

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**WEDNESDAY, 24 APRIL 2019 - 1.00 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor A Miscandlon (Chairman), Councillor S Clark (Vice-Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor A Hay and Councillor P Murphy,

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor D Connor, Councillor S Court, Councillor Mrs D Laws, Councillor Mrs F Newell and Councillor Mrs S Bligh,

Officers in attendance: Jo Goodrum (Member Services & Governance Officer), Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), Sheila Black (Principal Planning Officer) and Chris Gordon (Legal Officer)

## **P73/18      PREVIOUS MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of 27 March 2019 were confirmed and signed.

## **P74/18      F/YR18/1104/F LAND EAST OF 13 NORFOLK STREET, FACING ORANGE GROVE, WISBECH**

### **ERECTION OF A 3 STOREY BLOCK OF FLATS COMPRISING 2X2 BED AND 1X1 BED**

The Committee had regard to its inspection of the site (as agreed in accordance with the Site Inspection: Policy and Procedure (minute p19/04)) during its deliberations.

Sheila Black presented the report to members and drew their attention to the update report which had been circulated and also advised members of a late objection which had been received from the tenant of the public house with regard to concerns over inadequate fire escapes and issues concerning deliveries to the premises.

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

1. Councillor Murphy commented that the proposal tidies up the area and enhances it and Councillor Benney concurred.

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

## **P75/18      F/YR19/0164/F 20 DEERFIELD ROAD, MARCH**

### **ERECTION OF 4 X 2 STOREY 1 BED DWELLINGS INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND OUTBUILDING**

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. As a result of the revised plans which have been submitted, there has been a requirement to change the wording for the second reason for refusal, which is on page 28 of the agenda.

The amended wording is: Policy LP15 of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 requires all development to provide a well-designed, safe and convenient access. The proposal by virtue of the access and its relation to 18 Deerfield Road to the west would result in substandard visibility splays in that direction for traffic leaving the site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to highways safety and would be contrary to the requirements of policy LP15 in that respect.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure from Mr Robert Wickham, who spoke on behalf of the Agent.

Mr Wickham commented that it is disappointing to see the application is recommended for refusal. The site is derelict and contains asbestos and the proposal for four homes is similar to those, which were built in Elm Road, which were well received in the housing market.

He stated that he has concerns within the officer's report and mentioned that In 10.9 of the report it shows the description of the site and highlights a criticism of the width of the gap with the adjoining property, which identifies a detrimental impact of light and he added that the gap is similar to size to other properties in the road.

He mentioned that at 10.10 in the officer's report it states that with regard to privacy, the scheme utilises windows on all four main elevations from a mix of rooms with the main bedroom windows being located on the side elevations and secondary 'office' windows to the front and rear. However this is incorrect, as it is the other way round and the small office window on the side of the access could be a high level window.

At 10.11 in the report, it mentions concerns over car parking at the rear of the site, however this location was recommended by Officers in an email exchange from the 26 February 2018.

Mr Wickham added that with regard to 10.12 in the officer's report, it states that the proposal is out of character with the road which predominantly has 2 storey properties; however there are 7 detached houses, 6 bungalows and 3 pairs of semi-detached dwellings, along with 6 terraced houses in the road.

Mr Wickham concluded that the issues raised could be discussed with officers and an acceptable scheme could be achieved which would also be agreeable with highways in order to achieve a small development which has market appeal.

Members had no questions for Mr Wickham.

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

1. Councillor Hay commented that in her opinion a smaller development of two homes would have been preferable rather than the proposal for four. She agreed that the street scene is now better placed with the proposed dwellings being brought in line with the existing properties; however the gardens for the front two properties will still be adjacent to the main road, which in her opinion is not satisfactory. She added that following the previous refusal the applicant should have contacted officers to discuss what solutions would have been acceptable in order to achieve an agreeable resolution.
2. Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she agrees with Councillor Hay, that the proposal is over intensification of the site and she has concerns regarding amenity space particularly for the

front two properties.

**Proposed by Councillor Hay, seconded by Councillor Mrs Davis and decided that the application be REFUSED; as per the officer's recommendation.**

**P76/18**

**F/YR19/0146/O**

**LAND SOUTH AND WEST OF 4-5 MILL HILL LANE, MARCH**

**ERECTION OF UP TO 3NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS)**

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

Sheila Black presented the report to members and advised them that she had received a late objection relating to the level of housing in the general Mill Hill area, and that the development represents intensification of housing and that the access for the dwelling is inadequate.

Members received a presentation in support of the applicant, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Mr Matthew Hall, the Agent.

Matthew Hall stated that the proposed dwellings will be bungalows on a site which is situated in flood zone 1. He added that contained within the officers report under item 11.1 its states that the principal of the proposal is in accordance with planning policies and the proposed access would not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety. There have been no objections from the Environment Agency, Environmental Health or Highways and March Town Council support the application.

Matthew Hall added that a neighbour who is adjacent to the development has written to the planning officers and advised them that he has no concerns over the development and fully supports it. Mr Hall stated that number 7 Mill Lane is the applicants own property.

Matthew Hall identified to members on the presentation screen the proposed development including the access point and he highlighted the recent dwellings which had been built in the vicinity, clarifying the access drive, its proximity to other dwellings and the location of the bin stores. He clarified the third garden areas of the plot and pointed out the neighbouring existing dwellings garden area along with the applicants' garden area.

Matthew Hall informed members that the site layout is indicative and there is a layby for additional parking, a block paved area and if needed a hammerhead could be incorporated for a refuse vehicle. The plot sizes are similar to those that have been approved previously. The proposal is for bungalows resulting in no overlooking, as opposed to 2 storey dwellings that were approved on the other side.

Members had no questions for Mr Hall.

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

1. Councillor Murphy asked for clarification as to where the 18 responses from the public which had been received had originated from. Sheila Black stated that they had been received from within the ward and any received from outside the ward had been discounted. Councillor Murphy asked for further clarification with regard to specific addresses of support and objection to the proposal which Mr Nick Harding ascertained and provided to members.

There were 9 letters of objection and 7 of support.

2. Councillor Murphy asked for confirmation as to how far the residents would have to move their refuse and recycling bins to the designated collection point. Sheila Black confirmed that plot 3 would have to move their bins 110 metres and plot 1 would be 75 metres.
3. Councillor Hay stated that she has concerns over the reduction in amenity space for number 7 and although it is currently the applicants address that may alter in the future and for a large property she does not feel there is enough amenity space. She questioned that if it was a fresh planning application would the land that was left be classed as adequate amenity space. Sheila Black responded and said it would be looked at to see if it would fit a third of a plot which is the requisite size and the agent has confirmed that he considers it is a third of a plot.
4. Councillor Benney stated that upon the site visit, the issue of the bin collection point stood out for him and he understood the normal drag out distance for bins is 30 metres and the closest property is almost twice that distance. The reduction in amenity space to a very nice property is also a concern.

**Proposed by Councillor Benney, seconded by Councillor Hay and decided that the application be REFUSED, as per the officers recommendation.**

*(Councillor Mrs Davis declared a non pecuniary interest in the fact that she knows members of the applicant's family)*

*(The Chairman registered in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he has been lobbied on this application)*

1.40 pm

Chairman