

PLANNING COMMITTEE



25 APRIL 2018 - 1:00PM

PRESENT: Councillor A Miscandlon(Chairman), Councillor S Clark(Vice-Chairman), Councillor D W Connor, Councillor S R Court, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor Mrs F S Newell, Councillor W Sutton, Councillor Mrs V M Bucknor(Substitute), Councillor D Hodgson(Substitute).

APOLOGIES: Councillor Mrs A Hay

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

P76/17 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the 28 March 2018, were confirmed and signed.

P77/17 F/YR18/0158 LAND SOUTH OF NEEDHAM ROAD COTTAGES, NEEDHAM BANK, FRIDAY BRIDGE ERECTION OF UP TO 4 X DWELLINGS AND THE FORMATION OF A NEW 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 advised the Committee that this application was subject to a previous appeal decision in January 2016, where an application had previously been refused which was again an outline application with all matters reserved and in that case the Inspector concluded that the site was visually part of the countryside which development to the site would adversely harm and that appeal was dismissed. David Rowen highlighted to Members that with regard to the application before Members today, it is still considered that that harm to the Countryside highlighted by the Inspector previously is still relevant.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Paul Lattimore, the Applicant. Mr Lattimore highlighted to Members that the area is too small to farm and has been left as disused land, If approved the site would provide four new houses to the village, which would be starter homes as opposed to the larger dwellings which have been constructed in the area. Mr Lattimore stated that since the application has been submitted, he has been approached by persons showing an interest in purchasing the properties as they cannot find other homes of this size in the village, which in his opinion highlights the need for this type of property to be built. Mr Lattimore stated that he agrees that residents living in villages need access to a private vehicle, however this is due to poor public transport and he does not feel that this is a reason for refusal. The previous application was refused when the council had a 5 year land supply for housing in place however now a small development will now provide much needed housing in the area, allowing people the chance to step onto the housing ladder and as well as helping the council with their land supply, the development will not harm the surrounding area and is in accordance with policy LP12. Mr Lattimore stated that it will also improve the visibility along the

bend in the road. If the application is refused then Mr Lattimore stated then he will have to erect a 6ft fence to prevent fly tipping on the site as this is an ongoing problem in the area and this will also cause visual problems with the bend in the road.

Councillor Mrs Laws thanked Mr Lattimore for his presentation and added that whilst she appreciates that Mr Lattimore has to secure his land, there are rules and regulations with regard to fencing which take into consideration the height and distance from the highway and she asked Mr Lattimore to take that into consideration.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated that he thinks this application should be considered carefully by Members, as Officer's felt that the proposal did not quite satisfy them in favour for the five year land supply and Councillor Sutton feels this should be debated at the Committee today. Councillor Sutton asked David Rowen to show Members the aerial site plan again and stated that on many occasions both on delegated decisions and decisions brought before the Committee to determine, there have been comments from Officer's about natural boundaries and from the Officer's report there is no mention of a natural boundary and Councillor Sutton stated that it could be argued that the ditch is the natural boundary. Councillor Sutton stated that there is already a small building in the form of the pumping station in the vicinity.
- Councillor Connor asked for clarification on how this application differs from the previous one. David Rowen confirmed that there is no difference.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he believes there is a natural boundary and he agrees with Mr Lattimore that there is a lack of affordable housing and we are in a 5 year land supply issue and that gives the scope to say this application will add to the 5 year land supply.
- Mr Nick Harding asked Councillor Sutton whether he would be happy with Officer's applying conditions to the consent and Councillor Sutton agreed that he would.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton and seconded by Councillor Mrs Newell and decided that the application be approved against the Officer's recommendation. A vote was taken which resulted in the need for a casting vote by the Chairman resulting in the application being REFUSED as per the Officer's recommendation.

The Chairman added that in view of the 5 year land supply being mentioned and the fact that the application has not changed in any way since the refusal and dismissal at appeal but he stated that at some time in the near future this application could be brought forward as an application that would be sustainable at the moment in his opinion he does not feel it is sustainable and that is why he is supporting the Officer's recommendation today.

**P78/17 F/YR18/0117/F
LAND EAST OF HERWARD COURT, RAILWAY LANE, CHATTERIS
ERECTION OF A 2 STOREY BLOCK OF FLATS COMPRISING OF 4X1 BED
PROPERTIES**

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 highlighted the proposed location on the site plan. The majority of the application site is within a conservation area. The proposal is for four one bed roomed flats. The proposal indicates a total provision of nine parking spaces and contained within the Fenland Local Plan the parking standards are set at a 5 space requirement. David Rowen highlighted to Members that between the two rows of car parking there is a gap of approximately 5 metres and between the edge of the building and the nearest car parking bay

there is a space of 2.5 metres. David Rowen added that whilst the principal of residential development maybe acceptable as there has been planning permission for flats on the site in 2008, it is considered that the car parking layout is inadequate due to the lack of spaces and also as some of the spaces are un useable. The site is in close proximity to the town centre but with no easily accessible public car parking to justify relaxing the car parking requirements outlined in the local plan and this would mean poor quality amenities for residents and an increase in on street car parking in Railway Lane, which does have parking restrictions. The proposal is contrary to local plan polices and the NPPF.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Matthew Hall, the Applicants Agent. Mr Hall stated that he has read through the Officer's report and can see that the main concern is the level of reduced parking. Mr Hall stated that contained within the Officer's report it states that no statutory consultees object to the proposal and he then referred Members to a previous application where this site received approval in 2008, for four flats exactly the same size with 7 car parking spaces and the proposal to be determined today is the same with a slight reduction in width of the building. Mr Hall stated that highways have made no objection to this application or indeed the previous application which was approved. The existing access is in a poor condition and the applicant has only owned the site for 5 months and is aware of the bad state. Mr Hall confirmed he has spoken to the applicant who would be happy for a condition to be added with regard to totally resurfacing the access and the parking area and also agreeing a dedicated bin collection point. Mr Hall highlighted to Members that this proposal is a town centre location and he is aware of a number of applications which have been approved in Fenland in high street and conservation area locations including one in March High Street, which have no parking. Mr Hall drew Members attention to the local plan and under LP3 it mentions, where a site has good public transport links such as a central area of a market town of which Chatteris is, a reduction in car parking provision can be negotiated and maybe approved. Mr Hall stated that if Members are satisfied that a reduction in parking can be allowed, then the applicant would be happy to look at a revised parking plan.

Councillor Mrs Laws asked Mr Hall to clarify whether it was the width of the car parking spaces that have been reduced and Mr Hall confirmed that it was the width of the actual building that is reduced by a metre and not the parking spaces.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws stated that all Members attend the site visit and in her opinion the site would lend itself to one dwelling or maybe 2 semi-detached properties. The parking for the vehicles is very limited and Councillor Mrs Laws had also noted that beside the area where the bin were, there was also one particular property on the right hand side which had a gated entrance who also placed there bins on the service road. Councillor Mrs Laws had observed that when you walk towards the site, there is also a hard standing area with a vehicle parked and there may be issues for this to manoeuvre. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that contained within the Officer's report mentioned in 10.7, with regard to the character and amenity, the Town Council highlighted the need to retain the historic stones on the site and these were looked at on the site visit and most of them had collapsed and fallen over and the one stone that was upright was looked at by Councillor Mrs Laws and Councillor Sutton to see if any identification or numeric marks could be found to but nothing could be found and Councillor Mrs Laws was just questioning where the historic interest was.
- Councillor Sutton commented that the Agent is correct in that it does state in the local plan that in certain circumstances that parking can be reduced to nil, however he questions whether this is the site that should be allowing this. Councillor Sutton stated that he appreciates that the agent has worked with the applicant to reduce the size of the proposed footprint to allow for the extra parking, however he is still undecided whether this is one of the 'nil' parking developments and he thinks that the Committee should discuss this as it

forms part of the local plan.

- The Chairman commented there are a number of existing flats that do have parking and if the development went ahead there would be competition for the use of the spaces.
- Councillor Sutton commented that he takes on board the Chairman's comment but as it is a particular area in the local plan, there should be a debate and the Chairman agreed.
- Councillor Connor stated that in his opinion the application is over intensification of the site and car parking will be an issue going forward and although he recognises that the site is suitable for development but not for the proposal before them today.
- Councillor Mrs Laws understands where the Agent is comparing with other developments but that is not what is before the Committee today to determine and by restricting parking where are resident's visitors to park.
- Councillor Mrs Davis commented that if there is no parking associated with the development, there will be neighbourhood disputes amongst the residents and the site would be better suited to 2 semi-detached properties.
- Councillor Murphy agrees with the comments made concerning the parking and he is aware of similar issues within the vicinity where because of lack of parking, the cars have no option other to park on the highway and the road. With an increase of parking on the road, this will cause further issues for through traffic. Councillor Murphy added that he also feels it is over intensification of the site and the site lends itself to one or two properties at the most.

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

(Councillor Mrs Newell and Councillor Murphy registered in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning matters, that they are Members of Chatteris Town Council but take no part in Planning matters)

P79/17

F/YR10/0804/O

**LAND SOUTH EAST OF CHATTERIS, LONDON ROAD, CHATTERIS
MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT UP
TO 1000 DWELLINGS, EMPLOYMENT, LOCAL CENTRE, PRIMARY SCHOOL,
PLAYING FIELDS, LANDSCAPING AND OPEN SPACE, NEW HIGHWAYS AND
ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT**

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.

Sheila Black presented the application to Members and reiterated to Members that the application has already had previous resolutions in 2013 and 2015 to approve the revisions and master plan and revisions to the Section 106 in relation to school contributions and the securing of affordable home provision. The report before Members provides updates on the two rounds of consultations that have taken place on the master plan and affordable housing. Updates had been circulated to Members following the two consultations which had taken place. Sheila Black highlighted to Members the location plan and highlighted the 2 illustrative master plan layouts. The site has been identified within the Local Plan as a strategic allocation under Policy LP10 of the Local Plan. Contained within the master plan layouts, the proposed access points were highlighted to Members. A phasing plan was shown to Members as to how the development could come forward and there are 5 phases. With regard to the listed Tithe Barn, Sheila Black advised Members that any proposals for the Barn would have to be subject to a separate listed buildings consent application. Sheila Black concluded by saying the principal of the development has been accepted by Planning Committee in 2013 and the scheme does remain policy compliant and the current report updates members on the two previous resolutions and makes further recommendations in relation to changes to the section 106 contribution and the revision to the master plan. The changes to the master plan have arisen due to the request of the Education department at County

Council.

Mr Nick Harding advised Members that there is a 2015 resolution to grant the consent and the 2 issues that needed to be resolved were the final issue of affordable housing and its mechanism for delivery and the issue of education delivery. With regard to the education delivery, Nick Harding stated that the issue was at what point in time the development would be able to start to make cash contributions towards the construction of the school. With regard to affordable housing the issue was that policy compliance could not be achieved and in terms of viability it was only possible to commit to 14% of phase 1 and then all subsequent phases the level of affordable housing was to be subject to a review of viability, which meant at every subsequent phase there would have to be renegotiating the amount of affordable housing every time. There have been lengthy negotiations with regard to this issue and the applicants have carried out some soft market testing and received feedback from potential purchasers is that the review mechanism was not seen favourably from potential purchasers. Due to this issue, the applicant has reconsidered their position and the proposal is now 16% affordable housing on every phase.

With regard to school provision, Mr Harding stated that at the time of the 2015 resolution the school was going to be located at the northern section of the site and County Council approached Fenland District Council and the applicant to advise them that the provision of a school was needed as soon as possible and asked whether the land could be released earlier in order for construction to commence. The applicant agreed to look at this and that is why there is second option which is to pull the site further south and the reasoning behind this would be less infrastructure would be required. As a consequence due to the changes of the master plan, it had to go back out to public consultation which then widened the consultation and additional comments have been received from County Council highways. County Council Education team then asked whether there could be an either or option where the school could be built in the north or pulled further south and the applicant agreed and that is why there are two options in front of Members at today's meeting.

Mr Harding stated the applicant did not need to be so accommodating and could have kept with their proposal which was before Members in 2015, however as a consequence of that decision by the applicant, issues have arisen, such as the comments raised by Consultees and members of the public. Mr Harding stated that Members will note from their papers that the road safety audit will be reviewed; however Mr Harding added that the original road safety audit did start off by saying that there were no road safety issues or problems identified last time round. Mr Harding stated that the applicant has offered to make a further £125,000 contribution towards transportation mitigation and the caveat to that money being offered is that the planning conditions with regard to the preparation, submission and approval of a transport plan is removed and Members may wish to consider this. Colleagues from Cambridgeshire Highways have indicated that they would not be happy with the removal of the transportation plan conditions. Members will note from their report that the NHS have requested a contribution and the NHS have recognised that they did not comment previously. Mr Harding stated that if Members were minded to make a contribution towards health facilities then that could be facilitated by a pro rata reduction in the contributions being made to other elements of the section 106. Mr Harding stated Members will have seen that Chatteris Town Council have made a suggestion with regard to the current draft 106 agreement when they would be happy to see a reduction in payments to be made in transportation matters which could then be transferred to Health contributions. Mr Harding advised Members that additional comments have been received this morning raising three issues, one is concerning the review of the road safety audit which they state is critical, the second point the developer should make a contribution towards the traffic regulation order on London Road as they are concerned over the amount of HGV vehicles, which Mr Harding advised Members there is a construction management plan condition and a routing agreement can be included in this, so it may not be necessary to have a traffic regulation order to control that and the third point that Chatteris Town Council have raised is with regard to the NHS contribution which they feel is necessary.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Marcia Whitehead, the Applicants Agent. Ms Whitehead stated that Members are already aware that two resolutions have already been granted to grant consent subject to section 106 agreements and planning conditions. The sole reason for the application to come back to Planning Committee is with regard to the request from the Education team with regard to the education facilities and in particular primary education facilities. The County Council are looking for flexibility with regard to the master plan as to where the primary school could be located and the application has now been amended to provide the 2 illustrative masterplans. This will enable a new primary school build to be brought forward which could mean the school could be built without any of the other development on site. Due to the re-consultation process the flood risk assessment and transport assessment have been updated and there have been no issues raised with regard to the flood risk assessment. With regard to the transport, there have been many discussions and the revised transport assessment has been approved by the County Council and as part of the approval, County have advised that the previously agreed monies for a range of transport measures in the Section 106 should now be allocated to measures which are now more appropriate. The overall contribution is not being reduced which is £630,000 towards transport measures. One outstanding matter from Consultee comments is the request for a further stage 1 safety audit and that work has been commissioned. With regard to the NHS response from the latest consultation, Members will be aware that the application has been subject to expert viability work agreed independently and also by the Planning Officer's. The monies available for financial contributions are limited to those which are within the draft 106. Ms Whitehead stated that it is a late request and the concerns that the applicant has are that the actual sum of money has not been quantified and all that the NHS has stated is that they are looking at approximately £362,000 and they have yet to qualify how they wish for these monies to be spent. Ms Whitehead stated that the affordable housing position has been reviewed to 16% for all the phases.

- Councillor Connor asked Ms Whitehead to clarify how long the site will take to build and Ms Whitehead a great deal depends on the state of the market as this is 1000 houses, so it could be 10 years.

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

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that with regard to the NHS contribution, she feels this needs to be looked at very closely as 1000 homes will have families who will need medical support and she feels the NHS contribution is essential and further enquiries need to be made as to when it will be spent and how it will be spent. Councillor Mrs Laws stated that moving forward the NHS does need support and if there are developments of this size coming through it is important that an allowance is negotiated in the Section 106 agreements and developers should be made aware that they will be expected to make a contribution towards the NHS.
- The Chairman agreed with Councillor Mrs Laws and stated that this was raised at the Chairman's briefing that morning, where it was considered that the NHS should have foresight and not leave requests till the last minute.
- Councillor Connor commented that this will not be the only development in Chatteris in the next ten years and this will put pressure on services and the provision of dentists also needs to be considered. Councillor Connor also asked whether the junctions at the Slade End roundabout and the Huntingdon Road roundabout have been investigated within the traffic and highways assessment as there are often traffic tailbacks there at busy times.

Officers from Cambridgeshire Highways moved to the Public Speaking Table to answer queries

and comments from Members of the Planning Committee.

- Alex Woolnough from County Council advised Members that following a request to re consult on this application, he has looked further back at the history and has struggled to find a recommendation from the highways authority which has said that there are no highways objections and there have always been outstanding matters. The main issue when reviewing the history was the road safety audit being outstanding and the issue of consideration with the safety audit were the two site access roundabouts and when looking at the transport assessments that were submitted there were also proposals for improvements to the Slade End Roundabout and also proposals for a junction improvement to West Park Street/Huntingdon Road, however this went before committee with a resolution to approve with conditions from an unknown origin that are unclear. There also appears a number of pieces of infrastructure which appear to have been missed off or overlooked and that is why his concerns have been raised in recent days concerning this application. With regard to the applicants comments, Alex Woolnough stated that the Applicant is predicting ten years more development, however his understanding is that the transport assessment is only modelled for 5 years and over a ten year period the impact would be different.
- The Chairman stated that he understands that the Chatteris transport study is about to take place and asked whether this would highlight any of the concerns that have arisen over the junctions and other turnings within the town.
- Jez Tuttle from County Council stated that the only transport strategy that he has reviewed in terms of Cambridgeshire so far is in Huntingdonshire and if the Chatteris Study is being carried out in a similar way, it is a very comprehensive study, covering accidents, traffic flows, projected forecasts for the local plan duration, so it is hoped there will be a great deal of information which will be gathered. It will also identify schemes that would be required to mitigate the general traffic flow in that area, however it is a piece of work that is going to take a great deal of time.
- The Chairman stated he has been provided information which states that the transport study for Chatteris is due to take place and asked whether that is specifically for Chatteris or for the surrounding countryside.
- Jez Tuttle stated that it will cover Chatteris specifically.
- Alex Woolnough stated it would identify junctions where they are approaching capacity issues or areas that are in need of improvement.
- The Chairman asked whether the developers have been made aware that this study is about to take place or is underway. Alex Woolnough responded that it is the developer's responsibility to carry out their own studies and mitigate their impact. If the study was in place then the developer could use that information and dovetail into the study work but he is not aware of that information being available at this point in time and therefore the developer should present a package in support of their development that demonstrates that their development doesn't have any unacceptable harm to the highway.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he is sure the transportation study for Chatteris was announced by the Combined Authority a few weeks ago for the three market towns March, Chatteris and Whittlesey. This will be a similar study to the one that has taken place in Wisbech and that has taken some time. Therefore the applicant will be able to feed into this study that is coming forward.
- Councillor Connor stated he would have liked more information surrounding these issues prior to today's meeting and asked the Highways Officer's whether are the two roundabouts mentioned earlier are up to capacity and will this development make the situation worse.
- Jez Tuttle stated that the history has been set out and there was a resolution to grant so the transport assessment that was requested was a refresh and revalidation of the existing assessment to see whether the projected growth in the future. Over a series of documentation that were revalidated and redone the 2020 projected growth was modelled on the network and it has shown that there were various increases in traffic at various junctions. There were validation exercises carried out at some of the junctions where traffic

queuing was looked at and there was one junction which Highways were not sure about which was the Slade End roundabout and there was information presented which seemed to contradict the data which was given to the Highways Officers. The conclusions of the data was queried which is why the contribution of the existing package of measures was switched from its existing package to measures to works at the Slade End roundabout. All other points on the network were seen to be acceptable in terms of the impact of the new development and there was one roundabout which was slightly over capacity which means there maybe queuing of 1 or 2 vehicles. Alex Woolnough commented that with regard to the Slade End roundabout that the contribution identified for highway improvements and it is possible that a highway scheme could be delivered at this location; however a scheme should be presented to Officer's at road safety to ascertain whether capacity improvements could be delivered safely at that location.

- Mr Harding advised Members that in 2015, there was a resolution to grant this application. The applicant has accommodated a request from the County Council regarding school provision and if this had not been the case, then the development may have already started and this needs to be factored into the decision that is made today. Nick Harding commented that Jez Tuttle has advised Members that the updated transport assessment has been reviewed and an overview of the impact the development will have on the junctions has been provided and a sum of money has been set aside specifically for improvements. Nick Harding highlighted that he has the comments from Highways from the original application and the only reference in those comments in relation to transportation concerns is about the travel plan and it does not reference the concerns over junctions and junction capacities.
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that she is concerned about the number of heavy goods vehicles travelling along London Road. There is an undertaking from one local business who ensures his vehicles only travel at 20mph along that road, which are monitored, however the residents that live along London Road do raise the issue regularly about the amount of traffic and road conditions. Alex Woolnough responded that a 7.5tonne HGV weight limit would be brought into force, however in order deliver that a public consultation exercise would need to be carried out and this would be a separate piece of work and matters outside of the planning process. The London Road roundabout would be located on the 30mph/50mph speed limit and therefore amendments to the Traffic regulation orders would be required and the 2 roundabouts are also causing him concerns.
- Councillor Mrs Newell commented that a lot of traffic can access from the A142, which would alleviate the problems on the London Road. Alex Woolnough stated he unclear of the strategy to deal with the development and to deal with the control of the traffic from the A142.
- Councillor Murphy commented that he uses the Slade End roundabout on numerous occasions daily and the only time there is an issue are at peak rush hour times, but this is not uncommon in any town. There is a large amount of money and time being spent discussing this issue and we want the homes to be built which will stop the over intensification in the middle of the towns. There are 1000 homes to be built and if it takes ten years to complete the development that is only 100 homes a year being built. Alex Woolnough responded that at the moment the Slade End roundabout is approaching capacity and at the moment it functions but at peak times the traffic on Fenland Way does back up, but the developer needs to mitigate their impact and the impact of the development will only be known when it is fully built and completed.
- Nick Harding highlighted that an updated traffic assessment has been submitted and it has been reviewed by Jez Tuttle and his Manager have agreed they are happy with it and the mitigation that has been provided by way of a sum of money. Although Alex Woolnough would prefer a detailed scheme to be submitted for the roundabouts, we have a written response from the Traffic Assessment Team at County Council that states they are happy with the assessment and the sum of money for the mitigation.
- Councillor Connor stated that he is not against the 1000 homes but he is trying to ensure that the infrastructure is in place to support it.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that we have approved this application and we should be only

be discussing the section 106 and whilst she appreciates Members concerns the application has been approved.

- Councillor Mrs Laws commented that she is pleased that Members are making observations, as differences have evolved and we are all aware traffic is increasing, however we are in a position today where we have made observations and listened to the Highways Officer's but we are now in a position where we must be mindful of the construction traffic and do what is possible to help and support the local residents and move forward.
- The Chairman, thanked Jez Tuttle and Alex Woolnough for their presentations and responses provided to the Committee today.
- The Chairman reminded Members that there is a £125,000 contribution from the Developer on the Section 106 for the retention of a travel plan condition and if the recommendation is to approve the Chairman will personally support that recommendation to be added to the permission.
- Councillor Mrs Laws asked about the NHS contribution and the Chairman stated that this has been discussed and the letter from Chatteris Town Council, are in full support of the trimming of other contributions to alleviate the NHS contribution.
- Councillor Sutton stated that in his opinion the NHS have no shortage of money, what it does have is a shortage of persons who know how to spend the money. GP surgeries are now private businesses and if a surgery is needed then a private business will need to fill that gap.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he agrees with Councillor Murphy concerning transport and that in any town in rush hour you will suffer from congestion. The applicant is willing to pay £125,000 for the travel plan, but he does not think it should be traded and thinks that the travel plan conditions should remain as well as the monies. Whilst he understands the applicant wants to negotiate the best available deal, he believes the monies could be used to implement an extended plan, to benefit both old and new residents and he would hope somebody will propose to agree with the Officer's recommendation and he will support the inclusion of the £125,000 and the retention of the travel plan.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton that the application is APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation, with the inclusion of the £125,000 from the developer, but to note that this will not be traded against the proposed travel plan addition. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Laws, who agreed with Councillor Sutton that there should be no trade off.

Nick Harding asked about the contribution to NHS facilities and if supported where the pro rata reductions would be made.

The Chairman proposed to Members whether they wished to delegate to the Head of Planning to negotiate the re allocation of monies from the 106 agreement as he saw appropriate and this was agreed unanimously

Nick Harding stated that he will clarify with NHS England to ensure that the monies that they are asking for are for capital projects.

The Chairman returned to the original proposal from Councillor Sutton and seconded by Councillor Mrs Laws and decided that the application be : APPROVED as per the Officer's recommendation.

(The Chairman registered , in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that all Members of the Planning Committee had been lobbied on this application)