

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**WEDNESDAY, 7 OCTOBER 2020 - 1.00 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor A Lynn (Vice-Chairman), Councillor C Marks, Councillor Mrs K Mayor, Councillor N Meekins, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor R Skoulding and Councillor W Sutton.

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

**P35/20**      **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2020 - 2021**

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Connor, and resolved that Councillor Lynn be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year, 2020/21.

**P36/20**      **PREVIOUS MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the 2 September 2020 were confirmed.

**P37/20**      **F/YR20/0458/F**  
**LAND NORTH WEST OF NEMPHLAR, BEGDAL ROAD, ELM; CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO A 6NO PITCHED TRAVELLERS SITE INVOLVING THE SITING OF 6 X MOBILE HOMES AND 8 X TOURING CARAVANS AND 6 X UTILITY BUILDINGS WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS (PART RETROSPECTIVE)**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public Participation Procedure, from Mr Mark Codona, the applicant.

Mr Codona explained that he was making this presentation on behalf of himself and his extended family, asking members to agree with the planning officer's recommendation for granting of planning consent, subject to appropriate addition of conditions. He explained that he had occupied the plot for 12 months and, during this time, there had been no fly-tipping incidents or any other form of anti-social behaviour.

Mr Codona stated that his children attend the local Elm Church of England Primary school and that his family use the local post office quite regularly, sometimes daily, and get on well with the owners. He added that he also has a lot of family and friends in and around the Wisbech area and has a good friendship with the local farmer and the other local residents who walk their dogs regularly through Newbridge Lane, and they have all commented on how much cleaner it is now, and how much more of a pleasure it is to walk down without rodents or anything else running out at them now the rubbish has been removed.

Mr Codona stated that his family now feel that they are part of the community of Elm and added that he feels he has helped improve the local area as he has cleared away all the fly-tipping from Newbridge Lane and continued to maintain it at no cost to the Local Authority. He stated that his

family have been in the Wisbech area for over 40 years and have strong links to the area, with his family attending the local Light and Life Christian Church on a regular basis which is in the nearby village of Elm.

Mr Codona stated that his family need to have a place that can provide them with a safe space, especially for disabled family members where they can be together as one extended family unit and so that they can all provide care for one another. He explained that he has 6 members of his immediate family which are under the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at Kings Lynn with specialist health needs that require regular hospital visits and ongoing healthcare from a local GP surgery.

Mr Codona explained that this is the first time that a piece of land has become available, which was big enough to accommodate his family and his horses as they will now be close by, especially for those disabled family members who find it difficult to care for their animals without additional support and would find it challenging to maintain regular visits or access if the animals were not in the vicinity. He added that members of the committee are probably aware there is no local accommodation available for Gypsy and Travellers and he stated that when his family found this piece of land, which was available within his budget, they decided that it was the right time as a family to try and put down some permanent roots and hopefully establish a winter base where the children could continue their education, health needs could be met and his family could stay in-between nomadic travel periods.

Mr Codona stated that his family have been on the land for 12 months, feel that they are now part of the community and they never had anywhere else to go so felt that they had no choice but to move on to the land. He explained that his family have already carried out some development, most of which is fencing, clearing of the land and access lane and maintaining of the land, and that the other work carried out was undertaken on a need basis to provide hard standing for winter months and to assist those with walking difficulties or who are wheelchair reliant to be able to move around relatively safely.

Mr Codona stated that he is more than happy to work with the Local Planning Authority within the conditions which they have set out, so that he can develop the site to the correct standard and make it a nice, safe place for his family unit to continue to living there and explained that the intention is to plant some evergreen hedge screening to various boundaries of the if planning permission is granted. He explained that the proposal is for 6 pitches, with two of the proposed pitches having been specially designed for his disabled wheelchair reliant family members.

Members asked Mr Codona the following questions:

- Councillor Marks asked Mr Codona whether he has any intention of running any form of business from the site? Mr Codona stated that he does not intend to run any form of business from the site apart from the normal gypsy nomadic way of life. He added that he has 3.5 transit vehicles that will go out to work, but no registered businesses will operate from the site. Councillor Marks asked whether the 8 touring caravans that he referred to will all be for his family members? Mr Codona stated that each pitch will have a static caravan and a touring caravan and the two additional touring caravans on the disabled pitches are there if other families need to assist if need be if health conditions change.
- Councillor Sutton referred to the objection from the Parish Council to the proposal, due to several objections having been received from residents. He made the point that there are good and bad traveller sites, which can influence the views and opinions of residents with regard to the traveller community, and asked Mr Codona whether he could give assurances to the residents of Elm, that should planning permission be approved, his site will be one of the better operated ones. Mr Codona stated that he can give assurances that the site will be operated with the upmost respect for the local community and added that he has been on the site for the past twelve months and there have been no incidents of anti-social behaviour or any other issues. He expressed the view that he has a good relationship with the local farmer who has seen that his family are known and respected members of the

community in Wisbech. Mr Codona added that he agrees that there can be issues with the traveller community connected to certain sites, but he reiterated that there will be no issues from the proposed site.

- Councillor Sutton stated that his understanding was that the entry and exit points to the site would be from the A47, where it is stopped off and asked Mr Codona for clarification? Mr Codona stated the entry and exit to the site will be from Begdale Lane and the Highway Authority have supported this strategy. He added the Traffic Regulation Order will need to be applied for if planning permission is granted. Councillor Sutton expressed the opinion that the site looks tidy and he hopes it will remain like that, if permission is granted, and he congratulated Mr Codona on his efforts towards the issues surrounding the fly tipping problems. Mr Codona added that the site will look even better once development is completed and stated that Newbridge Lane will not be opened as a through road and will remain blocked as it currently is at the A47. Councillor Sutton stated that his preference would have been for the access and egress points to have also been via the A47, as the stop point is a fly tipping hotspot, and had the proposal also used this access then it may have alleviated some of the issues surrounding fly tipping.

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

- Councillor Connor expressed the opinion that the site is very tidy and is a credit to the applicant. He added that he is also of the opinion that the fly tipped waste in Newbridge Lane does not all necessarily come from the traveller site. He noted that there is CCTV at the site, which should alleviate any problems and make it a nice place to live.

**Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Skoulding and decided that the application be APPROVED as per the officer's recommendation.**

*(Councillor Benney did not take part in the discussion or voting with regard to this application, due to the fact that he lost internet connection at the start of the item)*

**P38/20      F/YR20/0585/F  
FORMER COACH HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, CHATTERIS, ERECT A 2-STOREY 4-  
BED      DWELLING      INVOLVING      DEMOLITION      OF      STORE  
BUILDING:F/YR20<0586/LB  
FORMER COACH HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, CHATTERIS,DEMOLITION OF A  
CURTILAGE LISTED STORE BUILDING**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**P39/20      F/YR20/0740/F  
LAND TO THE SOUTH OF 125 FRIDAYBRIDGE ROAD, ELM;ERECT A 2-STOREY  
3-BED DWELLING**

David Rowen presented the report to members

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

Mr Broker expressed the opinion that there is only one reason that the Planning Officers have recommended the refusal of the application, which is that the site is within Flood Zone 3 and the sequential test has not been applied. He stated that officer's will not accept the physical proof that the site is level from end to end, including that of the adjacent site to the south which is in the same ownership and which has current planning permission.

Mr Broker stated that the whole area was made up with topsoil 30 years ago long before Flood Risk Assessments and sequential tests existed. He added that he has commissioned a GPS base

topographical survey by "RATCLIFFS" who are the same surveyors who carry out surveys for the Environment Agency and they have stated that they do not understand why the Planning Officers refuse to accept the proven facts, which they have previously supported in writing.

Mr Broker stated that over the whole area of the site the levels vary sporadically by only 6 inches and in general terms the site is flat and does not physically slope into Flood Zone 3 to the north. He added that it is all at the level of the approved site adjacent, which is Flood Zone 1, and, therefore, in

technical the terms the north end of the site is 3mms higher than the south end. He expressed the opinion that he contests the Planning Department's statement that the site is in Flood Zone 3 and that the sequential test hasn't been applied as it is a physical and proven fact that the site is at the level of Flood Zone 1 and for that reason the sequential test does not apply in this instance.

Mr Broker expressed the view that the proposal is not out of character with the large number of new houses on small plots along the north side of Friday Bridge Road, the application site is the same size and the proposed dwelling the same size as that approved on the adjacent site and he has proved that the site is above flood risk level. He stated that he would ask members to make their decision based on the physical facts and not the theoretical assumption of the rule book.

Members asked Mr Broker the following questions:

- Councillor Sutton asked Mr Broker to identify where Flood Zone 2 is, making the point that the plot to the south is in Flood Zone 1 and the plot to the north is in Flood Zone 3. Mr Broker stated that he did not know as the environmental mapping shows an area of dark blue, which crosses the road and to the north of the application site, and the only map which is available shows that Flood Zone 3 was at one point at the northern edge of the site in question. Councillor Sutton stated that he was also unsure as to whether Flood Zone 2 was located after reviewing the maps.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Meekins stated that on the map and aerial photo that was shown there was a red line highlighted and he asked for an explanation as to its relevance? David Rowen advised that it is to denote the visibility splay for vehicles leaving the site and the visibility needed for up and down the road, so the visibility splays need to be included within the red line boundary. Councillor Meekins questioned that if a sequential test had been carried out would officers have recommended the application for approval? David Rowen stated that the sequential test has not been carried out and there are extant planning permissions and, therefore, plots for development available within the settlement.
- Councillor Mrs Davis asked for clarity regarding the other properties, which have been built or are being built, on either side of the proposal site. David Rowen stated that the plot immediately to the south is in Flood Zone 1 and other plots that have recently been permitted on Friday Bridge Road are also in Flood Zone 1 and it is a narrow swathe of Flood Zone 3 which affects the proposal site.
- Councillor Mrs French asked how old the extant planning permission are and when were they were approved? David Rowen stated that they range from over the last two to three years.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that the neighbouring plots are in Flood Zone 1, which according to the agent has been taken out of the other zones and made into Zone 1 and asked as that issue is not reflected in the Environment Agency maps, if members approve the application because the land level is in effect the equivalent of Flood Zone 1, would that be wrong? David Rowen stated that planning policies at National and Local level, steer development away from Flood Zone 3 and, therefore, development should not be allowed in Flood Zone 3 unless a sequential test has been satisfied, including exception tests. He added that regarding the issue of whether the land level has been raised up to a similar level to those dwellings in Flood Zone 1 cannot be taken into consideration as the information that officers have to work with state that the site is in Flood Zone 3.

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

- Councillor Cornwell expressed the opinion that the existing physical circumstances appear to disagree, and have proven to disagree, with the Environment Agency map and there could be the possibility that the maps used need to be updated. He stated that, in his view, he cannot see a difference in the actual levels of the proposed site to that of the neighbouring sites.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he finds it strange that there are continual concerns raised about a proposal of one dwelling in Flood Zone 3, when the topographical survey has shown that the land is the same if not slightly higher than the plot next door. He expressed the opinion that the proposed dwelling is at no more risk than that of the already constructed dwelling next door and referred to the presentation slides where he highlighted to members a completed dwelling which is in Flood Zone 1 whose floor level is lower than the level of the soil of the two plots in question. Councillor Sutton questioned the accuracy of the Environment Agency flood zone mapping system.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees with the points raised by Councillors Cornwell and Sutton. She expressed the view that the proposal is infill development, will tidy up the unsightly plot and there are many ways that dwellings can be built nowadays to mitigate the risk of flooding.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she agrees with the other members and added that there appears to be some disparity with what can and cannot be built in Flood Zone 3, as an application has just been approved for caravans to be sited in Flood Zone 3, yet a dwelling is not permitted.
- David Rowen stated that it is important for a distinction to be drawn between the previous application containing caravans and the proposal currently being determined. He added that the site in Newbridge Lane was in Flood Zones 2 and 3, there was detailed modelling work available which demonstrated that should a flood event occur that site would not be at risk of flooding, whereas that level of information is not available in this instance.
- Councillor Sutton stated that any modelling that took place on this application would only identify that there was not a risk to the proposal.

**Proposed by Councillor Cornwell, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and decided that the application be APPROVED against the officer's recommendation, subject to reasonable conditions being applied.**

**Members did not support the officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they feel that the physical flood zoning map has not been kept up to date with regard to the actual events on the site and there is no difference in the levels on this site compared to other sites in the vicinity which are being developed and they believe the site is viable as far as flood risk is concerned.**

**P40/20**

**F/YR20/0751/F**

**LAND NORTH OF 1-5 BREWERY CLOSE, PARSON DROVE;ERECT 4NO DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 2X3-BED SINGLE-STOREY, 1X2-STOREY 4-BED AND 1X2-STOREY 4/5 BED WITH GARAGES INCLUDING TEMPORARY SITING OF A CARAVAN DURING CONSTRUCTION ON PLOT 3 ONLY**

David Rowen presented the report to members

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Mr Robert Bellamy, the Applicant.

Mr Bellamy thanked the committee for giving him the opportunity to represent his family at the meeting and added that he has lived in Parson Drove all his life and intends to do so for the rest of

his life. He stated that he currently lives in the 3-storey house adjacent to the proposed development and advised members of the background history to the site and how he became the owner.

Mr Bellamy explained that the proposal started as an informal joint venture between his parents, Grace and Cyril Bellamy, and the Council in 2008, which culminated in planning permission being granted for 5 bungalows in 2009 and 2012. He added that his father's health declined at this time and the momentum of the development ceased with both parties incurring time and money into the project at this stage.

Mr Bellamy stated that as there had been no other serious purchasers who came forward due to the site complications, his family decided to move matters forward by purchasing the land, buying an adjacent garden to increase the size and reignite the development for themselves. He added that this process began in 2015, but had numerous setbacks and obstacles to overcome in order to achieve the desired family homes and enable his sister to return to the village to assist with their parents' care.

Mr Bellamy stated that he wished to address the Planning Department's concerns and recommendation of refusal with some points to defend and support his application, which has been provided in the further in-depth information and photographs documentation circulated to members prior to the meeting. He referred to the Brewery Close street scene in the application where it shows the properties fronting on to the road, explaining that his existing dwelling is to the left hand side, which is a full 2 storied house with further rooms in the roof space, plot 4 is one and a half stories with the first floor rooms partially within the roof space and plot 3 is the same. He added that the final dwelling is the bungalow which fronts on to Ingham Hall Gardens, but has its side elevation on to Brewery Close, consistent with his proposal, and that as this street scene shows the transition between the 2 and a half story house to the single storied bungalow with the ridge and eaves heights stepping down gradually, his proposal provides a transition which can be seen throughout the village.

Mr Bellamy expressed the view that the dwellings have been designed not to overlook the neighbouring properties from habitable rooms, with the only situation where this is not the case was originally on plot 3, bedroom 4, so he has provided roof lights to this room ensuring views of the sky not of the neighbouring dwellings and the distance between plots 1 and 2 is one metre, not 0.7 metres as stated in the report, as the dashes shown on the roof plan are the brickwork line, therefore, enabling wheelie bins to be brought through and people can pass on it. He stated that the wheelie bins will be brought to the front of the site on collection day and a slabbed area for them can be allocated between the fence on plot 3 and the public footpath, which can be conditioned.

Mr Bellamy expressed the view that the decision to come off Brewery Close was to reduce impact on Springfield Road, which is a tighter road and has predominantly retired occupants, and with regard to the 2 reasons for the recommendation of refusal he would argue that together with his agent he has worked closely with the Parish Council and the neighbouring dwellings, and has produced a transitional scheme that not only is consistent with Policy LP2 and LP16, it is supported by these. In his opinion this has created a bespoke solution for a restricted site for which he has provided a reduced number of dwellings than originally approved for the plot, consistent with National and Local policies.

Mr Bellamy made the point that over the last 18 months, together with his architect, he has put in an enormous amount of time and effort in designing properties that complied with the Neighbourhood Plan, utilised the space efficiently and effectively, met his family requirements with a low maintenance amenity space for those at this time of life, has retained the original reinforced concrete roadway for environmental sustainability, and ensured his plans were supported by the surrounding residents and the Parish Council. He explained that he submitted this proposal in good faith to his desired specifications and requirements to enhance and compliment the surrounding area whilst maximising the sunlight to all plots.

Mr Bellamy explained that his preferred contact method with the Planning Department to discuss his proposal would have been verbally, but he was advised the procedure is to send in a pre-application, which resulted in a disappointing letter asking for 'a complete redesign of the scheme'. He stated that he consulted with his neighbours on the limited options that were available and the overwhelming support was for the original 4 executive homes from the pre-planning application and any drastic alterations would have resulted in objections being raised locally with his neighbours and the Parish Council.

Mr Bellamy concluded by asking members to approve the proposal with the conditions they deem appropriate.

Members asked Mr Bellamy the following questions:

- Councillor Lynn asked Mr Bellamy to clarify whether he is stating that he did not take advice from Planning Officers as part of the pre-application stage because the neighbours were not in support of the detail? Mr Bellamy stated that at the pre-application stage he was advised by officers to carry out a complete redesign of the proposal and when he consulted his neighbours to ascertain their views on the options, they were only satisfied with the proposed option. He added that one neighbour stated that they would object to the proposal if the house faced their property, another neighbour stated that they only wanted the executive style homes proposal. He explained that the estate is of an executive style, which is why it has been reduced from 5 smaller bungalows to 4 executive style dwellings.

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

- Councillor Meekins expressed the view that officers have highlighted the issues of overlooking and difficulties with parking as there are too many dwellings proposed for the space and he would have preferred to see 2 dwellings rather than 4 on the site.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she disagrees with Councillor Meekins and added that in the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 117 and 118 it states: 'to promote effective use of land, opportunities and benefits of the reuse of land'. She added that she thinks the committee could support the application for an executive style development, which has the support of the residents, and it should be approved to complete the site.
- Councillor Mrs Davis expressed the opinion that the officer's recommendation is correct. She added that there is considerable overlooking into neighbouring properties along with several issues, including visibility and bins, and, in her opinion, the number of dwellings does not accord with the size and shape of the plot.
- Councillor Murphy stated that he agrees with Councillor Mrs Davis and referred to 1.6 of the executive summary, which highlights the proximity and overlooking issues. He added that he is against any form of development in such close proximity of dwellings already in existence and he will support the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Benney expressed the view that he has taken into consideration the resident's letters of support and that many of them have referred to the proposal resolving the issue of

flooding. He made the point that if you have purchased an executive home, there is the normal expectation that you would want a garden, however, plots 1 and 2 have no amenity space, only a patio area at the front of the house, and plots 3 and 4 are also built close to the boundary, which does not feel the right development for the site. Councillor Benney expressed the opinion that if the site was redesigned with one plot removed, there could be executive homes with executive gardens, and it would solve the problems and have the support of the residents. He added that he will be supporting the officer's recommendation.

- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she knows the area well and added that it does need developing and for the area to be finished off. She added that she does support the officer's recommendation and agrees with the points made by the other members, making the point that it is a shame Mr Bellamy did not take into consideration the officers suggestions during the pre-application stage when they suggested that he should re-evaluate his proposal. She expressed the opinion that the proposal is over developed, the 2 houses dominate the site and the whole application needs to be looked at again.
- Councillor Lynn stated that development on the plot is needed, but he does not agree with overlooking. He feels that the proposal site is too tight, and agrees with the officer's conclusion that the proposal is over development.
- Councillor Cornwell expressed the view that the site is overdeveloped. He expressed the view that it is an awkward shaped plot, but it does need some form of development and he would encourage the applicant to come back with an amended scheme that has enough amenity space for the residents to be able to enjoy.
- Councillor Connor endorsed the comments made by Councillor Cornwell.

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

*(Councillor Sutton had left the meeting during the consideration of this application and took no further part in this item or the meeting)*

**P41/20**

**F/YR20/0760/PIP**

**LAND NORTH OF THE RECTORY, WHITTLESEY ROAD,  
BENWICK, RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 3 DWELLINGS  
(APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE)**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure, from Dr Robert Wickham, the Agent.

Dr Wickham explained that he represents the Diocese of Ely and Chorus Homes in this application. He referred to the two objections raised to this application, which he feels are closely related, and that if the site is within the settlement then the flooding policy issue falls away. He asked for the application to be considered fairly and there are several issues where he takes a different view from the Planning Officer's report.

Dr Wickham referred to the issue of whether the proposal is in the village and asked members to take into account decisions on two other applications in this part of Benwick one with reference F/YR15/0411, for a cemetery extension which was the site immediately adjoining to the west of the former Rectory. He quoted from the Case Officer, Kathryn Brand's report of 12 October 2015, which stated under '*Principle of Development* The site is located within Benwick which is identified as a small village in accordance with Policy LP3 of the Local Plan' and under 'Health & Wellbeing The proposed development would be located within a sustainable location located within the village of Benwick'.



Dr Wickham then referred members to the second decision, which related to a consent for a single dwelling further to the west at 6-7 Nene Parade, reference 12/0981/F, which was granted on 11 February 2013, where the Planning Officer on that occasion recommended refusal but the Committee determined in favour. The presentation by the applicant referred to 99% of Benwick being in Flood Risk Zone 3 and that Benwick is 'a real community having a school, pub, hall'. A favourable proposal by Councillor Stebbing was supported at the time and resulted in consent.

Dr Wickham asked members to accept that this is the older part of the village and it is of lower density than the recent part. He drew members attention to one other decision under reference YR15/0132/F and in that case the Planning Officer stated that it was not strictly an infill, with the report explaining that 'it is not strictly supported by LP3 of the plan.

Dr Wickham stated that regarding the proposal before members today, the Diocese will enter into a Section 106 Agreement for the two dwellings to be affordable, with the Diocese having worked with Chorus Housing Association of Huntingdon and the Planning Officer's dismissal of this is disappointing. He stated that a Section 106 is the recommended method to provide affordable housing, with the need for affordable housing in the area being well known and in the Cambridgeshire Acre Survey for Benwick it states that there is a need for 1 or 2 bed homes and this offer is not subject to viability testing because the land is surplus and a cost to the Diocese in terms of upkeep. He explained given that the number of affordable homes in Fenland that are produced, these modest two homes will be of use to the community and should not be ignored.

Dr Wickham stated there is one other important material consideration to mention and that is paragraph 78 of the latest NPPF and this together with paragraph 79 supersede Policy LP3, with this point being accepted very fairly by the Planning Officer on the earlier application and should be considered on this occasion. He added that a detailed flood risk assessment has been undertaken and 99% of the village is in Flood Zone 3. In his opinion the land is dead, is waste land and common sense and public gain in terms of special circumstances, with a material consideration being the affordable housing provision and a Section 106 Agreement will be entered into prior to planning consent being issued.

Members asked officer's the following questions:

- Councillor Murphy asked why no archaeological investigation has taken place with this application? David Rowen confirmed that this is something that would normally be dealt with as a condition and this application is recommended for refusal. He added that the determination of this application is purely for permission in principle and the issue of archaeology would be looked at during the technical detail stage should permission in principle be granted. Councillor Murphy asked for clarity in that if the application was approved, then an archaeological dig would be requested? David Rowen confirmed that if planning in principle permission was granted then a further application for technical details consent would be required and at that stage the archaeology detail would be picked up.
- Councillor Mrs Davis asked for confirmation that, in terms of LP3, this is classed as an elsewhere location? David Rowen stated that the view of officers is that it is outside of the established settlement of Benwick, which constitutes it as an elsewhere location.

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

- Councillor Mrs Davis expressed the view that she will support the officer's recommendation, as it is in Flood Zone 3 and is in an elsewhere location under the terms of LP3.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees with the comments of Councillor Mrs Davis and added that it is interesting to see this first application for permission in principle and she hopes there will be more of these types of application received which will save applicants and officers time and money. She stated that she agrees with the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Murphy stated that he agrees with all the comments made by members and he added that if the applicant realises that they would have to carry out an archaeological

study, it could dissuade them from going further as it is so costly and therefore the affordable homes, no longer become affordable dwellings. He added that he agrees with the officer's recommendation.

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

*(Councillor Sutton had left the meeting prior to the consideration of this application)*

2.42 pm

Chairman