved and any Affordable Housing associated with these applications. Councillor Ruth Hufton confirmed that they had.

2. Councillor Mrs Davis asked Councillor Ruth Hufton if she knew of the number of places available at the local primary school, Lionel Walden. Councillor Ruth Hufton confirmed that there are limited spaces available however this involves moving existing pupils into alternative years in order to facilitate new pupils joining the school.

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

1. Councillor Mrs Laws asked officers for the financial information from the Section 106 Agreement. David Rowen confirmed that £92,000 was available for an early-years classroom as part of the Section 106 package.
2. Councillor Mrs Laws asked officers for information on the development threshold for Doddington. David Rowen explained that the issue of thresholds have been superseded by the issue regarding lack of land-supply. He confirmed that the Policies regarding housing needs and distribution are now considered out of date so the threshold policies in the plan should not come into consideration.
3. Councillor Mrs Laws said that she is very concerned that villages will be penalised in relation to the lack of 5-year land supply and fears it could affect every village in Fenland.
4. Councillor Mrs Laws said she was concerned with the difference between the Agent's figures in relation to public consultation and the Parish Council's figures. David Rowen confirmed that the policy in relation to Community Consultation is now deemed to be outdated due to the issue with the land supply so should be disregarded.
5. Councillor Mrs Davis highlighted that Doddington suffers from sewerage issues and although Anglian Water are aware of this, no action has been taken to rectify it.
6. Councillor Mrs Davis explained that Wood Street has very poor access onto High Street and is concerned the additional volume of cars could cause accidents. Alex Woolnough confirmed that there is no reported accident data to suggest that there is a Highways safety issue with the Wood Street junction. He highlighted that the Agent's Transport Statement showed that the development would only increase traffic by approximately one vehicle movement every three minutes during peak-hours.
7. Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification on reported accident data. Alex Woolnough confirmed that a reported accident is one that results in an Insurance claim.
8. Councillor Murphy explained that whilst he sympathises with residents whilst sites are being developed, there is no planning reason to refuse this application.
9. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if any further correspondence could be had with Anglian Water in respect of the sewerage issues. Nick Harding advised that the feedback from Anglian Water was, that once the planning permission was granted, the developer will have the right to connect and it's Anglian Waters duty to grant this. He stated that in his experience where there are local concerns regarding capacity of a sewerage arrangement, residents have reported these incidents in order to have them investigated further. He confirmed that the Planning Department could be involved in this also.
10. Councillor Mrs Laws asked if the Parish Council had been consulted in regards to the suggestion that they would take over maintenance of the drainage pond. David Rowen explained that if the Parish Council were not happy to take on this maintenance it could be handled by a Maintenance Company.
11. Councillor Mrs Newell asked officers if Conditions were in place in relation to bats and nesting birds. David Rowen highlighted that Conditions 16 and 17 of their recommendation, cover this concern.

Proposed by Councillor Murphy, seconded by Councillor Mrs Hay and decided that the application be; APPROVED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Sutton joined the Committee at 1:24 PM; having given his apologies that he may be late. He declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application stating that his brother lives adjacent to the proposed site and he has had a relationship in the past with the Owners of the site. Due to this, he withdrew from the Committee and took no part in the discussion or voting)

(Councillor Connor declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in this application due to his involvement with the Parish Council's Consultations and therefore withdrew from the Committee and took no part in the discussion or voting)

(Councillor Mrs Davis asked for it to be noted that in relation to this Item, she has taken no part in any discussions relating to the application and will therefore make an independent decision)

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.

P42/17 **F/YR17/0974/O**
LAND SOUTH WEST OF THE ORCHARDS, GULL ROAD, GUYHIRN,
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF UP TO 5NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE WITH ALL MATTERS
RESERVED)

The Committee returned at 1:56 PM.

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.

Councillor Connor and Councillor Sutton returned to their seats as Members of the Planning Committee.

David Rowen presented a summary of the report to Members highlighting an update that had been provided regarding letters of support that had been received. He reminded the Committee that earlier this year an outline planning application for 7-dwellings had been refused. He stated that the officer's recommendation is to refuse the application.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, by Councillor Sarah Bligh.

Councillor Sarah Bligh thanked the Committee for allowing her to speak. She explained that she is speaking on behalf of the agent and Wisbech St Mary Parish Council. She explained that following the planning refusal earlier this year, the applicant and agent had been advised by a member of staff at Fenland District Council, to not appeal the decision and instead apply for planning permission for 5-dwellings as oppose to 7. The member of staff assured them that there would be no grounds for refusal if he re-submitted the application in light of this. The agent sought Councillor Sarah Bligh's help after the application was recommended for refusal again and sent to today's Committee meeting. She explained that there is no evidence of the advice the applicant and agent received as the conversation was via telephone. One of the reasons for the refusal of this application is that officers believe it would damage historic homes however she highlighted that the properties to the rear of the site are relatively new. She also explained that work is due to be carried out to improve the Guyhirn Roundabout and therefore the officer's concerns of increased traffic to the A47, are not verified.

She confirmed that the fields mentioned are privately owned and horses currently graze there, stating that the owner of the horses is in support of the application. She highlighted that this development will assist with the current issue surrounding the lack of land-supply. She explained that she wanted to see villages such as Guyhirn thrive and believed the properties would appeal to Commuters working in Peterborough, Cambridge and London due to the accessibility to the A47.

She explained that the site had previously been a pond and allegedly material had been discarded in to the pond from a nearby building. She reminded Members that if planning permission was granted, a survey would be carried out to ensure that no harmful materials, such as asbestos, are present on the site. She appealed to the Parish Councillors present by stating that each Parish Councillor knows what will work and what will not work in their respective areas and Wisbech St Mary Parish Council support this application for approval. She summarised by explaining that there would be minimal impact on the Highways compared to larger developments that have had planning permission approved.

Councillor Sutton explained that Councillor Sarah Bligh had contacted him in regards to this application however he had merely referred her to the agenda. Councillor Sarah Bligh confirmed this.

There were no questions asked of Councillor Sarah Bligh.

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

1. Councillor Mrs Laws explained that other applications received where there is a concern relating to dangerous materials on site, have submitted reports in relation to this prior to submitting the application. David Rowen confirmed that in relation to this site, no information had been submitted as part of the application but confirmed that Environmental Health had no concerns about this.
2. Councillor Mrs Davis asked officers for clarification regarding Councillor Sarah Bligh's comments on the advice the applicant had received from a member of staff at Fenland District Council. David Rowen confirmed that he is unaware of which officer this could have been as the conversation allegedly took place over the telephone and due to this he cannot comment on the matter any further.
3. Councillor Sutton agreed that if the site was located closer to the village centre, he would be in support of the application. However he doesn't believe the location of the site is sustainable as residents would have to use a vehicle to access the village amenities. Because of this, he agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.
4. Councillor Mrs Hay agreed with Councillor Sutton's comments. She believed the site was an unsuitable location for development as it borders open countryside.
5. Councillor Mrs Laws said very little difference had been made to the application in reducing the number of dwellings to five.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Hay, seconded by Councillor Sutton and decided that the application be: REFUSED as per the officer's recommendation.

**P43/17 F/YR17/0756/F
LAND NORTH EAST OF AVONDALE FEN ROAD, FRONTING, SWAN GARDENS,
PARSON DROVE, CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY 2-BED DWELLING WITH SINGLE-STOREY
1-BED SELF-CONTAINED ANNEXE; AND DETACHED TIMBER GARDEN SHED
AND PORTABLE BUILDING FOR USE AS TEMPORARY LIVING
ACCOMMODATION (PART RETROSPECTIVE)**

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.

David Rowen presented a summary of the report to Members. He highlighted an update that had been provided to Members in relation to information regarding a boundary on the site. He stated that it had been confirmed with the Refuse Team, that they currently collect waste from the property to the West of the site.

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, by Councillor Sarah Bligh.

Councillor Sarah Bligh confirmed to Members that Swan Gardens, Parson Drove is an un-adopted road with no streetlights or footpaths and residents are responsible for paying for any maintenance of the road. She explained that there is currently an on-going boundary dispute on the proposed site and the applicant has paid no costs towards any maintenance of Swan Gardens. She highlighted that although a planning application had been approved on the site in 2014, no residents approved of the proposed access at this time either. She said that in regards to the refuse collection on site, this was only a Gentleman's Agreement with the residents of Swan Gardens as the resident was of ill-health. She said the fact that the refuse collection vehicle goes down this road does not prove that it is an access road for the site. She confirmed that the sales particulars for the land, mentioned that access for the site was via Swan Gardens however no legal proof of access was required or provided. She recommended that legal proof of access needs to be obtained prior to granting the planning permission.

She explained that the developer who built Swan Gardens had purchased land up to a certain point however due to trees obstructing the boundary, he had built the current fence 4m further forward. Therefore part of the land that has been sold, in her belief, does not belong to the applicant. Parson Drove Parish Council believe this application should be refused due to over-development and she asked the Committee to not grant the application based on the current issue with land-supply and to refuse it due to the issue with the right of way.

Members asked the following questions to Councillor Sarah Bligh;

1. Councillor Connor informed Councillor Sarah Bligh, that several issues she had mentioned in her presentation were not issues relevant to Planning decisions. Councillor Sarah Bligh responded by saying that she feels it is a Councillor's responsibility to help local people in such matters. Councillor Connor said the issues raised should not effect a planning decision and should therefore not be taken into account.
2. Councillor Mrs Hay reiterated this and clarified to Councillor Sarah Bligh that access issues are civil matters and therefore not relevant to the Planning Committee.
3. Councillor Sutton highlighted to Councillor Sarah Bligh that planning permission had already been granted on the site in 2014 and therefore the applicant has every right to commence building on the site. He highlighted that if this happened, residents would have to go to Court in an attempt to rectify the matter. He confirmed that Planning Law does not take into account the issues raised today regarding rights of way and boundaries.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, by Grahame Seaton (the applicant's agent).

Grahame Seaton confirmed that the applicant had purchased the land in 2016. The land had been advertised as a building plot with full planning permission for the erection of a 3-bedroom bungalow and garage (planning reference F/YR14/0703/F). The applicants had been looking to purchase a large building plot, with potential to build a bungalow and annexe for Mr Sharman's parents as his Mother suffers from advanced Alzheimer's. A letter from her doctor was submitted with the application confirming this. He highlighted that although Parson Drove Parish Council class the bungalow as over-development, the bungalow will only cover approximately 21% of the total site. He confirmed that the access issues raised by the residents are incorrect and the applicant's solicitor has confirmed that the site benefits from a legal right of way. He confirmed that Fenland District Council had granted full planning permission in 2014 and had approved the Pre-Application submitted by himself subsequently. He asked the Committee to follow the officer's advice to grant permission.

Members had no questions for Grahame Seaton.

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

1. Councillor Mrs Laws said that whilst she understands that Councillor Sarah Bligh is representing the residents of Swan Gardens, there is a planning application already approved for the site and the access issue is a civil matter.
2. Councillor Sutton asked for confirmation that the application complies with planning policies in relation to amenity space. David Rowen confirmed that the application does meet those requirements.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Laws, seconded by Councillor Connor and decided that the application be: APPROVED as per the officer's recommendation

**P44/17 F/YR17/1012/F
PRINCES FOOD LIMITED, LYNN ROAD, WISBECH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF AN 11.4M HIGH (MAX) EXTENSION TO EXISTING BUILDING**

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.

David Rowen presented a summary of the report to Members. An update had been circulated to Members to reflect an error in the report. In Para 10.2 it should read; 'It is considered that the extension per se will NOT cause tangible further harm'.

Members received a presentation objecting to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, by Jane Brackenbury.

Jane Brackenbury explained to Members that she is a resident of a property which is located behind the application site. She informed Members that she is representing local residents today. She stated that the factory was already in situ when she moved into her property 25 years ago, however explained that it has expanded significantly in recent years and this has had a daily impact on the lives of the residents who live nearby. She said residents suffer from noise complaints and have issues with smells produced by the factory. She confirmed that they have repeatedly tried to liaise with the owners of the factory in relation to these problems however no issues have been resolved. Whilst she recognises that the proposed development says vehicles will be kept inside, the Design and Access statements highlights that forklift trucks will be entering the site at all hours. She stated that proposed development will also block out any remaining light in her and neighbouring properties and asked the Committee to consider adding further Conditions to address these matters, if they decide to approve the application.

Members asked the following questions to Jane Brackenbury.

1. Councillor Connor asked Jane Brackenbury if she had ever raised the issues with her local Councillor. Jane Brackenbury confirmed that she had spoken to Councillor Carol Cox and tried to arrange numerous meetings with the factory. She explained that during earlier expansion work on the site, these meetings had been constructive however subsequently this has not worked. Councillor Connor encouraged her to pursue discussions with the factory in order to help the matter.
2. Councillor Mrs Davis asked Jane Brackenbury if she had reported the issues to the Environmental Team. Jane Brackenbury confirmed that she had although this only alleviated the problem for a short time. She is aware that the Environmental Team recommend keeping records of incidents however as the factory is aware that they are being monitored, the issues stop for the short-term as a result of this.
3. Councillor Mrs Laws reiterated that Jane Brackenbury and other residents should persevere

with the recording of all incidents.

4. Councillor Connor confirmed that diary entries of incidents would be considered by the Environmental Team and used as evidence if required.
5. The Chairman confirmed that this should be the avenue that residents explore in order to achieve a result beneficial to both themselves and the factory. He highlighted that it must be beneficial to both, as the factory is responsible for a high level of employment in the local area too. The Chairman recommended contacting Wisbech Town Council to voice their grievances as they are responsible in helping deal with residents' concerns.
6. Councillor Mrs Laws agreed with this and informed Jane Brackenbury that in the past, businesses with similar complaints, had conducted surveys and studies in order to rectify the issues and therefore she highly recommends approaching them again via the correct channels.

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

1. Councillor Connor said that whilst he sympathises with the residents, there are no planning reasons to refuse the application.
2. Councillor Mrs Laws asked officers if there were any Conditions on the site in regards to these problems. David Rowen confirmed that they had received no information to suggest the factory was breaching any such Conditions. He explained that the issues surrounding noise need to be passed on to the Environmental Team so they can follow their procedures in dealing with this.
3. Councillor Connor referred to point 5.2 in the report, where Councillor Steve Tierney had asked if bushes could be planted in order to improve the appearance of the site. He asked officers if this was something that could be implicated. David Rowen explained that it would be unreasonable to add this as a Planning Condition in respect of this particular application.
4. Councillor Sutton said that in his opinion, the proposed development will improve residents quality of life as the outbuilding will be used to limit noise produced from vehicles.
5. Councillor Mrs Davis agreed with this and asked officers if there would be a condition relating to noise-levels in the planning permission. Councillor Mrs Laws responded that any forklifts on site would be in an air-locked building if the application is approved and therefore the noise level will reduce as a result of this.
6. Councillor Mrs Hay stated that Point 9.4 explains this in further detail.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Hay, seconded by Councillor Connor and decided that the application be: APPROVED as per the officer's recommendation.

**P45/17 F/YR15/0865/O
LAND NORTH OF 118-124, LEVERINGTON COMMON, LEVERINGTON,
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
ERECTION OF 6 X DWELLINGS (MAX) (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL
MATTERS RESERVED)**

David Rowen presented the report to Members. He explained that Members had previously refused an application on the site and subsequently an appeal had been submitted challenging this decision. Whilst they wait for the Inspector's decision on this, officers recommend that it is unreasonable for the Council to defend this refusal in light of the recent appeal decision at Syringa House, Christchurch.

Despite most strongly disagreeing with the Inspector's decision in Appeal reference: APP/D0515/W/17/3171513 and believing that greater weight should be given to Policy LP5 of the Fenland Local Plan rather than the Written Ministerial Statement in respect of affordable housing on small sites, given the affordable housing need in the District (currently there are 2,336 applications on the Housing Register), as has happened on various other appeals around the country, the Council's Planning Committee very reluctantly agreed to not defend its reason for

refusal in respect of the current appeal at its meeting of 6 December.

Proposed by Councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Mrs Davis and decided that the application decision be reversed as per the officer's recommendations.

2:51 PM

Chairman