

PLANNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY, 29 JANUARY 2020 - 1.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor A Hay (Vice-Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor S Clark, Councillor A Lynn, Councillor C Marks, Councillor Mrs K Mayor, Councillor N Meekins, Councillor P Murphy and Councillor W Sutton,

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

OBSERVING: Councillor J Clark, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor A Miscandlon

P60/19 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 4 December 2019 were confirmed and signed.

P61/19 F/YR18/0165/F - ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY RETIREMENT COMPLEX BLOCK COMPRISING OF 13 X 1-BED UNITS WITH COMMUNAL FACILITIES, AND A 1.1M HIGH (MAX HEIGHT) RAILINGS TO FRONT BOUNDARY INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING - LAND NORTH AND WEST OF ELLIOTT LODGE, ELLIOTT ROAD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

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

Sheila Black presented the report to members.

Member asked questions, made comments and received response as follows;

1. Councillor Lynn said whilst he had no issues with the principle of development, he was disappointed to see that there would be no Section 106 (S106) contribution.
2. Councillor Benney agreed but highlighted that issues surrounding viability assessments are out of local authorities control and unless Central Government change the formula used, this will continue to be a problem.
3. Councillor Mrs Mayor agreed but highlighted that this application is for a retirement complex and its benefits will be felt across the wider community. She supported the application.
4. Councillor Connor agreed and supported the application.
5. Councillor Sutton concurred but highlighted that the assessments are carried out by experts and the Council cannot argue with these. He added that on many occasions outline planning permission is granted subject to S106 contributions only for viability assessments to be carried out and the scheme deemed unviable. He said officers spend a lot of time processing S106 viability assessments and suggested that their time may be better spent elsewhere as the majority of assessments deem schemes unviable.

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

P62/19

F/YR18/0984/RM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION RELATING TO DETAILED MATTERS OF ACCESS, APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PERMISSION F/YR14/1020/O, FOR THE ERECTION OF 28 X DWELLINGS CONSISTING OF 4 X 3-STOREY 6-BED WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE, 5 X 2-STOREY 4-BED WITH DETACHED GARAGE AND 19 X 2-STOREY 3-BED WITH DETACHED GARAGE -LAND SOUTH OF BERRYFIELD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

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

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

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Mark Frost.

Mark Frost thanked members for the opportunity to speak at today's meeting and explained that he has been a resident of Berryfield for fifteen years. He stated that residents had been given an undertaking that the development would be in-keeping with the current estate and would include an extension to the open space. He stated that this proposal is not in-keeping with existing properties in Berryfield and there is no provision for open space.

He stated that the lack of open space will cause issues for residents of the new development as their children will have nowhere to play safely and stated that children living on the estate would have to walk quite a distance to get to open space. He added that there will be further danger as the proposed development will not benefit from a pavement extension of the existing footpath. Pedestrians will be required to walk in the road to access the site and the road is unlikely to be adopted which can cause a number of issues with street lighting and refuse collection as well as access for the farmer to his adjacent field.

He informed members that the applicants had provided false information in their original planning application as they do benefit from full access to the site from Berryfield and urged members and officers to look into this further.

Mark Frost stated that residents are extremely concerned at the flooding risk to the development and highlighted that there had already been incidents of sewage coming out of drain covers on-site. He stated that should a flood or incident occur once the development is complete; the Council will be held accountable by residents. He stated that current residents on the estate should be protected from disruption during the construction period and asked that if planning permission is granted, a traffic management plan must be implemented to allow residents to enter and exit their homes safely. He stated that the road is already heavily congested with parked vehicles and will only worsen once construction vehicles are on-site.

He disputed the applicant's claims that the site currently has no wildlife inhabiting it and diseased ash trees and said this is completely untrue. He said subsoil on the development has been exposed for almost a year and this has led to many species of wildlife on-site which will need further investigation. He stated that the site was due to be fenced off however this has still not been done and as a result is often victim of trespassers.

He concluded that the development does not provide anything to the community and asked members to refuse the application today.

Members had no questions for Mark Frost.

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Graham Moore (Middle Level Commissioners).

Graham Moore thanked members for the opportunity to speak at today's meeting on behalf of March Middle Level Commissioners (the Board). He said whilst the Board are not opposed to the principle of development; they are concerned about the water level and flood risk aspect and want to ensure a suitable scheme is in place to minimise flood risk. He stated that drainage is a key element that ultimately will determine the layout of a site and unfortunately is often an afterthought. Whilst he noted that the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has no objections to the proposal, they may not be totally aware of the issues that remain. The ownership, extent and capacity of the proposed sewer system are not known and it is understood that only Highway water is allowed to discharge into it. He asked where the water from the proposed development will go if this is the case.

Graham Moore stated that the surface water drainage solution is to be offered to Anglian Water for adoption which usually requires the discharge to be into a system that is the responsibility of a suitable authority. In the longer term the tanks may be subject to infiltration due to the high-ground water table which in turn, may reduce its storage capacity. He stated that members should also note that the actual discharge from the site may still be many times that received currently, which in turn will increase the costs much of which is paid by special levies. It is proposed that the road will be used to store surface water during extreme events and he questioned if this was the best solution. He said it is in the interest of all, especially rate-payers, to resolve this issue now rather than later in the process.

He said that the Board concludes that there are many unresolved issues which may affect the proposed layout and suggest that this application be deferred until these matters are resolved. He urged the applicant to discuss these matters with the Board before proceeding any further.

Members had no questions for Graham Moore.

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Councillor Cornwell.

Councillor Cornwell explained that he had not objected to the outline planning application for the site as it had been promised that the layout would be appropriate with a suitable provision for drainage, infrastructure and dwelling quality however unfortunately, these have disappeared. He explained that the development extends an original 'Allison' estate which is known for its dwelling size, space and quality however he does not believe the proposal delivers this.

He stated that whilst the site is located within Flood Zone 1 it is immediately adjacent to a narrow strip of Flood Zone 2 which is followed by a larger expanse of Flood Zone 3, both of which are drained by the March Fifth Drainage Commissioners existing infrastructure. He highlighted that the site is considerably lower than Berryfield which is confirmed by the proposal to use a foul sewer pump to lift it to the level of the existing sewer.

He reiterated that the current site already suffers from very wet conditions and the current farmer is only able to grow crops that can be harvested before autumn and winter wetter seasons begins. He stated that increased and quicker run-off from the development will further add to this problem and lead to an increase in costs to the Commissioners as well as increased system demand and maintenance. He asked members to note that whilst the developer will initially make a substantial contribution towards this, if they are not managed correctly the Council and ultimately the tax payer will have to fund the additional costs.

Councillor Cornwell stated that members are being asked to approve a development which simply cannot be approved by the drainage authority and is therefore undeliverable. He stated that these

issues need addressing however pre-drainage advice has been offered to the applicant since 2015 but never taken up. He added that the plan does not show the access to a private drain from Elm Road, March which crosses the site and will need to be relocated as a result of the proposed layout. He stated that there are limits on the capability of the existing system to take increased flow and using the road as an open sustainable drainage system (SuDS) feature is not acceptable and will not comply with LP2 (Health & Wellbeing) of the Local Plan. He highlighted to members that the LLFA have stated their disappointment at the lack of space for open SuDS features too.

Councillor Cornwell stated that the report fails to mention the proven presence of Radon Gas and associated monitoring equipment situated on the site. He stated that they are not included on the plan but provisions must be made to either relocate them or accommodate them within the proposal.

Referencing 10.3 of the report, he asked if the break in footpath would hinder adoption of the road by Highways and whether a revised layout can produce safer access to the site. He also questioned 10.5 of the report which refers to the design relationship with Station Road, March and asked why this is relevant as Station Road is located approximately a mile away from the site.

He concluded by reiterating that the site suffers from a number and mixture of issues, some of which can be resolved and some that are more difficult. He said there was little point members approving the application for a site that currently cannot be delivered. He stated that refusing this application will afford time for everyone involved to work together to produce a safe, quality, enjoyable and appropriate development for the town.

Members had no questions for Councillor Cornwell.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Gareth Edwards (Agent).

Gareth Edwards thanked members for the opportunity to speak in support of this application. He explained that outline planning permission had been granted for 30 dwellings however this has now been reduced to 28 and following discussions, officers recommend approval of the application.

He explained that the original application had included the allocation of S106 funding for open space however following a viability assessment this is no longer possible. Instead, the applicant is willing to contribute £10,000 to an off-site open space provision. He stated that the application is for traditional 3, 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings and the development will not appear out of scale to the existing development. He assured members that drainage proposals are underway and will form part of the application to discharge conditions following approval of this application.

He informed members that a viability assessment had shown a deficit of £105,000 following archaeological investigations however this concluded no further works are required. He asked members to support the officer's recommendation and the associated conditions.

Members asked Gareth Edwards the following questions;

1. Councillor Meekins asked for clarification regarding the contribution to an off-site play provision and stated that £10,000 is a low figure for a development of this scale. Gareth Edwards explained that the original application required no provision for an on-site open space but following a viability assessment, the applicant has made a token contribution of £10,000 to an off-site play area.

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

1. Councillor Hay referenced the update report circulated and asked for confirmation that Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) are in support of the application. David Rowen confirmed that no objections had been received from CCC.
2. Councillor Benney raised concern in relation to the drainage issues and asked what can be done to ensure that the development benefits from the correct drainage system. David Rowen confirmed that there is a condition attached to the outline planning permission which requires a detailed surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved.
3. David Rowen reminded members that the Reserved Matters approval sits under the original Outline Planning Permission and any controls in place under the Outline Planning Permission are still in existence. He added that it is not uncommon for planning permission to be granted where there are other outstanding statutory or legal approvals required. He stated that if Middle Level are not happy with the proposal, this can be dealt with separately under their regulations. He stated that officers are satisfied that the controls in respect of drainage are in place and it would be down to the applicant and consultants to design an appropriate scheme.
4. Councillor Murphy referenced that in 5.1 of the report, it states that if the application is approved, March Town Council request a contribution of £10,000 per property towards the provision of Estover Playing Field. He asked officers if there is a legal requirement for this. David Rowen explained that Item 7 of the agenda will cover this further but confirmed that S106 requirements must be policy-based and he is not aware of a policy that would support this level of contribution.
5. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she is not comfortable with the drainage issues on site and is further concerned that the off-site open space provision is not viable as open space is required closer to the development.
6. Councillor Sutton agreed that the application is controversial however reiterated that the Outline Planning Permission has the appropriate conditions attached to it which either will or won't satisfy the relevant bodies. The application today is to decide if the layout is appropriate. In relation to open spaces, he highlighted that the site is located within close proximity of Estover Playing Field and supported officer's recommendation.
7. Councillor Benney asked if it was possible to add a condition in relation to a Traffic Management Plan being implemented on site. David Rowen explained that unfortunately this condition is not included in the Outline Planning Permission and cannot be added although there is other legislation in place to ensure safety arrangements are in place on building sites.
8. Councillor Lynn asked for further information on the lack of pathway in to the development. David Rowen explained a path is shown on the plans, and if there is a lack of path this would be down to land ownership issues however there is a condition attached to the Outline Planning Permission which requires full details of road and footpath layout to be submitted and approved.
9. Councillor Hay stated that all planning permissions should include a condition relating to Traffic Management Plans. David Rowen explained that the Outline Planning Permission was granted in 2014/15 and was not common practise at that time. He reiterated that there is separate legislation in place for the management of building sites.
10. Councillor Meekins stated that he has concerns in relation to drainage on the site and asked what the implications would be for refusing planning permission based on this. Nick Harding reminded members that drainage is not a matter for consideration as part of this planning application and conditions are already in place in the Outline Planning Permission to resolve this.

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

(Councillor Mrs Mayor abstained from voting)

**TO PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR14/1020/) (ENTERED INTO ON 16/12/15)
RELATING TO VIABILITY - LAND SOUTH OF BERRYFIELD, MARCH,
CAMBRIDGESHIRE.**

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

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

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Mark Frost.

Mark Frost explained that a viability assessment drawn up on behalf of the developers had deemed the scheme unviable and predicts the developers could lose up to £1million based on current market values. He stated that the Outline Planning Permission had been granted subject to a S106 legal agreement however the developers are now stating that complying with this would reduce their profit margin significantly.

He stated that the residents of Berryfield believe the Council have an obligation to uphold such an agreement as it is not the Council's responsibility to ensure the developer makes a certain level of profit. He argued that the S106 agreement must remain and if a reduction is given to the figure requested, the Council are not acting in the best interest of local residents.

He urged members to ensure that the applicants uphold their end of the agreement by either providing affordable housing or a S106 contribution instead. He highlighted that the contributions had been allocated to a number of schemes including; the expansion of Westwood Primary School, improvements to March Library, Estover Playing Fields and March Railway Station.

Mark Frost stated that the applicants have provided the Council with evidence that the site is not viable if they are required to make a S106 contribution and the residents wish them to make this contribution or walk away from the development. He said residents are not happy with the offer of £10,000 and full payment is required to support the community. He added that the development is purely being built out of 'greed not need'

He said as elected members, it is the Council's responsibility to look after the interest of residents and not developers and asked that they make the right decision for those they represent.

Members had no questions for Mark Frost.

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

1. Councillor Benney stated that whilst he sympathises with residents, there is little members can do in relation to viability assessments. He stated that if the case was to be appealed and costs awarded this would cost the Council and ultimately residents. He highlighted that the Planning Committee must not make bad decisions against policy.
2. Councillor Connor agreed with these comments.

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

**P64/19 F/YR19/0467/RM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION RELATING TO
DETAILED MATTERS OF APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING AND SCALE
PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PERMISSION (F/YR13/0804/O) FOR THE ERECTION OF
6NO DWELLINGS (1 X SINGLE-STOREY 4-BED, 2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED, 2 X 2-**

STOREY 4-BED AND 1 X 2-STOREY 5-BED) - LAND SOUTH OF, JONES LANE, EASTREA, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

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

Sheila Black presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Councillor Miscandlon.

Councillor Miscandlon thanked members for the opportunity to speak and explained that both local residents and Whittlesey Town Council believe that this application is not compliant with policy as development will be detrimental to local residents. He stated that the development will overshadow neighbouring gardens which can have a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of those that reside there.

He explained that the access to the site is via a very dangerous junction which is currently used by farm vehicles, cyclists and horse riders. Increased traffic will make the junction unacceptable. He disagreed with the comments provided by Highways and stated that an in depth study into this is required. He asked members to refuse the application due to the detrimental impact the development will have on local residents.

Members had no questions for Councillor Miscandlon.

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

1. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that the applicant does not own the access into the development and asked what impact this would have. David Rowen explained that land ownership is not a planning issue and should not form part of member's consideration.
2. Nick Harding reminded members that this is a Reserved Matters Application and access does not form part of this application. He highlighted that the lane is a public highway and irrespective of ownership, benefits from a right of way.
3. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she does not support the application due to the varying size of proposed dwellings and the impact this will have on neighbouring properties. She added that she has further concerns about the impact of increased traffic from the site and disagreed with Highways comments.
4. Councillor Sutton supported the proposed layout. He said during the Committee's Site Visits he had been concerned about the width of the access into the site but had since revisited the site and was now satisfied that there is space for vehicles to pass one another.
5. Councillor Meekins stated that members must accept that Highways are happy with the application and planning permission cannot be refused on this basis.

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

(Councillor Mrs Mayor abstained from voting)

(Councillor Mrs Mayor declared an interest by virtue of the fact that she is a member of Whittlesey Town Council)

P65/19 F/YR19/0822/O - ERECT UP TO 2 X DWELLINGS (2-STOREY, 3-BED) (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF APPEARANCE AND SCALE) INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING - REAR OF, 76 HIGH STREET, CHATTERIS, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

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

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

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Councillor Haggata (Chatteris Town Council).

Councillor Haggata stated that he is attending today's meeting as Chairman of Chatteris Town Council's Planning Committee. He stated that he strongly supports the application based on comments received from local residents. Local residents have highlighted that the building has been derelict for a number of years and they are keen to see development due to ongoing issues with anti-social behaviour and vandalism on the site. He read out to members several letters of support from residents and asked that their comments are considered during deliberations.

Members had no questions for Councillor Haggata.

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, Ian Mason (Chatteris Past, Present and Future).

Ian Mason thanked members for the opportunity to speak and explained that the property dates back to 1757 and is still standing today. He highlighted that previous applications submitted had been for the conversion of the existing building and said it was disappointing that the Planning & Heritage statement submitted neglected to include information about the building's heritage.

He informed members that the building has had many uses over the years including being used as a Quaker House until the 1920's. He said based on this, the property should be considered a heritage asset and The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that neglect of an asset should not be a reason for demolition. He highlighted to members that the building is included as part of the 'Chatteris Town Walking Trail' which visits historical sites in the town.

Ian Mason informed members that he has significant concerns in relation to a potential burial site within close proximity of the development as there is no documentation that confirms it has ever been relocated. He highlighted that if the application is approved and it is determined that the burial site is still in-situ this will be both detrimental to the development and costly. He asked members to take this into consideration during their decision making.

He concluded by informing members that a visit to Chatteris from Historic England is scheduled to take place in the near future and he had hoped that this building would receive the recognition it deserves as an important heritage building.

Members had no questions for Ian Mason.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from David Brooks (Applicant).

David Brooks thanked members for the opportunity to speak and explained that he had lived and worked in Chatteris for 30 years. He stated that he intends to use the proposed dwellings as homes for both himself and his sister, who is a care worker. He said the development will rejuvenate part of the town and will provide sympathetic, energy efficient and sustainable homes.

He explained to members that the site has suffered from anti-social behaviour and vandalism and the proposed works will put a stop to this. He confirmed that he had evidence to show the changes to the building over the years proving that many of the original features have been lost. As a result

of this, the property has very little original woodwork or brick remaining.

In relation to the alleged burial site, he understands that there was a burial ground between 1892 - 1914 but it is located outside of the site boundary. He confirmed that Chatteris Town Walking Trail references this. He reiterated the support the application has received from residents and asked members to grant planning permission today.

David Brooks showed members a document he had which stated that the property had suffered from severe fire damage in 1878.

Members asked David Brooks the following questions;

1. Councillor Meekins asked for clarification that the existing burial ground has been built over. David Brooks stated that the burial ground is located under the entrance of the adjacent road.

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

1. Councillor Marks asked for confirmation that the building is not a listed building. Officers confirmed this.
2. Councillor Benney stated that as a local resident he has been aware of this site for a number of years. He reiterated that the building has few original features and has changed over time. He highlighted to members the varying types of brickwork and roofing they witnessed during the site visit. He said the current building is not fit for purpose and as the application is for a sympathetic design it would enhance the town.
3. Councillor Lynn agreed that during the site visit he saw very little evidence of the original building. In his opinion, even with extensive renovation work, very little of the original building will be salvageable.
4. Nick Harding stated that whilst members may not agree that the property is a heritage asset, it is included on the town's historical walking trail and this should be considered. He suggested that if members are minded to grant planning permission, conditions should be added requiring the building to be recorded and preventing the demolition of the building prior to a suitable contract being in place.
5. Councillor Murphy stated that the address is incorrect as the property is clearly fronting Ash Grove and The Grove, Chatteris.
6. Councillor Murphy disagreed that the site contributes to the character of the area as it is an eye-sore located in an otherwise presentable street. He explained that a development had taken place recently on the opposite side of the road which had vastly improved the appearance of the locality and this development had had no concerns raised in relation to its heritage or proximity to the town's conservation area.
7. Councillor Murphy echoed member's comments in relation to the fire damage and subsequent repair works to the building and stating that the property is only of single-skin construction which would not be suitable for modern day conversion. He highlighted that the new development would offer off-street parking for two vehicles per dwelling which is rare and sought after in the town-centre location.
8. Councillor Murphy stated that Chatteris Town Council and CCC have no objections to the application as well as many residents of the town. He stated that whilst he supports protection of heritage sites, he believes applications should be considered on their own merits and he sees no planning reason as to why planning permission should not be granted due to the enhancement the development would bring to the area.
9. David Rowen reminded members that a previous application had been submitted which proposed the conversion of the existing building. Unfortunately no supporting or structural information has been provided with this application to show that this is no longer a viable option and warrant going against planning policy.
10. Nick Harding requested that if members are minded to approve planning permission

delegation is given to officers in regards to the associated conditions relating to materials, archaeological investigation, heritage registration and permitted development rights in line with the NPPF.

11. Councillor Benney stated that he does not wish limiting conditions to be placed on the application if it is to make the scheme unviable for the applicant and would like officers to consult with members in relation to this.
12. Councillor Murphy agreed with this request.
13. Councillor Hay agreed but highlighted that a condition regarding archaeological investigation is required in light of the potential burial ground.
14. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked if the earlier planning application on the site had conditions imposed regarding archaeological investigations. Nick Harding confirmed that the previous planning application did not include this condition.
15. Councillor Sutton agreed that members should be involved in the decision surrounding attached conditions, if planning permission is approved.

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

Members approved the application against officer's recommendation for the following reasons; the property is not a listed building and development would enhance the area.

It was decided that the conditions imposed on the planning permission be agreed in conjunction with Councillor Connor, Councillor Murphy, Councillor Mrs Mayor and Councillor Benney.

(Councillor Lynn left the meeting at 3.15 PM)

(Councillors Benney, Hay and Murphy declared an interest by virtue of the fact that they are members of Chatteris Town Council but take no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Sutton declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of the fact that the agent is his nephew)

P66/19 F/YR19/0840/F - ERECT A 2-STOREY 4-BED DWELLING INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FIRE DAMAGED DWELLING - 15 CHURCH STREET, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE, PE15 9PY.

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

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

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Councillor John Clark.

Councillor J Clark thanked members for the opportunity to speak and stated that whilst he knows the applicant he has no pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest in the property. He explained that he had grown up in this area and is familiar with both the site and applicant. As a former member of St. Wendreda's church choir, he is keen to ensure development does not cause detrimental harm to however in his opinion; the proposal will only enhance the area.

He highlighted that the replacement dwelling will be a similar size to the previous site as there was previously a large wooden shed which was in poor condition. He reminded members of the 29 letters of support the application had received, including a letter of support from the minister of St.

Wendreda's and a Planning Officer who lives in the locality.

Councillor J Clark disagreed that the development will have a visual impact on the church and argued that the nearby eco-house built by Tommy Walsh has far greater a visual impact than this proposal. He reiterated that the application will be an improvement to the locality and asked members to support the application.

Members had no questions for Councillor J Clark.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Matthew Hall (Agent).

Matthew Hall thanked members for the opportunity to speak and explained that the applicant had resided in the property for 62 years before it was destroyed by fire in April 2019. He highlighted that the application proposes that the property be set further back into the site and on all boundaries to prevent obstruction of views to the church.

Matthew Hall highlighted to members the differing property styles located in Church Street. He explained that the proposal had been developed over a number of months and confirmed that the applicant would be happy to agree to conditions in relation to external materials. He reiterated that the property will cause no overlooking or overshadowing to neighbouring dwellings and has received a lot of support from both local residents and the minister of St. Wendreda. He asked members to approve planning permission.

Members had no questions for Matthew Hall.

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

1. Councillor Sutton said whilst he has taken into consideration the officer's recommendation, most of the comments received from local residents and the minister have been in support of the application. He agreed that there is a vast array of property types in the locality and the proposal will not have a detrimental visual impact on the church.
2. Councillor Murphy agreed and stated that he cannot understand why planning permission should not be granted due to the mixture of existing property types in the road.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Murphy and decided that the application be APPROVED; against officer's recommendation.

Members approved the application against officer's recommendation for the following reasons; the development will enhance the area and benefit the local community.

Members agreed to delegate authority to officers to formulate conditions.

P67/19 F/YR19/0931/O - ERECT UP TO 9NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED) - LAND SOUTH OF 137, UPWELL ROAD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

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

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Gareth Edwards (Agent).

Gareth Edwards thanked members for the opportunity to speak. He explained that the site extends into two neighbouring gardens and benefits from a number of existing outbuildings. He highlighted that the development will be located behind the adjacent Upwell Park site and therefore be a continuation of the built form of Upwell Road.

Gareth Edwards stated that the site benefits from established boundaries which the applicant was advised would encourage wildlife. Whilst no requests for biodiversity reports have been made, the applicant is happy to comply with this if necessary. He highlighted the support from all statutory consultees as well as March Town Council and neighbouring residents. He stated that the site will appeal to both self-build and small local developers and is very similar to other developments located throughout the district.

Gareth Edwards reiterated the established boundary on the site and reminded members of the existing outbuildings in-situ already. He asked members to approve the application which will provide completed development on a prime route into March.

Members asked Gareth Edwards the following questions;

1. Councillor Sutton asked if there had been any discussions with owners of the plot immediately adjacent to Upwell Park. Gareth Edwards confirmed there had but the owners were not interested in including their site in this development.

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

1. Councillor Murphy agreed with officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission.
2. Councillor Hay agreed and highlighted the appeal which was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on another similar site in Upwell Road and added that granting planning permission will set a precedent for others.
3. Councillor Sutton stated that he regularly drives past the site and has no issue with the visual impact the development may have. He stated that as members have refused a similar scheme in Upwell Road he has reservations about approving this application as the Planning Committee must be consistent in its decision making.
4. Councillor Benney supported the application and said the application would provide 9 properties for local residents set within a nice development.
5. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked when the other site in Upwell Road was considered by the Planning Inspector as part of the appeals process. David Rowen confirmed that the appeal took place in October 2019.

Proposed by Councillor Meekins, seconded by Councillor Murphy that the application be refused as per officer's recommendation.

A vote was taken and the proposal failed.

6. David Rowen reminded members of an appeal decision at another site located on Upwell Road and stated that members must consider the Planning Inspector's comments in relation to the prevailing pattern of frontline development and his statement that Upwell Park is an anomaly. He urged members to consider these comments when making their decision.
7. Councillor Marks highlighted the existing buildings on this site and asked if there were outbuildings located on the appeal site. David Rowen confirmed there were no outbuildings located on the appeal site. However the application would not be classified as previously developed land.
8. Councillor Benney highlighted the support received by March Town Council for this application and urged members to consider this.
9. Councillor Sutton stated that whilst the Inspector's decision should influence members, this

site differs to the appeal site. He added that whilst the Inspector views Upwell Park as an anomaly, it does exist and adds to the built form of Upwell Road. He highlighted that the appeal site is not located within as close proximity to Upwell Park as this proposed development either.

10. Councillor Mrs Mayor highlighted 10.4 of the report and said she supported the application.

Proposed by Councillor Benney, seconded by Councillor Marks and decided that the application be APPROVED; against officer's recommendation.

Members approved the application against officer's recommendation for the following reasons; the development will not be detrimental to the local area and will enhance the town.

Members agreed to delegate authority to officers to formulate conditions.

P68/19 F/YR19/0972/FDC - ERECT 1NO DWELLING (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED) - LAND EAST OF, 80 UPWELL ROAD, MARCH, CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

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

David Rowen presented the report to members.

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

1. Councillor Connor stated that he can see no issues with the site and supported the application.

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

(Councillors Benney, Clark, Hay and Murphy declared an interest by virtue of the fact that they were members of Cabinet and have been involved in the decision making in relation to this proposal. They took no part in the discussion or voting for this item)

P69/19 F/YR19/1031/O - ERECT UP TO 3NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS) - LAND NORTH WEST OF 24 WILLEY TERRACE, DODDINGTON ROAD, CHATTERIS, CAMBRIDGESHIRE

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

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Gareth Edwards (Agent).

Gareth Edwards thanked members for the opportunity to speak and stated that development of the site will match the dwellings opposite to complete the built form of the area. He reminded members that under the Local Plan, Chatteris is considered an important area of development for the district.

He stated that the three plots will appeal to local self-build developers as there is currently a shortage of suitable building plots in Chatteris. He confirmed that the applicant has agreed to install hedging to the boundary to prevent future spread of development and the application has

received no objections from statutory consultees. He added that the site is not currently used for agricultural purposes and will provide a diverse housing mix to the town. He asked members to approve the application.

Members asked Gareth Edwards the following questions;

1. Councillor Hay asked why the applicant has only applied for planning permission on a small portion of the site. Gareth Edwards confirmed that this was to ensure development matches the built form of the properties opposite. He reiterated that the applicant proposes boundary hedging to stop further spread of development.

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

1. Councillor Benney agreed that this would complete the built form of the road and will improve the appearance of the surrounding area. He welcomed quality development in Chatteris and said the town needs developments like this.
2. Councillor Meekins disagreed and highlighted that the drawings show that the site will extend the built form of the properties opposite.
3. Councillor Murphy stated that the road currently has a 'stop line' of development and this should be adhered to. He stated that if planning permission is granted for three dwellings, this will no doubt spread over time. He agreed with officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission.
4. Councillor Sutton agreed that the site would complete the built form and questioned why an application had not been submitted to develop the whole site as this would have been appropriate.
5. Nick Harding informed members that he would need them to provide planning reasons if they are minded to approve planning permission. He reminded members that Highways do not approve the proposed access and footway and recommended that if members grant planning permission, it is subject to a satisfactory plans being submitted by the applicant.
6. Councillor Marks asked if a condition could be added to planning permission in respect of street lighting. Nick Harding confirmed that this would be the decision of CCC.
7. Councillor Sutton asked why the development would require a footpath as there is one the opposite side of the road. David Rowen explained that there is a footpath that serves the adjacent plots and this should be extended to serve the new dwellings.
8. Councillor Mrs Mayor highlighted that if the footpath is to be extended this would need to be agreed with the relevant Internal Drainage Board as there is a ditch to the front of the plot.

Proposed by Councillor Hay and seconded by Councillor Meekins that the application be refused as per officer's recommendation.

A vote was taken and the proposal failed.

Proposed by Councillor Benney, seconded by Councillor Marks and decided that the application be APPROVED; against officer's recommendation.

Members approved the application against officer's recommendation for the following reasons; the development will complete the built form of the dwellings opposite and the detriment of the development is outweighed by the benefit it will bring.

Members agreed to delegate authority to officers to formulate conditions and dependent upon an acceptable revised plan being submitted illustrating footpath provision along site frontage.

(Councillors Benney, Hay and Murphy declared an interest by virtue of the fact that they are members of Chatteris Town Council but take no part in planning matters)

P70/19 PLANNING APPEALS.

David Rowen presented the report to members with regard to appeals decisions in the last month.

4.50 pm

Chairman