

PLANNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY, 20 JUNE 2018 - 1.00 PM

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

Officers in attendance: Jo Goodrum (Member Services & Governance Officer), Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), David Rowen (Development Manager) and Stephen Turnbull (Legal Officer)

P1/18 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting of 23 May 2018 were agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

P2/18 F/YR16/1017/O SITE OF FORMER EASTFIELD NURSERY, EASTREA ROAD, WHITTLESEY ERECTION OF 169 X DWELLINGS (MAX) (OUTLINE WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS ONLY)

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.

Graham Smith presented the application to Members and explained as it is an outline planning application, the applicant only has to provide an indicative layout and this demonstrates that they can accommodate up to 169 houses and includes provision for play areas and SUDS features. The proposed access into the site complies with engineering requirements as sought by the local highway authority. Mr Smith presented the overhead slides to Members and outlined details including the footpath from the existing housing which goes around the site. The site is a brownfield site on the edge of Whittlesey and is considered a sustainable location. The proposal cannot provide policy compliant levels of signing for affordable housing and the applicant has provided a viability assessment which has been assessed by the Section 106 Officer who has agreed its findings and therefore the significant education request from County Council. The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions attached and signing of the Section 106 Agreement.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Struan Power, from Taylor Wimpey. The application has been submitted in line with the allocation for residential development under Policy LP11 of the Local Plan. The application will deliver new homes on the brownfield site and provides a range of family housing comprising of 169 homes. The homes will provide spacious gardens and surrounding open space and there will also be a children's play area on the site. The subsequent reserved matters application will be submitted without delay.

Councillor Mrs Laws asked Mr Power whether he was present when Taylor Wimpey presented to Whittlesey Town Council in 2016. Mr Power confirmed he was present at that meeting. Councillor Mrs Laws commented that although Whittlesey Town Council are not objecting to this application because they would like to see the site come forward, several things were mentioned at the

meeting in 2016, which she does not think that Taylor Wimpey have taken into consideration. One of these items is over intensification and at the time Councillor Mrs Laws recalls the proposal was for 160 houses as opposed to 169. The Town Council thought that 120 homes would be adequate. At the south of the site there are bungalows and it was requested at the time from local residents that bungalows would be built at that location. The third item was that a pedestrian footway would be constructed from Diana Close and this would not be opened up for vehicles. Councillor Mrs Laws asked what has happened to those three points.

Mr Power responded to Councillor Mrs Laws that as far as he has been involved with the project the scheme has always been for 169 units and the layout before Members today is the same layout that was presented to Whittlesey Town Council in 2016. Mr Power takes on board the comments regarding density but the calculations show it to be 14 houses per acre and 35 per hectare and they do not feel it is over intensification, it is making best use of land that is available it is an allocated site and is capable of delivering up to 169 homes. With regard to the footpath and Diana Close, Wimpey do not control the land that is outside and they are providing connections to the nature reserve and upgrading the 400 metre loop that runs through there. With regard to the bungalows, there are bungalows at the northern edge at Bellmans Grove and also at the north eastern end of the site, however, at the reserved matters stage the layout will be determined.

At this point in the meeting the Chairman advised Members that there would now be a fifteen minute recess to allow them time to review the confidential papers that were being tabled.

Members debated several points in relation to the information in the confidential papers.

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

APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation.

(Members resolved to exclude the public from the meeting for this item of business in so far as it related to confidential papers tabled at the meeting on the grounds that it involved the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)

(Councillor Mrs Laws and Councillor Miscandlon registered in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they are Members of Whittlesey Town Council but take no part in planning matters)

P3/18

F/YR17/0616/F

**SITE OF FORMER GAS DISTRIBUTION CENTRE, GAS ROAD, MARCH
ERECTION OF 19 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 1 SINGLE-STOREY 2-BED; 5 X 2-
STOREY 2-BED; 5 X 3-STOREY 3-BED AND 8 FLATS; COMPRISING OF A 3-
STOREY APARTMENT BLOCK CONSISTING OF 6 X 2-BED FLATS AND 2 X 1-
BED FLATS, CYCLESTORE, BINSTORE AND PARKING AREA**

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

Graham Smith presented the application to Members and informed them that in addition to the update they had received a further representation of objection had been received from a resident in Upwell Road, relating to the prevention of pollution to the surrounding area. Graham advised Members that the Health and Safety Executive have been communicated with throughout the application process and have no objection to the proposal. The Council's Environmental Health Team have also reviewed the concerns raised by the objector with regard to partial completion of

the site and have concluded that planning condition 4 which is attached to the application gives the Council the authority to address the issues of partial completion and therefore the ability to deal with any contamination throughout the development and therefore the Officers recommendation is unaffected by this further representation. Graham Smith highlighted to Members that the site is contaminated and has a high pressure gas pipe which crosses the site. The application has addressed health and safety requirements and the area that must not be developed due to an exclusion zone. The Health and Safety Executive are happy with the proposal and additional conditions that are attached provide further protective measures for the pipeline. With regard to contamination it is a highly contaminated site and the contaminated land survey which has been carried out has been assessed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer and has highlighted two planning conditions, one of which is the requirement for decontamination works and the second one is the requirement for a construction management plan, which will give the Council the ability to monitor the construction phase as it takes place. With regard to the viability assessment that the developer has submitted that the site would not be viable to provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing, however the applicant has agreed to provide a contribution towards affordable housing and works to play areas or other local amenities in West End Park.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Caruso the acting agent on behalf of the Applicant. Mr Caruso explained that the proposed site was purchased in a portfolio of five sites from National Grid in 2015. The layout of the site has been designed with the help of the Health and Safety Executive and the Gas Company over many months who are both in support of the scheme. Each of the homes will have parking spaces and gardens and Gas Road will have a footpath in front of the site for the first time providing safe access for pedestrians. The Council has proposed a range of conditions to ensure the construction activity on the site is controlled to protect the local residents and workers. A contribution will be made towards local open space facilities by a legal agreement.

Councillor Connor asked for clarification on the number of homes and it was clarified as 19. Councillor Connor commented that Gas Road is a busy area and also a cycle route, nearby to a school and asked whether the developer would avoid these busy times when deliveries were made to the site. The Developer confirmed he is happy to work with the planning team to come to an agreement concerning hours of works.

Graham Smith clarified that contained within the construction management plan there would be a condition where it stipulates working hours and delivery times to be adhered to.

Councillor Mrs Laws stated that when considering traffic management it is not only just the hours that need to be considered which should include no Sunday working and no bank holiday working.

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

- Councillor Murphy asked for clarification as to whether the decontamination works would be supervised throughout the whole process as it is a very expensive project to carry out and he would not like to see any cost cutting or cut corners taking place. Graham Smith clarified that the significant issue of this application is that of the contamination and that is why the planning conditions are so detailed. There is a four page informative which sets out the management plan should be implemented and details the recommendations and advice from the Environmental Health Officer. Councillor Murphy asked whether alongside the informatives, will there be an Officer monitoring the works as they are carried out. Graham Smith stated that in planning terms there are Enforcement Officers and it will down to them to monitor the planning conditions and works alongside our Environmental Health Officers, HSE and the Environment Agency. David Rowen stated that in condition 4, part c of that condition requires the works to be carried out in full under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate the compliance and therefore if the compliance of the agreed methodology does not occur then in fact that condition does not comply and is not discharged and will therefore cause the

developer issues when the site needs to be signed off. Mr Harding added that at the end of the decontamination process the site has to be inspected and tested again and reported on to make sure it is fit for purpose.

- Councillor Mrs Laws added she has a concern regarding electric cabling and asked whether there is cabling on site. Graham Smith stated that he is not aware of any cabling but there is a sub-station.
- Councillor Connor stated that he is familiar with the site and he is aware that there are no cables there and he is reassured to hear that the decontamination will be handled in the correct manner.
- Councillor Mrs Davis referred to comments made by a resident where they have observed a continuous hissing noise coming from the major accident high pressure pipe line on the adjoining piece of land as well as a smell of gas and Councillor Mrs Davis asked whether the gas company have been spoken to. Graham Smith stated that they have responded with regard to the application details but they haven't referred specifically to that issue and that will be followed up with the gas company.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he thinks the bill for the decontamination will be huge. He stated he is pleased to see that the Agent and Developer have been working well with the planning department and he welcomes the application.
- The Chairman commented that according to the drawing there is a yellow hatching non construction area and he is concerned that the adjacent properties to that hatched area there appear to be no garages and wonders whether it would be possible to add a note to the planning approval where it stipulates that no garages could be constructed in this area in the future. Graham Smith commented that condition 13 removes the permitted development rights. The Chairman stated that on occasions people go ahead and build garages without planning permission and would like an informative added highlighting that point. Graham Smith agreed that this would be added.
- Mr Harding commented that during the Members deliberations there was a discussion concerning delivery and timings of materials being delivered to the site and feels that an informative can be added to say that any construction management plan that is submitted for discharge of condition should state that any delivery to the site should avoid the school drop off and collection times and also Members had mentioned to avoid Town Centre events, however, Mr Harding said this would be more difficult to do as we are unsure when the development will commence and therefore we are unsure going forward when events will be scheduled for therefore this will be unrealistic to include this into any condition or informative or construction management plan.
- The Chairman stated that the Developer needs to be mindful of any road signs which detail road closures.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked for bank holidays and no Sunday working to also be included.
- Councillor Connor stated that this could be delegated to Officers.
- Mr Harding clarified that the construction management plan as a rule states that the hours of construction exclude Sundays, Saturday afternoons and bank holidays, however the addition to the informative will remind the case officer dealing with the discharge of planning condition and also the applicant that when they prepare the Construction Management Plan it should state that deliveries should avoid those specific hours.
- Councillor Sutton asked Officers of the need to put the informative on for Middle Level and the relevant Internal Drainage Board.

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

APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation and that informatives be added to cover the following points:

1) To note that on the grounds of health and safety some permitted development rights have been removed for some plots.

2) The Construction Management Plan should make provision so that deliveries are not made during school drop off and collection times.

P4/18

F/YR17/1147/F

**MARCH COLD STORES LIMITED, 20 -24 MARWICK ROAD, MARCH
ERECTION OF A COLD STORAGE BUILDING INCLUDING PLANT ROOMS, 6NO
LOADING DOCKS, 14NO VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS, 2NO CONDENSERS
AND NEW HARDSTANDING AREA**

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

Graham Smith presented the application to Members and explained it had been brought before Members to determine due to the fact that there had been more than 6 letters of objection received. Mr Smith highlighted to members the linear strip of land which is land attached to the garden area of 160 Elm Road. Graham Smith highlighted to members the proximity of the residential properties to the eastern edge of the site. The proposed additional planting was pointed out and highlighted the elevations of the building. The original application had been submitted and was only 28 metres from the proposed end elevation to the site boundary and a request was submitted to the applicant and an amended scheme was submitted and there is now a separation distance of between 60 and 68 metres to the rear windows of the residential properties. The lighting plan was pointed out to members and the proposed lighting at the rear of the premises which will be at a height of 2 metres and they will be down lighters. This lighting is considered to have little impact on nearby neighbours. In terms of loss of light, the Council does not have its own design standards in terms of separation distances so the BRE guidance which suggests that facing buildings can go up to an angle of 25 degrees which is considered to be acceptable. This proposal demonstrates would be approximately 10 degrees and would be compliant with BRE standards.

Graham Smith highlighted to Members the indicative junction improvement which shows the junction of Marwick Road and Elm Road and the proposed widening of the highway, and as it is only indicative currently it has planning conditions attached requiring the provision of this and the details to be submitted. The Environmental Health Officer has considered the applicants noise assessment and has requested an acoustic barrier to be provided on the northern boundary and this has been included in the planning conditions. The applicants have also offered to provide a contribution towards the existing TRO in terms of prohibiting parking near the junction with Elm Road and Marwick Road and this is proposed to be part of a Section 106 contribution and the highways improvements to the junction are considered to alleviate the exiting difficulties of large vehicles coming out of the junction.

Members made comments and asked questions as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that when Members attended the site visit it was noted that the area where the HGV come in is very dusty and asked whether there will be a water bowser or whether the applicant will be considering tarmacking the area.
- Councillor Connor stated that he was happy with what he observed on the site visit and what he has heard today and industry is needed in March.
- Councillor Murphy stated he was also concerned with the amount of dust and asked which area is going to be tarmacked. Graham Smith clarified that it is his understanding that it will be the HGV dock that will be hard surfaced. Mr Harding clarified that in the yard area on the site plan there is a horizontal area which will be hard surfaced.
- Councillor Murphy commented that in his opinion he thinks the application conforms with LP3, LP6, LP14, LP15 and LP16 and he can see no planning reason for this application to be refused.
- Councillor Connor commented whether a consideration of a dust separation unit could be installed.

- David Rowen commented that in condition 3 it refers to hard and soft landscaping which could include the hard surfacing area around the site.
- Councillor Mrs Newell asked for clarification that there is a condition included with regard to archaeology and Graham Smith confirmed that yes that is condition 9.
- Councillor Mrs Hay stated that we need to be encouraging businesses in Fenland to keep and retain in Fenland and to make them grow and the applicant in this case has listened to the Planning department and although some of the neighbours comments have been with regard to the noise, the proposal will be an improvement as the building will shield the noise and the electricity points that are being installed will now mean that the lorries with refrigeration units will not need to keep their engines on overnight.
- Councillor Mrs Laws stated we have to encourage businesses and they have worked very hard with our Planning Officers and the site visit demonstrated that they are responsible owners.
- Councillor Sutton commented that this is a good established company who want to expand.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that with regard to the dust comments. On the site visit, the site foreman explained that it is one of the first priorities to reduce the dust level of vehicles entering and exiting the site, not only for the surrounding area but also for their employees.

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

APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation.

**P5/18 F/YR17/1171/F
LAND EAST AND WEST OF ISLE OF ELY WAY, SOUTH OF RIVER NENE, GAUL
ROAD, MARCH
CHANGE OF USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND TO SURFACE WATER LAGOON,
AND ASSOCIATED DRAINAGE WORKS**

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

David Rowen presented the application to Members which is for change of use of agricultural land to a surface water lagoon with associated drainage works. At the present time the site is 5.75 hectares in size and is uncultivated land and the proposal is to take surface water from Willow Green residential development and utilise an existing ditch with some improvement works and a culvert under the A141. There is a proposal of a vehicle access to the site from Gaul Road with an outfall ditch. Mr Rowen advised Members that as part of the Willow Green planning permission in 2009 this drainage arrangement was indicated as part of that. The lagoon has also been designed to accommodate any additional flows which would arise from further future development on Gaul Road as well as being intended to accommodate flows from the existing Middle Level drainage network. Mr Rowen indicated to Members on the overhead presentation the lagoon configuration which is a series of ditches which would be allowed to flood in the middle in times of high water. The scheme has been designed in conjunction with Middle Level Internal Drainage Board and once constructed this will be adopted by them.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Hodson, the applicants agent who explained he has been dealing with the three outstanding elements one of which is the drainage scheme. The highway works will commence on the 2 July and the Countryside Park which is part of the Section 106 Agreement which will be with the Planning Department in due course.

Councillor Mrs Laws asked for clarification with regard to the consultation on the design of the lagoon whether it will be sloped or stepped as she has concerns with regard to it being an area where children may be drawn to. Mr Hodson stated that he was not the engineer who designed it but for most of the year it is anticipated it will remain dry, however this will be looked at.

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

- Councillor Sutton declared that he is a Member representative who sits on the Middle Level Internal Drainage Board but has taken no part in any of the discussions surrounding this application.
- Councillor Mrs Hay commented that the traffic lights were approved in July 2016 and she cannot see the point of constructing the lagoon at the same time as the Gaul Road traffic lights as this will cause more traffic problems and she would feel happier if there was a condition that the construction of the lagoon should not start until after the traffic lights are in place.
- Mr Harding stated that he does not believe that it would be an appropriate condition to place on any consent that is granted due to the fact that there has to be a request from the highway authority so we always have to have a reason for condition and if there has not been a recommendation from the highway authority that the works need to be staggered then it would not be an option to put on a condition.
- Mr Harding stated that he thought it was highly unlikely that the commencement on the works to the lagoons would begin at the start of July and Mr Hodson confirmed that it would not begin at this time.
- Councillor Mrs Hay asked that why under section 10.3 in the Officers report does it state that the works will be 'concurrent' with the A141 Gaul Road Traffic Signal junction improvement works.

The Chairman invited Mr Hodson to return to the public participation table to answer the question raised.

- Mr Hodson stated that it is a major piece of work and they will not be starting at the start of July as the road space has to be booked in with the Highways Authority in advance.
- Mr Harding commented that if the Committee are minded to approve the application but are concerned about the timing of the works in relation to the separate junction improvements then the County Council Highways Authority and if they also share the concern and want a condition on, then the consent could be issued with that condition.
- The Chairman asked whether the Committee are happy with the proposal for County Council Highways to be consulted with regard to the two pieces of work and wait for their comments and delegate that to Officers to deal with.
- Councillor Mrs Davis asked whether it can be a requirement for the junction to be dealt with first.
- Mr Harding stated that as he understood, Councillor Mrs Hay had concerns over the two sets of works taking place at the same time and that the junction works will be starting at the beginning of July
- The Chairman asked the Committee to clarify that they are happy for the Officers to correspond with the Highway Authority and come to a satisfactory resolve and delegate the powers on behalf of the Committee in consultation with the Vice Chairman and Chairman of the Planning Committee.
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that the Ward Councillor was very concerned of the danger of that junction and would agree with the Highways Authority being consulted.
- Mr Nick Harding stated that the main concern that Councillor Count had was that this scheme would delay the implementation of the junction improvements.

The Chairman asked the Committee to confirm whether they are happy for Officers to consult with Highways and in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee and Councillor Mrs Hay, as she was the Committee Member who raised the issue.

Councillor Murphy commented that the application before them today has no objections from any of the relevant agencies and he can see no planning reason why this application should not be approved.

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

APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation with an informative recommending that the development does not take place at the same time as the Gaul Road junction works.

P6/18 **F/YR18/0128/RM**
WESTHAVEN NURSERY, PETERBOROUGH ROAD, WHITTLESEY
RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION RELATING TO DETAILED MATTERS OF
APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE PURSUANT TO OUTLINE
PERMISSION F/YR14/0183/O, ERECTION OF 68 X 2-STOREY DWELLINGS
COMPRISING OF 4 X 1-BED, 20 X 2-BED, 42 X 3-BED, 2 X 4-BED WITH PUBLIC
OPEN SPACES AND PLAY AREA

The Chairman reported that this item had been withdrawn from today's Planning Committee.

P7/18 **F/YR18/0321/F**
LAND SOUTH OF 31-33 LAKE CLOSE, MARCH
ERECTION OF 8 X DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 2 X 3-STOREY 3-BED, 2 X 2-
STOREY 4-BED, 2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED AND 2 X SINGLE-STOREY 3-BED

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 application to Members which is for the erection of 8 dwellings and referred Members attention to the update report. The application proposes the extension of Lake Close and this was highlighted to Members on the power point presentation. David Rowen highlighted to Members that the western half of the site already has planning permission for the erection of four dwellings. The proposal is for a range of house type proposed, predominately 2 storey but also with some 1.5 storey and also a couple of bungalows. Mr Rowen drew Members attention to the relationship between the development and the property 4 Gilbert Row which fronts onto West End. No objections have been received from that property in respect of the relationship which is to the side of unit 6. A number of the objections that have been received to this application including the Town Council who have raised the issue of flooding and drainage, however the previous granted planning permission on the western half of the site contained a condition requiring details of surface water drainage to be submitted and if Members are minded to grant planning approval today a similar condition could be added as an acceptable solution can be achieved subject to a detailed surface water strategy being presented. David Rowen stated that if the application is approved then an addition to the planning condition would be required to state the materials to be used and one requiring the details of the management and maintenance to the roads to be submitted and agreed.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Adam Sutton, the applicants' agent. Mr Sutton explained that the Planning Officer has assessed the application and half of the site has approval albeit with a condition concerning surface water drainage. Mr Sutton commented that applications have been made in terms of getting the road adopted. The site forms a natural progression from Lake Close and finishes the development off and this has been discussed with Planning Officers from the outset with the pre application meeting.

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

- Councillor Court asked whether there is an issue with flooding at this site. David Rowen stated that the site is within flood zone 1 which is the lowest risk of flooding. Some of the objections that have been received refer to an incident on the site in 2014/15 where there was a

particularly intense rainfall event. If there are surface water issues these can be adequately addressed through a detailed engineering scheme and that is why a condition to that effect is recommended.

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that normally a developer will complete a development and then there is normally a period of grace, however she cannot understand why the developer has now applied for an application for this to be adopted.
- Mr Harding commented that neither the District Council or the County Council can force a developer to have their roads adopted, they can keep them as private if they wish and if a developer has not made arrangements when they sold the plots to individual purchasers for those purchases to contribute into a management fund then the developer will find that they will have issues in terms of long term maintenance. This application may therefore have focussed the applicants mind in terms of if they have applied for a Section 38 Adoption Agreement then that will be following a process. The issue that is often found with retrospective applications for road adoptions is that as the road is constructed without the supervision of County Council then core samples have to be taken to ensure it has been constructed in accordance with County Council specifications.
- Councillor Connor stated that it will complete the site.

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

APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Sutton declared a non pecuniary interest by virtue of the fact that his Nephew, Adam Sutton was the Agent who would be speaking with regard to this application)

P8/18 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Mr Harding presented the Statement of Community Involvement to Members which sets out the District Council's approach to community engagement in respect of dealing with planning applications, the local plan and other planning policy documents that we may send out for consultation and the production of neighbourhood plans. Under new government legislation the Local Authority is required to periodically review our Statement of Community Involvement and our current version was adopted in 2013, it is now due for review. Mr Harding advised Members that the document has not changed significantly since the 2013 version was produced and he highlighted the approach in terms of consultation on planning applications it remains the same as it is at present in terms of how far we circulate neighbourhood notification letters, in what circumstances we advertise site notices and in what circumstances we advertise in the local newspaper. There is an area where there is a change in respect of neighbourhood plans and that is to ensure we are compliant with what is set out in the new legislation in connection with neighbourhood plans. Mr Harding asked Committee Members to consider the document and if there are any suggested revisions to it then these will be passed on to Cabinet for its consideration before the matter goes out to public consultation.

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

- Councillor Sutton commented that the one complaint he is often contacted about is to do with boundary issues and he wonders whether this can be considered within the document.
- Councillor Mrs Davis agrees as she also receives the same queries and complaints.
- The Chairman agreed and wonders whether it will prudent for Officers to consider a circle within a specific radius around the property is notified. County Council operate this scheme with a 250 yard radius.
- Mr Harding commented that County Council do not deal with many planning applications and those that they do deal with are often waste applications and school applications. Mr Harding commented that the printing and post cost implications need to be considered if the radius is

extended, in terms of the number of properties, road, frontage and common boundary consultations and he suggested that it may be worth considering consulting the one that abuts the property and then the next property.

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that maybe affixing notices to street lights could be considered.
- David Rowen commented that it is worth noting that the Development Management Procedure Order states what the Local Authority statutorily has to do in terms of neighbourhood notifications which is properties that immediately join the application site.
- Mr Harding stated that the issue with notices on street lights is that the letters are sent out first they will be dated which stipulate 21 days to respond and the site notice may not be displayed at the same time and will have a different date on it, which can cause confusion.
- Councillor Mrs Davis commented that at the bottom of page 126 there is an anomaly with regard to the statement which mentions the planning applications that the Committee determines and requires a slight alteration. Mr Harding noted the comments and agreed to amend the document.
- Mr Harding confirmed with Members that as a result of their discussions surrounding the Statement of Community Involvement, he has ascertained that the section within the document concerning the Member call in arrangement needs to be made clearer.

Members agreed to approve the Statement of Community Involvement subject to the agreed amendment for submission to Cabinet.

3.41 pm

Chairman