

PLANNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY, 23 JULY 2025 - 1.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor Mrs J French and Councillor N Meekins, Councillor M Purser (Substitute)

APOLOGIES: Councillor C Marks (Vice-Chairman), Councillor R Gerstner and Councillor E Sennitt Clough,

Officers in attendance: Matthew Leigh (Head of Planning), David Rowen (Development Manager), Alan Davies (Principal Planning Officer), Richard Fitzjohn (Senior Development Officer), Jade Allen (Enforcement Assistant), Stephen Turnbull (Legal Officer) and Elaine Cooper (Member Services)

P23/25 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the 11 and 25 June 2025 were signed and agreed as accurate records.

P24/25 F/YR24/0857/F LAND SOUTH WEST OF THOMAS CLARKSON ACADEMY, CORPORATION ROAD, WISBECH ERECT A SECONDARY SCHOOL (3-STOREY) WITH ASSOCIATED FENCING (UP TO 3.0M HIGH), PE COURTS, EXTERNAL LIGHTING, PARKING, ACCESS, LANDSCAPING AND DRAINAGE

Richard Fitzjohn presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Oliver Corbett, the agent, and Richard Scott, Headteacher. Mr Scott advised members that he was the Executive Principal of the new Wisbech Academy and would be speaking about the opportunity to represent the young people of Wisbech. He stated that the new school is a response to a clear and growing need, they have already received 200 applicants for a second intake of the Wisbech Academy and the neighbouring school has received 400.

Mr Scott expressed the opinion that it tells them that the families of Wisbech are seeking a high quality education for their children. He expressed the view that the new Wisbech Academy will be a distinct school with a strong focus on science, technology, engineering and maths and a smaller more personalised environment.

Mr Scott stated that a state of the art permanent building would be ideal in supporting such as curriculum and it would also not be isolated with its location next to Thomas Clarkson Academy allows for meaningful collaboration, something which is already underway and it will bring shared benefits from curriculum support to economies of scale and the campus with its wide range of sports facilities will also be available to the wider community. He stated that they are proud that Thomas Clarkson achieved two consecutive good Ofsted ratings, the first in its history, and this gives them the confidence that as part of Brooke Weston Trust, the same academy, the new school will be in strong hands, with a leadership team that understands the local context and is committed to continuous improvement.

Mr Scott stated that many of its young pupils face significant challenges and the demographic of the school represents some of the poorest youngsters in Cambridgeshire and in the East of England more generally. He continued that the school will offer them not just a place to learn but a place to belong, be supported and to thrive, it will open doors to opportunities that might otherwise remain closed.

Mr Scott added that the school also offers a broad and enriching curriculum with access to high quality facilities and extra curricular activities that will help to build confidence and a sense of purpose for these young people. He stated that he wants every child to feel that their aspirations are valid and achievable and that they are part of a school community that believes in their potential.

Mr Scott recognised the concerns raised about traffic and congestion and advised that a robust travel plan will be in place from the outset and reviewed annually. He stated that they are committed to being good neighbours and to working with the community to ensure the school's presence is a positive one, above all they see this as a chance to invest in the future of Wisbech, its young people, its families and its wider community, hoping that the committee would see the value of this vision.

Mr Corbett stated that there is significant interest in places in the school and there is temporary accommodation at the Thomas Clarkson Academy for some pupils on roll for the Wisbech Academy currently and there will a further temporary building on site later this year to accommodate those pupils. He referred to the positive discussions he has had through the course of the application resolving matters raised by the IDB, the LLFA, Highways and Fenland's Ecology Officer to result in the positive recommendation in front of committee, with all of the matters being addressed or will be dealt with via planning conditions.

Mr Corbett referred to the Town Council objection and it is known that these projects do cause disruption to residents and their contractors, Henry Brothers, delivering the school will work closely and in accordance with the Construction Management Plan to try and avoid any detrimental impacts.

Members asked questions of Mr Scott and Mr Corbett as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French asked about SEND children as this has not been mentioned and is there provision? Mr Scott responded it would, with there being around 80 children with ECPH needs and that has had a significant impact on what they are trying to do at Thomas Clarkson and the needs into the new school. He added that a SENCO has already been appointed and they have every expectation that they will be supporting ECPH students within the context of the new school and this is where the campus collaboration will come in because they will be able to offer opportunities for a best suit for school for some students, offering a more bespoke setting.
- Councillor Mrs French referred to the concerns of Middle Level regarding site encroachments and asked if they were going to discuss this with Hundred of Wisbech IDB? Mr Corbett responded that they have had a number of meetings with the Board over a number of months and they have dealt with some of their objections and comments and they have formally withdrawn their objection. He stated that part of what they need to do is ensure access to their facilities and assets and that is achieved through the planning application and there is a separate consenting process with the drainage board, which will be carried out and as part of that there might be some works to widen accesses and enable future vehicles and operational requirements to be dealt with.
- Councillor Purser referred to buildings of this nature taking some time to construct and it is on quite a busy road and with the weather having been what it has been like is there provision for wheel cleaning, etc, for vehicles coming on and off the site to keep the road clean. Mr Corbett responded that as part of the construction management plan, of which a draft version was submitted with the application and another one is subject to condition,

things like wheel washing and dust mitigation will all be considered and agreed with officers.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French referred to the officer's report stating that it broadly accords with the plan and asked what does this mean as it either does or does not? Richard Fitzjohn responded that with any planning application, especially of a major scale, there is always elements of certain criteria and certain policies of the Local Plan that it might not specifically comply with but the Development Plan has to be looked at as a whole. He stated that it is his words in the report that it broadly accords as it is very rare that you would get any proposal that accord with every specific criteria.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she welcomes this as a new secondary school is needed and is pleased to see there are going to be SEND places, there was supposed to be a Special Education school for March and unfortunately County Council withdrew that last year. She asked if it known when this school, if approved, will start? Richard Fitzjohn stated that his understanding of the opening date for the school is aiming for September next year. Mr Scott was permitted to confirm that it would be September 2027.
- Councillor Benney expressed his surprise to see this application before committee, councils usually want to see schools come forward and he does not understand why the Town Council has objected. He feels it is something that is needed with Wisbech being a growing town.
- Councillor Mrs French asked if a BNG was submitted with the application? Richard Fitzjohn confirmed that there was and it is included within the conditions for the BNG to be agreed.
- Councillor Connor expressed the view that the application ticks all the boxes, a robust construction management plan is required and he does not understand why anyone would go against something that is so much needed.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Purser and agreed that the application be GRANTED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Meekins declared, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a member of Wisbech Town Council and was on the Town Council's Planning Committee when this application was discussed so took no part in the discussion or voting thereon)

P25/25

F/YR23/1033/F

LAND SOUTH OF 88 WEST STREET, CHATTERIS

ERECT 21 X DWELLINGS (4 X 2-STOREY 2-BED, 15 X 2-STOREY 3-BED & 2 X 2-STOREY 4-BED) WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS WORKS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING, AND THE FORMATION OF ATTENUATION PONDS, INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS

Alan Davies presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Kate Wood, the agent. Ms Wood stated that the application is for 21 houses on this partly brownfield site immediately adjacent to the edge of the town of Chatteris. She continued that the proposed development will facilitate the removal and remediation of the noisy engineering company on the site, which will now be able to move to a larger and more modern facility elsewhere in Chatteris.

Ms Wood expressed the view that the main positive impact of the development will be the improvement of the road at West Street, all the way from where it starts to be an unmade track further up the street. She feels the road improvement will benefit neighbouring dwellings that are effectively accessing their properties off a track currently as well as providing a safer length of

access for the many dog walkers using this route towards the pocket park which is further south.

Ms Wood reminded members that a similar application on this site was supported in principle by the committee in 2022 but at that time they had not resolved the upgrade of the byway through the Definitive Map Modification process with the Highway Authority and, therefore, the application was refused for that reason alone. She continued that since then they have worked through that process with the Public Rights of Way Team at the County Council and the byway has been formalised in its width through their processes and that has allowed them to reapply for this application.

Ms Wood made the point that the process resulted in the width of the byway being defined as wider than assumed at the northern end of the application site and this has required them to lose one dwelling from the scheme so that they could move the frontage dwellings back off the definitive right of way and while the access itself will be created as a normal estate road the hatched area shown on the presentation screen will fall into the front gardens of the first two properties and the Highway Authority requires them to provide highway markers through these gardens to make it clear which is highway and which is private land.

Ms Wood expressed the view that committee can be confident to approve the application in the knowledge that a proper access can be provided now and a further benefit of the application is that it provides public open space which will result, in her opinion, in a more attractive and pleasant walking route through the development itself as well as ecological enhancements. She referred to Paragraph 10.60 of the officer's report where it mentions the timing of the application was such that BNG is not required, however, they did undertake a biodiversity assessment which concluded that there would be a net gain in area habitat of 28% and an absolute gain in linear habitat from the baseline of zero so, in her view, the scheme more than meets the 10% gain that is normally required.

Ms Wood stated that the proposed development will also result in much needed affordable housing providing further choice in the area for those seeking homes through affordable routes. She made the point that all other technical matters as has been said have been resolved, such as flood risk, drainage and residential amenity impacts and she hoped members would now be able to approve the application as per the recommendation.

Members asked questions of Ms Wood as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French asked if there was going to be any play equipment on the public open space? Ms Wood responded that there would be no play equipment as it is not the size of a site that would require it. Councillor Mrs French made the point that there are 21 homes and will probably be 50-60 children so thinks they should reconsider.
- Councillor Mrs French referred to drainage board and asked who is going to maintain it after the development as it does say in the report that it is not considered to be sufficient through the agent technical response? Ms Wood responded that there is a drainage strategy that was submitted with the application which sets out how drainage will be managed on the site and any runoff into the IDB system has been assessed by the IDB. She continued there is a separate process for a discharge application to the IDB drain, which is the ultimate way that water will come off the site but there is attenuation and filtration in the drainage strategy which is that there is permeable paving in parking spaces and there is the attenuation basin within public open space which are ponds effectively and they collect all the surface water from the site, roads and roofs and then it filters out and is controlled in its exit from the site to greenfield runoff rates and that is when it goes into the IDB system clean. Councillor Mrs French stated that it does say in the report the receiving ditch may need improvements and asked if they were prepared to improve this ditch that is going to receive the water? Ms Wood responded that the IDB ditch is maintained by the IDB but if they want to discharge anything into this ditch, the IDB will ask them to pay for any extra work that is required to do that and they will have to pay.

- Councillor Connor asked if a management company will be formed for the upkeep of the dwellings if approved? Ms Wood responded that the affordable dwellings will be managed by whichever housing association takes them on and the dwellings themselves are managed by the occupiers and then everyone pays into a management company which covers the upkeep of any private areas of road, the drainage system and the public open space.
- Councillor Connor asked if the attenuation pond will be adopted? Ms Wood responded that she does not have an answer for this yet, sometimes Anglian Water will take on bits of it so they will take on, for example the flow control system that takes it out but she feels in this case because they are not using any Anglian Water drainage infrastructure they would not be interested, which is why there needs to be a separate management company that looks after this. She stated that this is a requirement of either a condition or the Section 106.
- Councillor Connor referred to the roads, lampposts and paths, and asked if they will be brought up to adoptable standards or will they sign a Section 38 Agreement with the County Council so they will be adopted? Ms Wood responded that West Street itself will be upgraded to adoptable standards with footpaths to the correct widths and street lights and will be adopted. She continued that within the site the main spine road, which is quite short, is likely to be adopted and will be to adoptable standards and then there are private ways leading off them that would not be adopted. Ms Wood pointed out on the plan on the presentation screen where the private drive would be.
- Councillor Connor made the point that developers on many applications have said they would get roads, paths and lights adopted but have not, only the binder course is applied and then they are left and he likes comfort and he would request, with the private road having 4 houses, and there being 17 houses in the remainder of the development, if developers are absolutely honest about their intentions, which he has no thoughts that this one is not, build the houses but 25% cannot be occupied until such time as the road is brought up to adoptable standard so that residents are not left with unfinished roads. He asked if she would agree with this? Ms Wood responded that she does agree and feels there is a fault in Condition 19, which she read out, and feels it should say the road should be finished to finish level within 3 months of the final occupation or similar as there is no trigger point for finishing the road off, which is a problem she has found over the years and Condition 19 might need amending before it is issued. Councillor Connor stated that could be looked at but made the point that despite all the good intentions he wants some comfort so problems can be alleviated for residents going forward. Ms Wood responded that it is the intention to have the roads adopted, it is easy to do so as the responsibility goes to the County and it means that not such a high management fee is charged through the management company to residents. Councillor Connor asked that if this application is approved she is happy for this to be applied as a condition? Ms Wood responded that she feels it is already in the conditions. Councillor Connor stated the 25% is not. Ms Wood expressed the opinion that it is not physically possible because Section 38 agreement takes years. Councillor Connor made the point that County Council or Fenland District Council cannot force a developer to enter into a Section 38 Agreement and this would give him comfort that actually what they say they are going to do will be undertaken. Ms Wood expressed the view that what she thinks members might want is the road to be to a good standard when people move in and for it to be maintained thereafter. Councillor Connor stated that is the least he wants, he does not want a binder course and iron works protruding from the binder course for x amount of years and feels it will inspire the developer if there are 4 houses that cannot be occupied to get it done quickly and requested a yes or no answer. Ms Wood responded in the affirmative and referred to Condition 18. Councillor Connor agreed it goes some way to achieving what he wants but the agent is not saying this is fine. Ms Wood stated that she is saying it is fine but what she is concerned about is promising something that cannot be delivered by the County Council as the Highway Authority. Councillor Connor stated that this concerns him also and he does not like making promises to residents but the condition that he outlined would alleviate any problem, the applicant would be getting their development and committee would be getting

the roads resolved which residents would want. Ms Wood agreed but stated that Condition 18 about street maintenance does have the arrangements in there for management which they have to agree and one of those points in that arrangement could be amended to add a timescale so there is a timescale in there that could be agreed as she thinks officers would want to agree this also with the Highway Authority as they may be committing the Highway Authority to something that they cannot deliver. She stated that she does not want to promise something that cannot be achieved but if there is a condition there is something agreed about the timescales and the way it is going to be maintained and, in her view, she thinks should give committee comfort. Ms Wood referred to Condition 21, which she read out, and believes this issue is all controlled by conditions.

- Councillor Benney stated that he fully understands where Councillor Connor is going about the road surface and it is requested on many applications. He referred to the previous application and that plot 1 near 88 West Street was going to be a bungalow when it was resubmitted but it is still a house because there is overlooking, with No.88 having a conservatory and this house is going to look over into somebody's conservatory, which is not what committee asked for and what committee asked for has not been undertaken. Councillor Benney requested an explanation. Ms Wood responded that looking at the site plan the conservatory is on the end of No.88 and plot 1 has been set back from this so that it does not overlook the conservatory or face it in any way. She added that there are not any windows in the north elevation of plot 1 and feels that condition 3 could be expanded to include that no windows at all shall be provided in the north elevation of plot 1, which would cover any overlooking opportunity. Ms Wood stated that there was a different design for that house but because they have had to lose a plot to accommodate the changes to road alignment and not being able to provide any developments other than crossings, paths and accesses across the public right of way they had to move the house back and there was less space which was why a house was removed. She added that the previous application had a garage at that side and was stepping down but they have moved that property down and south from the boundary of No.88, which she hopes is acceptable. Councillor Benney made the point that it may have been moved but committee were told that this plot would be a bungalow and it has not been resubmitted as a bungalow. He feels that the agent is asking committee to take her word that the roads are going to be made up to adoptable standard and they have not undertaken what they said they would do when the previous application was refused so he is not inspired with a great amount of confidence. He referred to Ellingham Gardens in Chatteris which is exactly what the committee do not want and is another unmade road and he feels the agent has not listened to what the committee previously said. Ms Wood apologised and stated they have worked closely with the architect and on the previous application they did not have the width of the road set and because of that they were not able to provide what they wanted to provide on the site, they have lost a whole property from the scheme which has had an huge impact and things have changed significantly since the previous application. She added that it is not financially possible to put a bungalow on that site and there is no objection from the neighbour, with officers assessing the impact on the neighbour and decided it is acceptable, if they had come back and said it was not acceptable unless it was a bungalow on this plot then they would have obviously changed it. Ms Wood made the point that this is an expensive scheme now, with the road improvements to West Street and a bungalow takes up a huge space geographically on the ground so to do that they would end up with a cramped development or losing another unit and it needs to be a property that people are going to buy to make the scheme work. She expressed the opinion, in relation to road adoption, there are very strongly worded conditions which make sure that the road will be properly provided, made up to proper standard and thereafter maintained. Councillor Benney stated the fact that a plot has been lost viability is not a consideration for this committee as is if the land deal is not undertaken properly that is not a consideration. He reiterated that a bungalow was asked for on this plot and it has not been delivered. Councillor Benney made the point that every week other agents readily agree to what the Chairman has proposed regarding occupancy before the final course goes on the road but there seems to be some resistance against that which he

fails to understand. He agrees that there are no objections in the report but a bungalow was requested and there were assurances that this would be undertaken and it has not been delivered, and he is hesitant about whether the top course will be put on the road. Ms Wood responded that she feels the conditions are sufficient and she would just want the officers to liaise with Highway Authority before putting that condition on but if it is something that has occurred elsewhere she would accept it. She stated that she has no problem as a planning agent saying they will make the road up to adoptable standard throughout prior to the occupation of 25% of the houses as it would probably happen anyway but she is just wondering if it is legal in meeting the planning tests. Councillor Benney thanked Ms Wood and feels the answer has been forthcoming that was requested earlier.

- Councillor Connor stated that this course of action has been undertaken on about 8-10 occasions as unfinished roads are not wanted and each time agents/applicants have agreed to it, with there being no challenge to it yet.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French requested that officers' answers some of the questions that were raised by members. David Rowen referred to the issue of the bungalow and as set out in the officer's report and in the presentation, the previous application was refused purely on the issue of the unknown width of the byway and the delivery of the road improvements. He added that there was a recommended reason for refusal relating to the relationship between the plot closest to No.88 which was ultimately not included within the refusal, with that relationship in the northeastern corner having been assessed and deemed to be an improvement on the previous application. David Rowen stated that whether members were under the impression that a bungalow was going to be delivered there or the agent indicated this is irrelevant given that the application in front of members has been assessed as being appropriate and committee need to assess whether it is an acceptable relationship or not and given that the previous reason for refusal regarding that relationship was not carried through onto that decision it would be difficult to say that an improved relationship is now unacceptable.
- David Rowen referred to the condition regarding the road surface and he feels there may be some talking at cross purposes between members and the agent as he thinks members are looking for a condition that requires the road to be to adoptable standards rather than actually adopted and the Chairman is correct in that has been used in other situations where there has been a requirement for x number of dwellings to not be occupied until the road is made up to adoptable standard. He feels the difficulty on this proposal is that there is about 20% of the development served from a private driveway and there is the issue of West Street needing to be upgraded to an adoptable standard in any event which would serve several other dwellings so he feels that to put a blanket condition on of 75% of the dwellings can be occupied prior to the roads being made to adoptable standard then nothing beyond that until adoptable standard would be difficult in this particular instance. David Rowen stated that, however, if members want that form of condition to be included, the conditions that are set out in the recommendation are draft and delegation could be sought for the Head of Planning to finalise those. Councillor Connor stated that he would like that condition included, which would give him, future residents and the committee comfort.
- Councillor Connor referred to the presentation mentioning that the majority of the built form is in Flood Zone 1 and asked what percentage of the built form is in Flood Zones 2 and 3? David Rowen responded that he could not put a figure on it, however, none of the actual dwellings are within Flood Zones 2 or 3, with these zones being on the plan on the western side of the site and do include some car parking spaces and ends of the turning heads on the access roads.
- Councillor Benney referred to a percentage of houses not being occupied but it has also been undertaken with a number, such as the last 3 houses cannot be occupied until the road has been made up to adoptable standard so can this not apply here for the last 3 market housing. He made the point that he does not want to see West Street left where this

road is not made up all the way down and there is a considerable amount of money to be spent on this which is worked within the scheme. Councillor Benney made the point that Ellingham Gardens was worked up and was a viable scheme but the developer refused to make the roads up and he does not want to see the opportunity missed for a long stretch of West Street to be brought up to adoptable standard, although it does not have to be adopted. He stated that he would like comfort on this to know that this is going to happen and if it is not undertaken as a percentage of houses which is awkward when there is a mix of housing but on the last three market housing cannot be occupied until the top course has been applied.

- Councillor Connor suggested that the last three market housing be used as proposed by Councillor Benney and asked that it be added. David Rowen drew members attention to Condition 21 and read out the wording which he fully anticipates that this condition would include as part of that timetable an actual schedule for when the final level of tarmac will be laid relative to the delivery of the wider development so the mechanism that Councillor Benney is referencing is already included within this condition.
- Councillor Connor requested the 3 still be added for extra comfort. Councillor Benney stated that if it is already covered there should not be any problem with adding a second condition and as much as 98% of all developments go ahead smoothly and work, councillors get left with bits that go wrong and that is what is trying to be prevented here as it is known that developers walk away and save thousands of pounds by not undertaking this. David Rowen responded that as he indicated earlier if the committees desire to see that form of condition imposed then that is something that officers can try to take forward. He stated that his concern would be that potentially putting the kind of triggers that is being talked about may be less stringent than the scheme that would be brought forward as required through Condition 21 so there could potentially be two conditions that are slightly working against each other.
- Councillor Benney stated that if committee is being told that the condition already in the recommendation covers this and what that they are trying to stop then he feels it is acceptable as it does not want to be in conflict which could cause further trouble later on. David Rowen responded that he anticipates the scheme submitted as part of Condition 21 would set out at various stages of the delivery of the development what highway improvement works would be carried out and that would include a commitment to when the final level of surfacing would be applied to the road. Councillor Benney asked if this condition would be agreed before the decision notice is issued and if it is, could himself or whoever proposes or seconds this application and the Chairman take a look at it to make sure they are happy with it. David Rowen responded that this is not how a condition works, the condition is including within the planning permission so the planning permission would be issued and then there would need to be those details submitted through a separate discharge of condition application at whatever stage that this is brought forward within the three-year life of the permission. He added that if members are wanting to see that information submitted before a decision is made then they are effectively wanting to defer the decision to allow that information to be submitted, which he feels is not in anybody's interest. David Rowen expressed the view that Condition 21 as proposed would deliver the necessary information that the committee is trying to seek. Councillor Connor stated that members would like to think so but with the 3 that is a good backup and it may be that if everything goes smoothly there is nothing to worry about. In his view, he would still like to see the 3 put in the condition. David Rowen provided a scenario in that members are wanting a condition requiring 18 dwellings to be delivered prior to the road needing to be made up to adoptable standard, as part of Condition 21 it could end up with a potential scenario where the developer says "I want to deliver the road to adoptable standard before the occupation of say 50%", which is a better situation under condition 21 which is being declined because it conflicts with the additional condition so there are two conditions which are in conflict with one another. Councillor Connor stated that on the other side he referred to an estate in Wimblington where they were going to put conditions on the roads and paths had to be installed before 50% occupation and 3-4 years after the path has still not been

installed and road not finished so it does not necessarily mean that as you have an occupation that the developer is going to comply with it.

- Councillor Mrs French suggested that committee moves on, she feels that officers have answered the questions and the conditions should be left to the officers to resolve.

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

- Councillor Benney stated that he has listened to what David Rowen has said and because a big part of the development is on a private road he does see what he means and in this case he thinks a Section 38 is a better condition than applying a number to it so long as West Street is made up which is covered in Section 38 he is happy with this.
- Councillor Meekins referred to no mention about the number of objections and the objection from the Town Council, with there being a significant number who do not want this proposal to go ahead. He feels there seems to be a lot of ifs, buts and maybes and the officer did say it could be deferred until these issues were resolved.
- Councillor Benney stated that it is all very well having 11 individual objections and a petition with 167 signatures and it is in his ward but it comes down to policy and planning applications are not about popularity, with this application being refused previously on the access and the only thing that committee can approve or refuse it on is the access and, in his view, it is now right. He made the point that issues cannot be brought up that were not previously included and there is no other reason to refuse this application and if deferred what would it be deferred for and if it is refused it could go to appeal which could be overturned and people's Council Tax will increase to pay for that bad decision. Councillor Benney stated that whilst he is disappointed with some aspects of the proposal there is no reason to refuse it and not liking something is not a reason to refuse an application, with this proposal being policy compliant.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Benney and agreed that the application be GRANTED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Benney declared, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a member of Chatteris Town Council but takes no part in planning)

P26/25

F/YR25/0223/F

LAND SOUTH OF 28-29 JUNIPER CLOSE, DODDINGTON

ERECT 9 X DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ESTATE ROAD, GARAGES, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE/STORE AND CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR DOMESTIC PURPOSES FOR 9 SUTTON WAY

Alan Davies presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Councillor Ruth Hufton of Doddington Parish Council. Councillor Hufton stated that Doddington Parish Council objects to the application as Doddington was designated a growth village in the current Local Plan and in addition to the 127 homes, the 15% growth required, a further 196 have already been built and they have confirmation from FDC that no further housing would be required under that plan. She made the point that there are no affordable homes scheduled and 106 monies will not be allocated to be used in the village, with it likely to be used elsewhere in Fenland.

Councillor Hufton stated that the developer speaks of this development being perfect for the elderly, but, in her view, to access the High Street from the south of the new development will mean a 1500 metre walk through the new site into Juniper Close onto Wood Street before joining High Street, with there being no access directly onto High Street. She feels that this means that more car journeys will be made leading to additional congestion through the pinch point at the top of Wood Street that opens onto a Puffin crossing taking children to and from the village school.

Councillor Hufton expressed the opinion that construction traffic will cause noise, dirt and congestion on the High Street through phase one of Juniper Close and onto Wood Street, which is narrow making it difficult for two HGVs to pass each other. She understands that the plan changes at 9 Sutton Way to extend the garden and provide a walkway into the site has not been discussed with or agreed by the resident.

Councillor Hufton stated that residents of 9 The Larches have serious concerns about the impact of this development on their home, with their main living spaces sitting directly on the eastern boundary next to plot 7's proposed 5.2 metre high garage. She expressed the view that this structure will be overbearing and cause significant overshadowing particularly in the garden room, which is used daily as a home office and this room is not shown on the plans so the loss of light has not been properly assessed, with their home already suffering from poor natural light and the addition of a pond area and 90 metres of dense shrubbery, which could reach 3.3 to 6 metres in height will worsen this further and force greater reliance on artificial lighting.

Councillor Hufton expressed the opinion that due to the difference in land levels, the public pond will overlook their home and garden, severely reducing privacy, whilst also exposing the public space to views from The Larches. She feels the risk of stagnant water and health impacts so close to a kitchen, diner and patio has not been addressed, with these serious impacts on residential amenities having not been properly considered.

Councillor Hufton stated that the Grade II Listed Windmill Tower is the only remaining artifact from that period of the village's history and is, in her view, an important part of the heritage of Doddington. She feels the buffer between the tower and the proposed bungalows now contains an attenuation pond, which when it is dug may cause damage to the foundations of the building.

Councillor Hufton expressed the opinion that when the first phase of Juniper Close was built, the fenestration in the Windmill Tower was compromised with all the glass falling out and she felt that piling had taken place on the site which was categorically denied by Reason Homes but she has since acquired an e-mail from the Senior Planning Obligations Manager dated 22 June 2022 which states "in addition to the appraisals that have been submitted I have also received evidence of piling costs confirmation of the assumed cost for plot specification...." which confirms her suspicion that the damage was caused by piling and that Reason Homes blatantly lied to herself and her partner. She, therefore, feels that piling in this new phase could cause irreparable damage to the foundations of the tower.

Councillor Hufton stated that the roadway in the first phase was not completed and reassurance is needed that this will happen if and when this second phase is completed, questioning whether it will be adopted or managed by a residents committee. She made the point that Anglian Water are concerned that surface water issues have not been addressed properly and could propose a risk of flooding and pollution, with the site having been flooded for two years to a depth of 6 to 8 inches when rainfall has been heavy, which is something that is expected to be the norm in the coming months and years.

Councillor Hufton expressed the view that the site is already teeming with wildlife with a plethora of mammals, rare birds and myriad insects and plant life and questioned how the developer will mitigate for that loss but not by building a wildlife pond and the plans also contain no information as to who will maintain that. She added that the same problems still remain as were present when this site was put forward for development in the past, with the school being at capacity, the doctor's surgery being full and the sewerage system has not been fit for purpose for many years and despite remedial works that have taken place at Coneywood it is still not functioning without constant problems.

Councillor Hufton expressed the opinion that add to that poor public transport, parking problems

throughout the village but especially on High Street and Wood Street and this development makes no sense.

Members asked questions of Councillor Hufton as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French asked if there is any proposal to maintain the Windmill Tower? Councillor Hufton stated that it is privately owned and is nothing to do with Doddington Parish Council so it is not known but it is weatherproof.
- Councillor Connor asked if and when where Councillor Hufton lives gets brought by some other person it is possible for that person with money being able to put that Windmill right? Councillor Hufton confirmed this to be the case.
- Councillor Connor asked Councillor Hufton if it is her belief that the piling for the foundations or that the attenuation pond digging will put an end to the Windmill or make it non-viable? Councillor Hufton agreed, she is not capable of saying anything engineering wise but she has no idea what the footings are like on the Windmill or how deep they are. She expressed the opinion that not only did the piling take the windows out of the Windmill when it was undertaken on the first phase of Juniper Close but they have had problems in the house with noise and a bit of cracking.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Anthony Gowing, an objector. Mr Gowing stated that his concerns relate to sustainability and future management of the estate with open questions. He questioned what adoption processes does the developer intend to agree for the road in order to maintain it for the future, will it be a signed Section 38 Agreement which is a binding contract with a bond security or will it be a Section 37 Agreement, like the existing Juniper Close, with there being no guarantee under Section 37 that adoption will happen apart from the developer's word.

Mr Gowing referred to SUDs and questioned whether the developer intends to engage with Anglian Water from the outset to determine the design and maintenance of it as Anglian Water has said they are unable to provide comments on the sustainability of the surface water management in the plan, however, in this application, MTC Engineering say they have used the Anglian Water SUDs adoption process for maintenance, but refer to there being no SUDs approval body in the UK so if adoption does not take place, it leaves the SUDs unmaintained except by the developer until handover. He expressed the opinion that there seems no mechanism to provide maintenance services in perpetuity much like the 2020 existing SUDs in Juniper Close which is overgrown with vegetation, therefore, what mitigations will be in place to ensure the SUDs and pond are maintained from day one of the construction.

Mr Gowing stated that MTC also say that detailed design of the surface water drainage system will only take place once planning permission has been granted but Anglian Water say that the developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption and if he wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act to contact them. He questioned whether there is a risk that the costs when problems might occur to unadopted drainage fall to the homeowners to be shared amongst them?

Mr Gowing queried whether the developer intends to form a management company for maintenance of the estate or will they sign the necessary declarations for adoption of everything discussed in collaboration with the relevant authorities? He expressed the view that otherwise they are in the risk category of an unfinished estate and this plan in its present form to him produces a vision most people would love, but he finds the detail ambiguous to satisfy him that he will be seeing a finished adopted estate in the next 3 years or so.

Mr Gowing stated that he lives on Juniper Close, he moved there in 2020 and he has not seen the road finished and the developer has assured him that once this construction is finished he will finish the road, but all he has is his word. He made the point that he has had constant

communication with the developer and he is not satisfied with the answers that he has been given over 5 years.

Members asked questions of Mr Gowing as follows:

- Councillor Connor assured Mr Gowing that he will be asking the agent the questions that he has asked.
- Councillor Mrs French referred to the information that members had and made the point that Anglian Water have no objections so it is interesting to hear what he has just said. Mr Gowing responded that he read forensically all the paperwork on the portal regarding Anglian Water's correspondence and there is a hands off approach but the developer can communicate with them as the SUDs and the pond will not be adopted and they also have not discussed with them about the drainage, which means at the moment that the sewers will not be adopted either. He presumes this might happen later on, he did look at previous applications, the one in 2017 and could not find details of the 104 agreement but he did see the agreement about connecting the sewers up which had to take place anyway but he sees a conflict between the hydrology engineering company that Reason Homes have employed and the lack of communication with Anglian Water, with Anglian Water having their own conditions as to how SUDs should be designed, built and maintained and if the developer does not go through that route then they will not consider adoption of the SUDs. Mr Gowing stated that he has learned the SUDs that already exist in Juniper Close will never be adopted and it is completely overgrown because it has been unmaintained and the outlet is almost completely blocked. He expressed concern that this could end up an unmaintained estate just like the one he lives in, with the developer in the deeds on his estate in the TP1 stating that there will be no maintenance charges to residents so in that case if a management company is formed in the other part of the estate he can see all sorts of conflicts occurring if for example residents in existing estate are asked to sign a deed of variation so that they come in with the maintenance company for the upkeep of the estate. Mr Gowing stated that he wants the whole estate to be maintained, wanting the binder course top coat to be completed now and not as the developer says, which he uses the excuse of that because he is going to drive his vehicles down this road he is going to damage the road because he actually surfaced Wood Street with a top coat in order to build the existing Juniper Close anyway so he does not buy this argument. He added that he can understand it from an engineering point of view because it saves him money but he was expecting in 2023 to be living on an estate with a finished road and a maintained SUDs and his fear of what is going to happen is if this proposal goes ahead they are going to end up in a very risky situation where none of it is finished to adoptable standards and adopted by the relevant authorities because already the right actions have not taken place. Councillor Mrs French stated that between himself and Councillor Hufton a lot of questions have been asked and maybe the agent will be able to answer some of these questions during his opportunity to speak. She believes under the Drainage Act developers do have the Right to Connect to Anglian Water and they cannot refuse it and sitting on 10 Drainage Boards they have been trying to get the Right to Connect discontinued but Parliament will not do it. Mr Gowing responded that he knows they will connect but he is talking about adoption.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Lee Bevens, the agent. Mr Bevens stated that they have worked closely with the Planning Officer, Alan Davies, throughout the planning process and dealt with any issues proactively and this scheme follows a previously refused scheme for 16 dwellings in 2022 and 14 dwellings in 2024. He expressed the view that this scheme is significantly different to previous applications, not only is there over 35% less numbers but it also provides a greater public benefit for viewing the Grade II Listed Windmill.

Mr Bevens expressed the opinion that the application does not create any flooding issues and has been designed to accept surface water runoff from the adjacent development at The Larches, which have soakaways that do not work in clay soil hence the flood into this site. He made the

point that Anglian Water raise no objection and there are no objections from Highways or ecology.

Mr Bevens stated that the proposed density equates to 9 dwellings to the hectare which is very low density and not overdevelopment. He feels the Conservation Officer clearly rates the setting of the Grade II Listed Windmill highly, but, in his view, it cannot be easily seen from any public vantage point, referring members to the presentation screen he stated that he has walked the public footpath around the site and there are very limited views of the former Windmill, it cannot be seen from the High Street which is the main thoroughfare through the village.

Mr Bevens added that he has walked the public footpath FP10 that exists from Benwick Road and runs north past the village hall, with the first three slides showing the views towards the former Windmill from various points along this route, with the position of the former Windmill highlighted as it is obscured by vegetation and the only current views are long distance ones. He referred to slide four showing the current view of the former Windmill from the application site and again, in his view, the Windmill is largely hidden by existing trees and vegetation which will remain unaffected by the proposal.

Mr Bevens expressed the opinion that the Conservation Officer has the chance for the public to see the former Windmill much clearer rather than trespassing on private land and should there be the possibility of the Windmill being converted or renovated in the future it is even more important that the public can see it. He stated that the applicant has suggested they are happy to pay for signage to allow the public to reach the new area of public open space on the site, which has seating proposed, allowing much better views of the Windmill as well as improving the setting of the Listed Building.

Mr Bevens referred to slide 5 showing the comparison between the current scheme of 9 dwellings and the previously refused 14 and feels that members can see that the layout has significantly improved the setting of the Listed Building by providing a greater green setting to the north and east with previous dwellings being removed from this area. He stated that slide 6 shows the area of public open space and attenuation pond is part of the application site and not just an area that has been left out of the application, with great attention to landscape detail and ecology having been made to provide the public with a useable space but also to provide seating that faces towards the former Windmill, with over 35% of the proposed site being green space.

Mr Bevens expressed the opinion that the slide also shows how the proposed development has been sympathetically inserted into the site with all single storey dwellings and how the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area have already been eroded by the two sheds directly next to the former Windmill and the erection of a bland detached house with integral garages built in the early 80s. He stated that his heritage consultant has tried to address the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer but the site does not lie within the Doddington Conservation Area, which is more focused on the High Street and Benwick Road and the curtilages associated with these properties, with the site being surrounded by suburban development and not visible or appreciated from any part of the Conservation Area and there are no views into or out of the Conservation Area across the site due to the tight building line along the High Street to the south and enclosure of the site by the existing development to the north.

Mr Bevens stated that the Conservation Officer notes that the Windmill is best appreciated from its immediate setting in close range where it can be appreciated in full view and these views will only be possible from the application site. He expressed the opinion that the proposal will provide the views that the Conservation Officer seeks close range, with a large area of public open space to allow the wider public to appreciate the Windmill.

Mr Bevens referred to the officer's report noting that there is currently no mechanism proposed for the public open space to be secured for public use but the applicant will retain the area of public open space and continue to maintain it so there is guaranteed access to view the windmill in the

future. He stated that the sensitivity of the application site and the Listed Windmill and the proposals will enable much better appreciation of a key building in Doddington without, in his view, detriment to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Mr Bevens asked members to look at the benefits that this scheme can provide and largely supporting nature of the planning officer's comments and go against the Conservation Officer's recommendation. He expressed the view that the scheme is a sustainable development and according with the Development Plan as a whole they would ask members to support and approve it.

Members asked questions of Mr Bevens as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French asked who owns the trees that are obscuring the Windmill? Mr Bevens responded that the vast majority of the trees are outside the ownership of the site and are in adjoining land. He added that there is a hedgerow that runs around the boundary which is 50/50 ownership and then there is a couple of trees that are outside the application site.
- Councillor Mrs French made the point that the last two speakers had quite a lot of questions and perhaps Mr Bevens may be able to answer some of their questions. Councillor Connor stated that he was happy to put some of these questions to Mr Bevens.
- Councillor Connor asked if the application is successful will there be a management company looking after the 9 dwellings? Mr Bevens responded to his knowledge there will be no management company, with the areas of open space being controlled by Construct Reason.
- Councillor Connor asked about the attenuation pond with Mr Gowing saying the attenuation pond on the first phase has not been taken over and, in his opinion, is in an awful state and when he visited he agrees it is not the best. He asked who will be managing the attenuation pond and will it be adopted? Mr Bevens responded that he has photographs of the current SUDs at Juniper Close from fairly recently and it is pretty well maintained, with there being a lot of dry weather and then a lot of wet weather. He stated that the attenuation basin will be maintained by Construct Reason because it is within that area of open space and if it is owned by Construct Reason then it will be offered as part of that public area and can guarantee more that the public can go into that area. Mr Bevens referred to the mention of piling and believes on the first phase the piling was undertaken by orbit pile and he is surprised to hear of windows coming out of the Windmill undertaken by orbit piling as if its flight driven the vibrations can be disruptive but orbit piling generally does not cause that sort of damage.
- Councillor Connor referred to the road and his comments on the last application, what is going to happen to the road is it going to be adopted by a Section 38 Agreement or will it be as Mr Gowing said possibly by an Section 37 Agreement because 5 years ago with the same developer the road has not had anything undertaken to it at all apart from how it was left with the iron works showing which is wrong. He asked what is going to be the difference between the 28 houses where the road has not been brought up to adoptable standard and these 9 houses? Mr Bevens responded that his understanding is that the remainder of the road will be undertaken under a Section 37 Agreement for the remaining 9 plots, with the footpaths in Juniper Close already having been brought up to adoptable standard but the road has not and the reason for this is as discussed is that the County will not allow the roads to be finished until the development is finished. He continued that there has been several applications on this site over the last 3-4 years with the intention of extending the road further than it currently ends at the moment and whilst he has sympathy for the speaker that has been going on for the last 4-5 years in terms of applications. Mr Bevens stated that until this is decided and the road put in for the 9 dwellings then the whole roadway will be finished to adoptable standards. He does not believe there are raised iron works in the current Juniper Close, they are sitting at base level and they will be lifted to the correct level when the topcoat goes on. Councillor Connor expressed the opinion that they are raised and the topcoat has not been put on, he accepts the explanation given but it

gives him no comfort for these additional 9 dwellings. He feels that any future maintenance would fall on residents if there is no management company. Mr Bevens responded that Section 37 is also for adoption and it will all be offered for adoption, with the footpath already to adoptable standard.

- Councillor Connor asked if the application was successful would they be prepared to build the dwellings but only 6 to be occupied before the road is made up to adoptable standard and they would sign an agreement for this? Mr Bevens responded that, as the previous speaker stated on the previous application, if there is a condition worded, because no conditions have been agreed currently, that gives the reassurance as he believes it is tricky to restrict it to three because the construction traffic is still going to need access and the County will not adopt the road until the development's finished. Councillor Connor stated he is saying build the 9 properties if the application is successful but 3 are not to be occupied until the road was made up, which means there would be no more heavy traffic going through the development. Mr Bevens responded that on that basis he does not see a problem with keeping 3 back from occupation until such time as the road is made up to an agreed standard.
- Councillor Connor referred to the Windmill, making the point it is a Grade II Listed Building and he was invited by Ms Hufton and her late partner to look at the damage attributed to the piling and she is absolutely correct. His own feelings are that if the attenuation pond is in the same place as it is proposed it could undermine the foundations of the Windmill. Councillor Connor stated that he does like old buildings and wants to preserve them for future generation and he does not feel comfortable with putting that Windmill into jeopardy. He continued if the 9 were piled it would cause irreparable damage to the Windmill. Mr Bevens responded that he understands where Ms Hufton is coming from and he cannot confirm or not whether that damage was caused by the piling but all he knows is that orbit piling generally does not cause that sort of damage whereas flight driven does but it was not flight driven. He acknowledged that the attenuation pond would have to be created sensitively and he agrees that a Grade II Listed Building should be kept and looked after, however, if a condition could be put together that asks for a schedule of works or something similar for the creation of the attenuation pond that could be judged by officers to ensure that there is a protocol in making sure there is no damage to the Grade II Listed Building. Mr Bevens stated that he does not see piling being used to create the attenuation pond but there will be heavy machinery involved.
- Councillor Connor referred to the proposed pathway from the site, making the point that Mr Sutton owns the roadway from Wood Street into the site and whilst he notes that the footpath in the proposal is providing a shortcut into Wood Street and then into the village nobody has said anything to Mr Sutton and he will not agree to it anyway, which puts another obstacle in the way possibly. Mr Bevens agreed possibly but those discussions can take place post agreement of planning permission to ensure that whatever mechanisms are needed or reassurance can take place. He stated that extra garden is being given to Mr Sutton. Councillor Connor made the point that Councillor Hufton has spoken to Mr Sutton and he is adamant that none of this will happen, no one will be able to walk, cycle or enjoy this pathway and he does not believe he will change his mind.
- Councillor Mrs French asked Mr Bevens to answer the questions with regard to Anglian Water? Mr Bevens responded that they have produced a drainage strategy by experts, MTC, and Anglian Water have not raised any objection to the scheme. He stated that in the conclusion in MTC's report they have said that infiltration testing will be done once all planning approval is agreed and if the worse case scenario is that the current drainage strategy is based on zero infiltration taking place then surface water will be discharged to the adjacent drain along the northern boundary with discharge restricted to the rate of 2 litres a second during all events and the applications will be made to ensure this is all undertaken properly.
- Councillor Benney asked how far away is the Windmill from the nearest build point on this development? Mr Bevens responded that the distance from the Windmill to the edge of Plot 1, the corner of it with no habitable window, is 31.6 metres and to an actual ground floor

window it is 32½ metres.

- Councillor Benney asked what Mr Bevens' assessment was of the standard of the Windmill and is the building in fairly good structural state? Mr Bevens acknowledged that it is an expensive building to repair, he has only seen it from the application site and, in his view, it is in an average condition. He would not say it is at risk but it does need somebody to spend money on it in order to bring it into use again but that would be costly to undertake.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French asked what the reason was that the previous application was refused last time? Alan Davies responded that it was the same reason as for this application, which is the impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Windmill. He referred to the plan on the presentation screen and the advice from the Conservation Officer is by developing this site, which is currently a field, it is slowly eroding the agricultural fields that surround the Windmill, which is impacting upon the character and significance of that setting. Alan Davies stated that the refusal reason for this application is heritage due the impact on the setting of a Grade II Listed Building and the reason for refusal is not the impact on the Windmill itself but the setting so the Conservation Officer has not raised concerns with the structural stability of the Windmill or how it will be affected by vibrations and piling.
- Councillor Benney referred to the roads and drainage being mentioned but the only reason for refusal is the setting of a Listed Building and he does not see anything that is not seen every week in Planning Committee about the drainage, with members having concerns about drainage and the road surface and he agrees with the Chairman about holding 3 houses back in this case. He stated that there is nothing in the report that says there is a reason for refusal on any of the drainage or the road surface and asked if it is correct that these are not relevant planning matters? Alan Davies confirmed this to be correct, in terms of highway impact Highways have commented that they have got no objections to the scheme, with the layout, parking and car parking spaces for the dwellings considered to be acceptable. He continued in terms of drainage there are no objections from the LLFA, with drainage having been satisfactorily addressed.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she cannot see anything to debate, members have asked the questions and received the answers.
- Councillor Purser expressed concern about the access road, with construction traffic utilising it, the roads being narrow with people parking on the side of the roads and this having a detrimental impact on the neighbours. He added that he is also concerned about heavy vehicles damaging the drains underneath as well.
- Councillor Connor referred to Councillor Meekins making a relevant point on the previous application saying that local members are probably not being taken notice of and the Parish Council, if this is approved, are not being taken notice of.
- Councillor Mrs French made the point that the Windmill has been there for many years, probably built in the 1600s, and it is a shame to see it deteriorate. She can understand what Councillor Hufton has said, but she is concerned that if action is not taken it is going to end up falling down and then the developer can come back and get the planning application no problem.

Proposed by Councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Meekins and agreed that the application be REFUSED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillor Connor declared that he knows Councillor Ruth Hufton being the District Councillor for Doddington and Wimblington but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open mind)

**ERECT 1NO DWELLING AND FORMATION OF A NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS TO
14 GULDENBURGH CRESCENT (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS
COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS)**

This application was withdrawn.

**P28/25 ENFORCEMENT- LAND WEST OF 54 CHURCH STREET ACCESSED OFF PARK
LANE**

Members considered what action to take on the owner of land west of 54 Church Street accessed off Park Lane, Whittlesey for failure to comply with the requirements of a Notice under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) presented by Jade Allen.

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Benney and AGREED that officers commence further action under the provisions of Section 216 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and authorised referring the matter to the Council's Legal Officer to commence prosecution proceedings for non-compliance with the requirements of the Notice.

(Members resolved to exclude the public for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972)

P29/25 ENFORCEMENT - 10 MARKET PLACE, WISBECH

Members considered what action to take on the owner of 10 Market Place, Wisbech for failure to comply with the requirements of a Notice under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) presented by Matthew Leigh.

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses.

Proposed by Councillor Meekins, seconded by Councillor Purser and AGREED that officers commence further action under the provisions of Section 216 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and authorised referring the matter to the Council's Legal Officer to commence prosecution proceedings for non-compliance with the requirements of the Notice.

(Members resolved to exclude the public for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972)

P30/25 ENFORCEMENT - FENVIEW LODGE, 5 FEN VIEW, DODDINGTON

Members considered what action to take on the owner of Fenview Lodge, 5 Fen View, Doddington for failure to comply with the requirements of a Notice under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) presented by Jade Allen.

Members asked questions, made comments and received responses.

Proposed by Councillor Connor, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and AGREED that officers commence further action under the provisions of Section 216 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and authorised referring the matter to the Council's Legal Officer to commence prosecution proceedings for non-compliance with the

requirements of the Notice.

(Members resolved to exclude the public for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972)

4.03 pm

Chairman