PLANNING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 27 FEBRUARY 2019 - 1.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon (Chairman), Councillor S Clark (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Benney, Councillor S Court, Councillor A Hay, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor W Sutton and Councillor Mrs S Bligh,

APOLOGIES: Councillor D Connor, Councillor Mrs M Davis and Councillor Mrs F Newell,

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

P64/18 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 30 January 2019 were confirmed and signed.

P65/18 F/YR17/1127/O.
NORTH OF THE GREEN AND NORTH OF 145-159 WISBECH ROAD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

118NO DWELLINGS INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF 147A WISBECH ROAD (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS)

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 to members and drew their attention to the update report which had been circulated.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Tim Slater, acting on behalf of the Agent in support of the application.

Mr Slater stated that there is an error contained within the report at 9.3 where it states that no community consultation had taken place, this is incorrect as one took place on 16 November 2017. He added that the layout is indicative only and all matters except access will be subject to reserved matters.

Mr Slater stated that the application is for a sustainable development, in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and in his view, it is a sustainable and accessible location and is policy compliant.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that she is very interested in the Section 106 contributions and added that in her opinion suitable housing association accommodation is important and required. She added that it is a very healthy proposition of £1.65 million and she would hope that the relevant parties involved with the application adhere to the delivery of their promise.
- Councillor Mrs Bligh stated in her opinion that the site is well placed and the improvements

that are planned to the Peas Hill roundabout in her opinion will be welcomed. She feels the proposal in its outline form meets policy, however the Section 106 Obligations will not come to fruition with a later viability study, adding that whilst Fenland and the town of March need houses there also needs to be contributions towards education and health.

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that the development would enhance the area and she will be supporting approval of this application.
- Councillor Murphy stated that 12 statutory consultees have raised no objections to this application and, therefore, he cannot see any reason for it to be refused.
- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification with a couple of anomalies within the report. At point 5.9 of the report it mentions that the proposal is for 33 homes for affordable rent and shared ownership, but at 9.46, it states 30 units and he asked for clarity. David Rowen confirmed that the correct figure is 30.
- Councillor Sutton stated that at 5.19 in the officer's report where it mentions the provision of GP surgery needs, it mentions Mercheford House Surgery, and at 9.54, it quotes the Riverside Practice and asked for clarification of whether it is both surgeries or if it is just one. David Rowen agreed that there is a discrepancy, however the main issue for members to consider is that £42,435 will be secured towards GP provision in the vicinity, however, clarification will be sought from the NHS.
- Councillor Sutton commented on the Section 106 contributions and highlighted the financial contribution per plot, stating that, in his opinion, he has serious doubts as to whether the site will be developed based on the figures before members today. He added that it is not affordable to build the site out based on those figures.
- Councillor Court commented that although he is the Ward Councillor for the proposal, he has not been lobbied on the application and having studied the report, his main concern is the access onto Wisbech Road for 118 houses, with Wisbech Road being the main route into March from Wisbech, Peterborough and Kings Lynn and there is a great deal of traffic on the road. He made the point that In 2015, the speed limit on the road was reduced from 40mph to 30mph due to the risk surrounding school children trying to cross the road, the road is already an extremely busy road and to add an additional 118 houses will only add to the risk of road traffic accidents and in his opinion, he feels that a smaller development of 30 homes would be a better option. He also feels that the impact on schools and health provision also needs to be taken into consideration.
- Nick Harding stated that he has reviewed the NHS letter that was received by officers and it mentions both GP practices, so clarification will need to be sought, however, he does have a recollection of a proposed merger between surgeries, but this information will still need to be confirmed.
- Councillor Mrs Laws referred to the comments made by Councillor Court and added that there are no highways objections to the proposal, subject to the provision of the works at Peas Hill roundabout and the financial contribution towards the cycle infrastructure.
- Councillor Mrs Laws agrees with Councillor Sutton's concerns with regard to the Section 106 agreement, and in her opinion, believes a viability study will be undertaken going forward.
- The Chairman added that it has to be accepted that the Section 106 agreement is part of the application and what happens in the future does not form part of the determination before members today.
- Councillor Hay commented that she agrees that the Section 106 has to be accepted as it stands and 118 houses on that site is not, in her opinion, overdevelopment. She added that whilst it will create more vehicular movements, not all traffic will be leaving the site at the same time and there will be the benefit of the improvements to the road leading to the junction, which could ease the existing traffic issues already in existence.

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

P66/18 **F/YR18/1126/O.**
LAND EAST OF THE BUNGALOW, IRETONS WAY, CHATTERIS, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

ERECTION OF A DWELLING (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS AND LAYOUT)

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 to members and drew their attention to the update report which had been circulated.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Mr Lee Bevens, the Agent.

Mr Bevens explained that the application may appear straight forward for determination however the current application is a culmination of 2 years work where the applicant has been trying to resolve the issues at the site. He stated that the applicant had previously applied for a certificate of lawfulness on 2 separate occasions with one being refused, which was to establish a permanent dwelling for a mobile home, which would be used by his daughter and family and despite numerous letters of support to confirm that she has lived there for more than ten years it has proved problematic to obtain specific utility bills to prove it was a separate dwelling.

Mr Bevens stated that it was therefore, felt that given the length of time the applicant's daughter and her family had lived at the address, an application for a permanent dwelling would be a more acceptable approach. He explained that if approved, the current mobile home behind the bungalow will be removed and this will improve the visual character.

Mr Bevens made the point that whilst it is accepted that the site falls outside of the settlement of Chatteris, it is not practical to offer justification for an elsewhere location as the proposal has nothing to do with agriculture, forestry or horticulture. He added that mitigation has been offered in proposing a bungalow at the address to remove the long standing mobile home and in respect of policy LP12d, an explanation has been provided to explain why the bungalow should be supported and be treated differently to a typical dwelling in the open countryside.

Mr Bevens expressed the view that he proposed dwelling is in a sustainable location and will mean that the family can all live in the vicinity to provide a support network due to the issues of ill health. He commented that the National Planning Policy Framework has sustainability at its core and the proposal before the committee meets the social objective of sustainable growth, by providing a new home with the dwelling not being an isolated home in the countryside by virtue of it being similar to others in the vicinity and the land will be used effectively ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Mr Bevens stated that whilst there has been no request to update the visibility splays, the comments of the Highways Officer can be taken on board and the extra distances can be achieved. He concluded by stating that the proposal has overwhelming local support, and there have been no letters of objection to the scheme, there will be no negative impact on the area and it will not cause harm to the appearance of the surrounding countryside being of a scale and location that is in keeping with the immediate form of development. He asked members to use flexibility against the local plan and policies and grant approval.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws asked Mr Bevens whether any supporting documentation has been provided to support the medical history problems that he had alluded to? He stated that the medical history concerns have taken place in the last few months and no documentation has been submitted.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked whether the issue of utility bills has been resolved yet? Mr Bevens stated that when the Certificate of Lawfulness application was produced, whilst there was the local support to confirm that the daughter had lived there for more than 10 years, because the bills for the utility services were addressed to the bungalow, it had proved difficult to justify splitting the bills.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked whether the bungalow is still paying for all the utilities? Mr Bevens said that as far as he was aware that was the case. Mr Bevens and the applicant added that the electric bills are all separate. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that if the electric bills are separate then there would be an audit trail of information.
- Councillor Sutton stated that on the site visit members saw that there were two static vans on the site. Mr Bevens said that there is a temporary one there at the moment due to the ongoing health issues with another member of the family having moved onto the site temporarily and the mobile home will not remain in situ for the long term.

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

- Councillor Hay asked for clarity with regard to when the original bungalow was built. Her understanding was that one of the conditions was that the static caravan was there to facilitate the building and it would be removed once the dwelling was built. David Rowen advised that in terms of the original permission for the demolition of the original bungalow, no mobile home was included as part of that application, and whether there was a condition as part of the proposal is unknown. He added that the proposal is for a standalone new property to be erected and the presence and history of the mobile home is irrelevant.
- Councillor Benney explained that this is the first committee meeting he has sat on where he knows the applicant, knows the majority of the people who have written letters of support, knows the area and the site well and feels the siting of a bungalow would enhance the area. He added that if the application was approved, he would like to see a condition added that the mobile homes should be removed from the site altogether. He feels that time has proven that the location is sustainable and the existing bungalow is very well kept and maintained. He commended the family for wanting to stay together and in his view the human element should also be considered when determining the application, making the point that that both Chatteris Town Council and Manea Parish Council support this application.
- Councillor Murphy stated that the proposal is outside of all planning policies to add a new bungalow on the site. He added that he can recall when the bungalow was built and the mobile home was put in situ, and, in his opinion, he recalls that the caravan should have been removed when the bungalow was finished and this has never happened.
- Councillor Mrs Laws added that there are policies in place to consult when reviewing applications and whilst she appreciates Councillor Benneys comments, an applicant should supply evidence based documentation to officers, and in this case no medical evidence has been supplied. With regard to proof of ownership and utility bills this evidence has also not been submitted.
- Councillor Benney referred to Councillor Murphy's comments that the application falls outside of the building line, however, after consulting Google maps the development is closer to the centre of Chatteris than another application which was approved.
- Councillor Hay made the point that Cambridgeshire County Council have asked for a deferment for amended plans or refusal altogether because there has been a failure to demonstrate a satisfactory access point.
- Councillor Sutton stated that planning is about the use of land, and whilst he can understand the comments raised by Councillor Benney, and he commends the family for

wanting to reside together, planning law is about land use and planning policy, and if this application was approved it would be inconsistent with previous decisions.

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

(Councillors Benney, Hay and Murphy stated that they are members of Chatteris Town Council, but take no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Benney stated that he has known the applicant for many years and stated that the legal officer has advised that there is no reason why he should not sit on the committee.)

P67/18 F/YR18/1146/F.
LAND WEST OF 327, NORWOOD ROAD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

ERECTION OF 2 X SINGLE-STOREY 3-BED DWELLINGS WITH ATTACHED SINGLE GARAGE

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 to members and drew their attention to the update report that had been circulated.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Mr Gareth Edwards, the Agent.

Mr Edwards explained that the application is for 2 bungalows off Prospect Road in March and has worked closely with the Planning Officer throughout the planning application process. The site is the extended garden of the applicants dwelling, which is 327 Norwood Road, and he advised that the host property will still have adequate amenity space, should the application be approved.

Mr Edwards added that a pre-application on the site has taken place, which received a positive response and has led to the application before the committee today. He stated that the proposal will be for single storey dwellings, will not impact on the neighbouring properties and following the planning officer's comments, both bungalows will be moved further back to increase the distance between the proposal and the existing bungalows on the opposite side of Prospect Road.

Mr Edwards stated that as part of the proposal, a turning area has also been provided for the use of all residents on Prospect Road, which will mean that no vehicle will need to exit the road in reverse.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated that there are no reasons why this application should not be approved. The Agent and the Applicant have worked with the Planning Officers in order to overcome any issues and everything is now in order.
- Councillor Bligh agreed with Councillor Sutton's comments that the Agent has worked well with officers and she will fully support this application.
- Councillor Hay asked whether any amended Highway plans had been submitted following a comment received from Cambridgeshire County Council Highways where they state that Prospect Road does not allow 2 way vehicle flow at the access and stated that it could result in vehicles being stationary on Wisbech Road. David Rowen stated that no amended plans were requested in respect of that comment, as it was considered that Prospect Road

is of a limited width and the addition of 2 properties, although intensifying the use of the access, would not cause any problematic issue. In addition where Prospect Road meets Wisbech Road, there is quite a wide footway and parking area which was considered to provide a refuge if required.

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that there have been a number of letters of support received, the Agent has worked with the planning officers and the proposal will enhance the area.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Laws, seconded by Councillor Mrs Bligh and decided that the application be APPROVED, as per the Officer's recommendation.

1.55 pm Chairman