

PLANNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2020 - 1.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor Mrs M Davis, Councillor Mrs J French, 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,

APOLOGIES: ,

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

P51/20 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of the 28 October and 11 November 2020 were confirmed as an accurate record.

P52/20 F/YR19/1068/F LAND NORTH OF MAPLE GROVE INFANT SCHOOL, NORWOOD ROAD, MARCH.ERECT 48 X 2-STOREY DWELLINGS AND 2X SINGLE-STOREY DWELLINGS, COMPRISING OF 24 X 2-BED, 21 X 3-BED AND 5 X 4-BED WITH GARAGES TO PLOTS 18, 20, 21, 37, 43 AND 49 ONLY WITH ATTENUATION BASIN AND SUB-STATION INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Adam Conchie, the Agent.

Mr Conchie explained that the application was deferred by Planning Committee in October for the following three reasons, to explore access to and from the school, the retention of the fence to the eastern boundary and highway safety and he has sought to address these points. He stated that he has engaged with the Headteacher of Westwood Primary School to discuss the possibility of the access to the school and following these discussions the conclusion was that it would not be feasible, however, within the amended plans there are two potential access points to the school should access be required in the future and it would only need the school to move their boundary fence which is in their ownership.

Mr Conchie added that regarding the eastern boundary fence, national and local planning policies promote access and permeability to adjacent areas and in the adopted Neighbourhood Plan it highlights a shortage of accessible open space in the area and states that the proposed development should reduce the need for use of a car and promotes walking and cycling. He added that given the previous comments made by members the amended site plan retains the fence to the eastern boundary, which will unfortunately increase the walking and cycling distance to the town centre from 1km to 1.5km and increase the distance to the nearest entrance to the primary school, and reduce the accessibility to the open space for future residents.

Mr Conchie stated that regarding highway safety, additional personal injury accident data has been obtained from the County Council, which contains data up to July 2020, which is the most up to date information held. He added that the information details 9 collisions over a 6-year period, with only 1 being serious and none were fatal, and the County Council have confirmed that the accident data does not highlight any clusters, there are no March Area Transport Study surveys available that are relevant to the proposed development and have stated that the applicant has provided sufficient data to demonstrate that the development will not have a severe highway impact on the local highway network.

Mr Conchie stated that he has sought to address the three reasons for deferment where he has been able to and he asked the committee to support the application to bring a derelict site into use and provide 50 much needed homes to March.

Members asked Mr Conchie the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she is surprised that the County Council have advised that they do not hold any up to date accident data as she has been the Chairman of the March Area Transport Strategy since September 2017 and there is information available. Councillor Mrs French stated that there are three separate speed reduction schemes being worked on Norwood Road and she disputed the accident data that Mr Conchie had referred to in his presentation. She stated that one bungalow has been hit twice, another dwelling has had several of their vehicles written off more than twice and added that she is aware that the County Council only records serious collisions or fatalities.
- Councillor Cornwell asked for confirmation regarding the ownership details of the eastern boundary fence? Mr Conchie stated that as far as he is aware the fence is owned by the applicant, This Land.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he notes that the Headteacher does agree that an access point could be beneficial, but has added that the proposed access point would mean that children would be walking through the foundation outside classrooms. He added that to the east of the site that would be correct, but no consideration has been made to the west of the site, which could easily be made into a cycleway or walkway around the perimeter of the playing field and would come out on the pavement of Maple Grove and he asked why both access points have not been considered. Mr Conchie stated that with regard to the access to the school, he has looked at the boundary that abuts the site and he has proposed two access points at the end of each cul de sac and it is the decision of the school as to whether they wish to adopt one of those.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Cornwell stated that he is disappointed that there is not going to be a rear access to the school. He added that he is concerned that if the fence is removed it still does not affect the fence on the far eastern side, which is in the ownership of Fenland District Council and has gates within it. Councillor Cornwell added that on one side there will be some established shrubs, which are made into hedges and a fence which has double gates, which remain locked except for access. He asked whether there has been any consultation with the residents in Wake Road has been undertaken by the Planning Department, which forms part of the officer's recommendation? David Rowen stated that a community consultation exercise has been undertaken with residents, which included several representations from properties in Wake Road. He added that the formation of such linkages is good planning and conforms with the relevant policies regarding creating good quality environments, but stated that if members do not wish for any linkage to be provided then they are able to determine the application minus the second recommended condition. Councillor Cornwell asked for clarification that the residents of Wake Road did not want the area opened up by removal of the fence. David Rowen referred members to page 45 of their agenda pack where it states the concerns and views raised by residents regarding the fence. Councillor Cornwell expressed the view that now that has been highlighted it is apparent that the

residents appear to have concerns over the quality of their life through removal of the fence.

- Councillor Mrs French asked the Highways Officer, Alex Woolnough, why as a Highway Authority they are content with the fence being removed? Alex Woolnough stated that he has no preference on whether the fence is removed to Wake Road, but if there is a desire to form a link through to Wake Road, then there is no reason why a footpath connection could not be formed and a adoptable link constructed to link the development up with Wake Road, but that would be a policy decision for the Planning Team to decide.
- Councillor Mrs French asked whether there is the possibility of a Section 38 bond being entered into to negate the potential difficulties that have been encountered in other areas of March? Alex Woolnough stated that contained within his list of conditions there is a condition which requires the developer to inform the Planning Authority whether they are going to enter into a Section 38 or whether they will be going down the private management route prior to commencement on site. Councillor Mrs French asked whether consideration would be given to adopt the road when the road is complete? Alex Woolnough stated that the Highway Authority cannot stop the developer from keeping the road in private ownership, but they can request that the construction is bituminised to an adoptable standard.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he notes that the Highway Authority do have concerns over the shared access should there be footpath/cycleway link and asked whether that opinion is because the short stretch of road is not up to an adoptable standard and would that opinion change if it was made up to an adoptable standard? Alex Woolnough expressed the opinion that if there is a preference for a link to be formed at this stage, there is the opportunity now to form a separate footpath to form a link to the school or to Wake Road and he added that if there is that opportunity, then why not provide the footpath, rather than rely on a shared surface carriageway to provide pedestrian access.
- Councillor Marks stated that, with regard to the access along Norwood Road, there is an issue with parked vehicles on one side and he asked whether there is any provision in place to include double yellow lines for dustcarts to enter and excess the site? Alex Woolnough stated that there is no requirement to include any yellow lines, but as soon as a junction is formed, vehicles should not park within ten metres of that junction and, therefore, any enforcement required will be a Police matter.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that Fenland District Council are carrying out a civil parking enforcement consultation currently and a draft document should be available by the end of the year.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she will support the application provided that the fence in Wake Road is retained.
- Councillor Skoulding agreed with the comment made by Councillor Mrs French and stated that the fence acts as a deterrent from the anti-social behaviour problems which have caused concern over previous years.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he still has an issue with regard to the cycleway and added that, at certain times of the day, there is dreadful congestion and a cycleway around the perimeter would improve the whole development.
- Councillor Cormwell stated that the retention of the eastern boundary fence is essential for the residents of the Wake Road area. He added that he agrees with Councillor Sutton and added that the application could have been enhanced by insisting on a back entrance. He stated that he will support the application, but only with the retention of the fence.

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

(Councillors Connor and Mrs French both declared an interest as they are both elected members of Cambridgeshire County Council, but have had no involvement with This Land)

P53/20

F/YR20/0473/F

LAND NORTH-WEST OF 12 KNIGHTS END ROAD, MARCH, ERECT 9NO DWELLINGS (3NO SINGLE-STOREY (1 X 2-BED & 2 X 3-BED) AND 6NO 2-STOREY (3 X 5-BED, 1 X 4-BED & 2 X 2-BED)) INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS

David Rowen presented the report.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Andrew Hodgson, the Agent.

Mr Hodgson stated that the scheme benefits from outline planning permission, which was granted in 2018 and the reason the application is brought before the committee is due to an objection from March Town Council, however, in his opinion, the Town Council may not be aware that the outline permission already exists due to the comments that they have made. He stated that the Town Council have raised concerns over access, however, the access in detail has already been agreed, it has also cited the proposal as overdevelopment of the site, however, the principal of development for 9 units has already been agreed and it has also stated a concern with regard to trying to avoid social housing, however, this appears to contradict their concerns of overdevelopment, due to the fact that if there had been an element of social housing then there would have been more than 9 units, which would have made the site more dense.

Mr Hodgson stated that the reason that he did not proceed with the reserved matters application was due to the fact that previously there was some land to the rear of 22 Knights End Road, where a land swap was going to take place to make the alignment of the access slightly different, but this did not happen and, therefore, the red line had to be altered at the rear of number 22 and this is the only change to the original outline scheme. He added that there are 3 bungalows on the site, there is no overbearing impact and all plots will be of a decent size and of a good design.

Members asked Mr Hodgson the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French asked what the purpose is with the regard to the retention of one of the buildings highlighted on the presentation? Mr Hodgson explained that the building was outside of the red line and referred to the presentation screen where the building being retained is being kept by the owner of the land and does not form part of the application. Councillor Mrs French stated that she does not believe that the Town Council were aware that the application already had outline planning permission and she does not have any objection to the layout. She added that she presumes that the developer is going to realign the public footpath and Mr Hodgson confirmed that it does form part of their proposal. Councillor Mrs French stated that she hopes that the building that is being retained will not form part of a later proposal, which will mean that the 9 units will be exceeded.
- Councillor Meekins stated that he notices some of the buildings to be demolished appear to be constructed of asbestos and he asked whether this will be removed and disposed of appropriately? Mr Hodgson confirmed that any necessary works will be carried out under a special licence for the safe removal of asbestos material.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Cornwell stated that he has a concern that the road will be used as an entrance to March West, the applicant may have an interest to spread further into the west of the site at some point and the access into the new development is not entirely suitable to take an extension to the development at some stage in the future due to the way that it comes out onto the convoluted junction. He asked whether there was anything that could be put in place to control that use in the future? David Rowen stated that the application before members is for 9 dwellings and should an application come forward for any further development in the future then that will be assessed on its own merits at that time.
- Councillor Sutton asked for clarification that the application is for a full application as there

appears to be a typographical error. David Rowen confirmed that it is for a full application.

- Councillor Sutton stated that on the aerial photo on page 77, it shows a visibility splay on the left-hand side, when exiting the site. but it shows no ownership of a visibility splay on the right-hand side and he asked whether the visibility will be affected through non ownership of the land? David Rowen stated that it has been considered by the Highway Authority and they have raised no issue or concern with the visibility splay.
- Councillor Sutton stated that with regard to the drainage ditch he has noted that there is no access for the maintenance ditch on the site side and this should have been brought to the attention of the designers of the site to ensure that maintenance of the ditch is achievable. He added that currently it can be maintained from the west side, but this may not be the case when that area is built out. David Rowen stated that currently there is agricultural land to the west and, therefore, it would be unreasonable to seek a redesign of the application site, but it is a valid point and should any application come forward for the land on the west then that will be taken into consideration at this time.
- Councillor Sutton stated that, regarding riparian ownership, going forward could a note be added to a decision notice to state that once the plots are sold then the owner has part responsibility for the maintenance of the ditch and he asked for consideration to be given to this. Stephen Turnbull stated that the only way this could be considered is by adding something to the informative on the planning decision and he will investigate this further.
- Councillor Cornwell highlighted that this application is in a high ground area and as far as he is aware it is not in an internal drainage board area and it is not part of the ancient primary watercourse that runs further north from this site.

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

P54/20

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.

David Rowen presented the reports to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ben Oakley of SAVE Britain's Heritage.

Mr Oakley explained that SAVE Britain's Heritage is a national heritage charity that has been campaigning for historic buildings and their reuse since it was established in 1975 and as a non-statutory organisation it receives no government funding. SAVE selects very carefully the cases it chooses to comment on, and those it decides to pursue at Planning Committee and given the principles at stake with today's applications with regard to upholding national planning policies for the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment, SAVE has chosen to raise its concerns at today's Planning Committee meeting. He added that as the Conservation Officer for SAVE, he wished to draw the committee's attention to three urgent breaches of national planning policy guidance he has identified in these applications seeking the demolition of the curtilage Listed Coach House at 22 London Road, Chatteris:

Mr Oakley contested the erroneous claim in the applicant's Heritage Statement that the Coach House "*is not considered as a heritage asset within the listing description of 22 London Road, indeed it is not even noted as having group value*". He stated that the former Coach House is a Grade II curtilage Listed structure, protected by law under the Planning Act (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) 1990 as a designated heritage asset to the same degree as the Grade II Listed house at 22 London Road, with Historic England's Planning Advice Note 10 'Listed

Buildings and Curtilage' helpfully providing an almost exact case study of the listed status of a house and curtilage coach house.

Mr Oakley expressed the view that SAVE consider the applicant has, therefore, failed to fully describe the heritage significance of the heritage assets impacted by their proposals, as required by law under Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019. He added that, having failed to sufficiently understand the significance of the assets affected, this application has not represented the level of harm arising from total demolition and consequently not offered sufficient justification or articulation of public benefit to outweigh this harm, as required by Paragraphs 194 and 195 of the NPPF 2019 and for the sake of clarity, SAVE do not consider the provision of one private dwelling with no public access to be a public benefit.

Mr Oakley expressed the opinion that the application is not compliant with the requirements of national policy guidance and added that the planning system is in place, to define and manage the positive contribution of historic buildings, not describe their lack of significance to justify demolition. He stated that the fact that this single application has drawn objections from four national heritage bodies (the Council for British Archaeology, the Victorian Society, Ancient Monuments Society and SAVE) is unusual and significant.

Mr Oakley concluded by expressing the view that it is a matter of legal duty and principle that the Planning Committee uphold the recommendation of the planning officer to reject this application and require any future applications comply with local and national planning policy designed to protect and enhance Chatteris' historic environment.

Members asked Mr Oakley the following questions:

- Councillor Benney asked whether he had carried out a desk top study or carried out a site visit? Mr Oakley stated that, due to the Covid 19 pandemic, he has not visited the site.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Weetman.

Mr Weetman expressed the view that the District Council should be clear that the application it is dealing with here is an application for the demolition of a Grade II Listed coach house, as confirmed by the Conservation Officer and four national societies that are statutory consultees on this application and experts in historic buildings. He made the point that whilst demolition of a Listed Building is not completely out of the question, Section 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that the loss of a Grade II Listed Building should be "exceptional" and Section 195 lists criteria which must be met before an application to demolish a Listed Building is approved.

Mr Weetman explained the criteria and stated that firstly the applicant must show that the building cannot be successfully marketed for renovation by someone else and, in his opinion, the applicant has not shown any evidence they have tried to market the property. He stated that in late November a Chatteris resident indicated a willingness to buy the property for use as a workshop and art gallery, saying that they have funding in place and until this offer has been investigated by the applicant and all attempts to market the property for renovation are exhausted, the NPPF is clear that demolition should not be approved.

Mr Weetman stated that secondly the applicant must show that the building cannot not be restored with grant funding or by a charity, such as a building preservation trust. He explained that there are several building preservation trusts operating in this area, but there is no evidence that the owner has attempted to see if one of these could take on this Listed Building.

Mr Weetman added that the owner says in their supplementary planning statement that the restoration is not financially viable for them and that "the only circumstances where this would not be the case would be a personal 'grand designs' project or development for charitable or

community purposes with donated funding”. He added that the applicant seems to admit that there is a possibility of funding, or a sale to a private owner or charity, but does not demonstrate that they have made all possible attempts to secure the building’s future via this route and until they do so, the NPPF is clear that demolition should not be approved.

Mr Weetman stated that thirdly the building must have absolutely no other possible uses without the loss of the Listed Building and the owner previously applied to convert the building into a three-bed property, but this was refused on the grounds that it would result in substantial damage to heritage assets - namely the impressive barrel-vaulted ceilings inside the property. In their report, the Conservation Officer suggested ways in which the building could be appropriately converted to a 1-bed or 2-bed property. He stated that the applicant says that this would not be financially viable, but the owner must have known this when they purchased the site in December 2017 and in any case, it is not sufficient to argue that renovation of a Listed Building is not financially viable; the applicant must show that renovation is not at all possible and they have not done so.

Mr Weetman expressed the view that the structural survey submitted by the applicant does not appear to have been carried out with a conservation-first mindset and explained that only in October last year, the same applicant had insisted that the building was in a suitable state of repair for conversion to a 3-bed home, questioning as to what has changed since then? He stated that if the coach-house was ripe for conversion in 2019, why is demolition suddenly the only option now and if the coach house has deteriorated so significantly in such a short period of time then the owner has perhaps failed to uphold their duty of care to their Listed Building.

Mr Weetman expressed the opinion that the Council has a variety of options available to ensure that this is remedied. Part 191 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that in the case of “deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision”. He stated that the previous application for conversion to a 3-bed property was refused on the grounds that it would result in harm to a designated heritage asset and this application is more serious in nature and would result in the complete loss of a designated heritage asset.

Mr Weetman made the point that Fenland District Council’s own Planning Code of Conduct refers to Local Government Ombudsman cases where planning applications are granted after previously being refused and it says: “there is perversity and maladministration, if a Local Planning Authority approves a planning application, which has previously been refused, where there has not been a significant change in the planning circumstances.” and in order to comply with the Code of Conduct, the Chairman of this committee would need to explain the “significant change” that makes the significant harm to this heritage asset justified in 2020 when lesser harm was not justified in 2019. He added that fact that this committee did not review the previous application is insufficient, and members have a duty to ensure consistency across the planning system here in Fenland and this is in addition for planning reasons being required to justify ignoring the breach of 13 different planning policies listed in the officer’s report.

Mr Weetman concluded by stating that the Chatteris Conservation Area was added to Historic England’s “at risk” register in 2015 and that Chatteris cannot afford the loss of another historic building within the Conservation Area, or it runs the risk of losing the special status afforded to its lovely historic town. He added that some people say that no one is prepared to invest in old buildings like this, but recent renovations of 133 High Street, the chapel on Bridge Street, buildings in East Park Street, and applications to restore the old rope works, 12 East Park Street, 16 Park Street, the former chapel on West Park Street, and 11-13 High Street all show that there is a willingness to renovate old buildings and a desire to live in them and the applicant should either Brestore this Listed building or be prepared to hand it over to someone else who will.

Members asked Mr Weetman the following questions:

- Councillor Meekins asked Mr Weetman whether he is a Chatteris resident? Mr Weetman

confirmed that he is a Chatteris resident and he is also the Chairman of the Civic Society, Chatteris, Past, Present and Future.

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Kate Wood, the Agent and Richard Donoyou, the Heritage Consultant.

Ms Wood explained that she is the planning agent for the applications and is accompanied by Richard Donoyou, who is the applicant's heritage consultant.

She explained that the main thrust of their case is that whilst the Coach House is Listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of a formerly Listed Building, its heritage value and significance is minor, with the building having been significantly altered over the years and is not a good example of such buildings and added that Richard Donoyou will be showing some photographs of the interior of the building. She suggested that if members are in any doubt about approving the demolition of the building, that they may wish to defer the decision on this application in order to allow them to visit the site and see inside the building.

Ms Wood stated that as members are aware, the Town Council is in support of the application and there have been no objections from the Highway Authority. She explained that the site is in a location where residential development is appropriate in planning terms, and does not have any detrimental impact upon neighbouring residential amenity, and she is happy to accept the conditions that have been suggested within the officers report and added that the only matter outstanding is therefore the desirability or otherwise of retaining this curtilage Listed Building.

Mr Donoyou stated that the development of 22 London Road and the site of the former builder's merchants has been the subject of discussions with Fenland Planning Department since 2017. He feels there are three elements to the project; the restoration of the Listed 22 London Road from a builder's merchants shop and store to a dwelling, the demolition of the asbestos storage building and development of the yard for housing and the conversion of the Coach House to residential uses. He explained that these have all been subject to intensive pre-application discussions over a 3-year period and a scheme for 22 London Road and the new housing (applications F/YR19/0355/F & F/YR19/0356/LB) were approved in October 2019.

Mr Donoyou explained that 22 London Road is a late 19th c house which was altered at the turn of the 20th century and subject to substantial and idiosyncratic alterations, particularly to the rear wing, in the 1920's. The 1920's alterations included adding a substantial first floor bay structure supported on steel columns, inserting sash windows with a highly unusual horizontal emphasis and pebble-dashing the upper storey under a new roof. He stated that it was something of a surprise when the Conservation Officer suggested demolishing the rear wing due to the structure being of an eccentric/unusual design and, the structural integrity, particularly of the bay was suspect and showed evidence of stress and this section of the building could not readily be restored without substantial rebuilding, despite the fact that this would result in the loss of about 25% of the Listed Building, and, therefore, potential accommodation, the applicant agreed to this, submitted detailed plans and the Listed Building Consent included provision for this part demolition and these were approved in 2019.

Mr Donoyou explained that the Coach House was built in 2 phases in the 1870's, the southerly section was constructed first and the range running toward 22 London Road built soon after. He expressed the view it is very clear the range section was substantially altered, and some unusual idiosyncratic design elements introduced, which included a new heightened roof of flimsy construction that requires a "bodged" roof detail with the southerly structure, the insertion of 2-barrel vaulted lathe and plaster ceilings with an attic ceiling, all supported by the new roof structure, demolition of the north gable and replacement, a metre or so further south, with a new gable wall in "Phorpres" bricks and the adaptation / alteration of the rear (west) wall to install new doors top hung on rollers.

Mr Donoyou made the point that just as these unusual design elements have not stood the test of time on the rear wing of the Listed 22 London Road, so there are serious structural failings in the Coach House, with reports by a qualified structural engineer and a specialist plaster repair have concluded that key structural elements, most notably large sections of the range building and its roof, are incapable of repair and that repair of the walls would in effect require rebuilding; repair of the roof would require a complete new structure because the existing structure is of inadequate sizing and construction and, therefore, it has to be accepted that, if a building is to be converted to new uses, in this case residential, then the building has to be made structurally sound and be reasonable comfortable and safe to live. He stated that a builder is legally committed to offering a guarantee of sound design and workmanship.

Mr Donoyou concluded by stating that the applicant has worked very hard with the Conservation Officer to reach a satisfactory scheme and, in his opinion, this application represents a solution that will conserve the streetscape and has a fair amount of support from the local residents.

Members asked Ms Wood and Mr Donoyou the following questions:

- Councillor Marks asked Mr Donoyou whether it is just the older parts of the building that would fall under the status of Grade 2 Listing? Mr Donoyou stated that the most basic test for listing is for buildings constructed before 1840 and that are substantially intact and this building was built after 1840 and is not substantially intact and, therefore, if it was not connected to the Listed Building and is just a building in its own right it would not be listable.
- Councillor Marks added that a site visit would be beneficial and asked whether any of the materials could be recycled and reused so that the Listed part could be used somewhere else. Mr Donoyou stated that the developer would not wish to do anything other than ensure the bricks and tiles were available for reuse. Councillor Marks asked whether the ceilings could be reused and Mr Donoyou explained that the ceilings are constructed from lath and plaster and in the larger ceiling there is no plaster left and the lath is rotten and the other two ceilings the plaster is very poor and was never put up very well originally. Mr Donoyou added that the reason the ceilings are barrel vaulted is because they have a zinc ventilation shaft at the top and historically the building could have been used for poultry rearing or other animal stock. Councillor Marks asked what percentage of the ceilings are salvageable and what would have to be replaced? Mr Donoyou stated that, in his opinion, the ceilings are not salvageable.
- Councillor Meekins asked Mr Donoyou whether he was involved with the previous application in 2019 as the Heritage Consultant? Mr Donoyou confirmed that he was the consultant in 2019 and the application at that time was for a conversion and the developer was very much aware that the property was on the edge as far as viability was concerned. He added that the application was for a three bedroomed dwelling and involved the removal of some of the ceilings and their replacement. He stated that the Conservation Officer was unable to agree to any loss of any of the ceilings and only agreed to a 1 bedroomed dwelling and this was not deemed to be viable by the developer due to the costs involved and removal of any of the fabric of the building was deemed as unacceptable by the Conservation Officer and the application was refused. Councillor Meekins expressed the opinion that if you own a Grade 2 Listed Building you should be responsible for keeping it in good repair. Mr Donoyou stated that the position is not that the building was in one state 18 months ago and is now in a totally different state. He added that 18 months ago the application was submitted with a structural report which has now been updated, however, 18 months ago the report was not complimentary about the building but the intention was that the conversion scheme would allow for the repair of the building with substantial repair costs. He added that the owner of the building had intended on conserving and converting the building, but this has proved not to be possible and, therefore, an alternative course of action is to say that the building is not capable of conversion in a way that is viable to the developer in this case and the costs to make it structurally sound require the other developments on the site to subsidise it. Mr Donoyou

stated that figures were provided 18 months ago and again more recently, but an agreement could not be reached with the Conservation Officer who felt that elements of the building should be repaired in situ contrary to what his opinion is.

Members asked officer's the following questions:

- Councillor Meekins stated that if the committee decide that the building should be demolished what is the legal position of the Council and could it prove costly to the authority? Stephen Turnbull, the Legal Officer, expressed the view that yes it could prove costly as potentially in addition to the normal requirements of following the local plan policy and material considerations, the duty for a Listed Building is to give special importance to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building. He added that if members want to approve the application, they need evidence to counterbalance the strong legal presumption that the building should be preserved and evidence on the other side that there are some benefits or countermeasures which overcome the strong presumption. He expressed the opinion that from what he has heard there is not that evidence to overcome that strong legal presumption.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that there appears to be a focus on the lath and plaster ceilings, and he cannot understand why the Conservation experts cannot agree to the conversion of the building. David Rowen stated that he is aware that lath and plaster ceilings can be replaced with the lath and plaster ceilings as well as numerous other repairs to Listed Buildings which are sympathetic to the historic fabric of them.

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

- Councillor Benney stated that he has followed this application in its various forms since it was originally submitted in 2019 being at Chatteris Town Council when it was debated and at that time he welcomed the proposal for the 6 bungalows and the conversion of the house. He stated that the house is the Grade 2 Listing Building that members are looking at today and not the shed. Councillor Benney expressed the opinion that with regard to the house this should be retained and should be restored to a house. He expressed surprise that the application has been split into two parts and had expected both of the applications to be passed as it would have brought the house back into use and the bungalows would have provided much needed homes. Councillor Benney stated that he was surprised to see the conversion of the Coach House was refused as it was never a Coach House, it was a farm building. He stated that he has read all the reports as to why it was refused, including all the detail of the fabric of the building and he can fully understand why there is a viability issue and expressed the opinion that until this is resolved with a planning approval, the issue of viability will not go away. Councillor Benney added that when the two applications were submitted, the Council granted the application for six bungalows and the house and allowed demolition on the site. He added that the principle of demolition has been allowed on the site, together with development of six bungalows and a house as permission has been granted and there is a building left at the front which, in his opinion, is a standalone project which is no longer viable. Councillor Benney expressed the opinion that the building is in a terrible state, the front wall is cracked and the back of the building is just open sheds and he cannot see how this can ever be converted into a house in a viable way and added that as it juts out and is hiding the other two Grade 2 Listed Buildings. He expressed the view that he is concerned that nothing will happen to this building and it will deteriorate further and could be turned back into industrial units, but if a house is built there it will tidy the development up and improve the area and improve road safety and the visibility splay. Councillor Benney stated that there is not the need for more agricultural buildings and the application should be approved as London Road does not need another old farm building left there as it is a nice part of the town and he will not be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that the proposal establishes the building line, it is an interesting looking building, it is dirty and has interesting window features and has been altered on one end. He expressed the view that it is a heritage building and he would hate

to see it disappear and added that his concern is that if the committee agree that the building should be demolished, it could have a financial impact on the Council, due to possible action that could be taken under the legislation that has been identified. Stephen Turnbull, the Legal Officer, stated that it is possible for a third party to challenge the issue of planning permission or Listed Building Consent and if a third party were to launch a challenge, in his opinion, there may be grounds for doing so in this case, because he cannot see any substantive grounds for members to overturn the presumption in favour of preserving a Listed Building, and if challenged then the Council would have to pay costs and if the Council lost, then they would have to pay the costs of the other party which could be substantial.

- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she does sympathise with the views of Councillor Benney and the residents of Chatteris, however, given the views of the four heritage bodies, the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework and the legal presumption of the Planning Officers and Conservation Officer, she cannot support the application. She added that if demolition is to be allowed, then the legal path needs to be followed.
- Councillor Marks stated that he is uncomfortable making a decision on the application without seeing inside the building. He added that he has heard the views given regarding the state of the building and, in his opinion, the application should be deferred so that a meeting can take place with the Conservation Officers from both parties and actually looking at the site before making a decision.
- Councillor Meekins stated that he respects the views of Councillor Benney, however, the facts of the application need to be considered. He stated that if the building was never a Coach House why is it called the former Coach House? He added that there are many agricultural buildings which have shown that they can be turned into very desirable barn conversions. Councillor Meekins stated that Councillor Benney had referred to the buildings either side of the application site and had stated that he would fight to preserve them, however, Councillor Meekins stated that surely the application site forms part of the same vista. He added that he is concerned that if the committee vote and the building ends up being demolished, it could prove to be very costly to the Council and also be damaging to the reputation of the Planning Committee and that of the Council and he will be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Lynn stated that he agrees with Councillor Marks in that Committee members cannot determine the application without carrying out an internal inspection of the site. He added that he would like to be provided further detail on the costings that had been quoted and he would like all members of the heritage groups that had spoken to also attend the site, rather than carry out a desk top assessment to gain a better understanding of the condition of the building, as their views and opinions may change.
- Councillor Skoulding made the point that in the 1920's there were motor cars in existence not just horse and carriages. He stated that he has been to the yard many years ago and there was no way that a carriage would have been able to access the opening. He stated that the floor was earth, there was no concrete and the building was only one brick thick and that is why the costings are so great and in light of the new energy performance certificate requirements, to make the building more energy efficient, the ceilings would have to come down and new ceilings added. Councillor Skoulding expressed the view that it would be more economical to demolish the building and rebuild it.
- Councillor Murphy stated that the site was originally a farmyard and then became a builder's yard and the entrance was very narrow, which had caused issues for deliveries. He added that the Town Council have discussed this on many occasions, and he expressed the view that he cannot understand why there are parties who want to retain the building, if they are so passionate about the building then they could consider purchasing the site and bringing it back into use again. Councillor Murphy stated that there are many buildings in Chatteris which need attention, but this is not taking place as they do not have the funds to do so. He added that he appreciates the comments made by the Legal Officer, but he cannot understand why the building is listed because it is a farm building and always has been. Councillor Murphy stated that he will agree with the comment made

by Councillor Marks for the committee to undertake a site visit, so that members can fully appreciate the state of the building.

- Councillor Meekins asked whether the site visit could be carried out virtually and have video footage circulated to all interested parties.
- Councillor Lynn expressed the view that a virtual inspection will not be sufficient for members to ascertain a full and accurate assessment.
- Councillor Marks expressed the view that he appreciates the comments made by Councillor Meekins, but he agrees with Councillor Lynn that the site visit needs to be carried out in person
- Councillor Benney expressed the view that it looks like the application is going to be deferred. He added that the site inspection should only be for members and no other parties should be involved.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she agrees a site visit would be beneficial, but even if members want to agree to the demolition there is a legal path that needs to be followed and members must not lose sight of that.
- Councillor Marks stated that he agrees with Councillor Mrs Davis that there is legal process to follow, but to begin the process a visit needs to take place to look at the fabric of the building and then the next stage can take place.
- Councillor Sutton expressed the view that he agrees with Councillor Mrs Davis and stated that whatever the condition of the building is the process will still need to be followed. He expressed the opinion that to allow the demolition of the building would show the committee as acting in a perverse way and whatever is seen on a site visit becomes irrelevant because the recommendation will be the same. He added that, whilst he respects the comments of other Councillors, to consider going against the officer's recommendation would be a mistake and the Council could find the heritage bodies challenging the Council's decision.
- Nick Harding stated that the name of the building, the Coach House, is immaterial to the planning considerations when determining the applications. He referred to questions having been asked with regard to the quality of the building and whether it should have been included as a curtilage building and that was a question that the heritage body, who are responsible for the listing of buildings, had looked at when they looked at the listing initially and it would have had regard to the physical layout of the site, the ownership both historic and current and also the use or function both historically and currently. Nick Harding drew members attention to the officer's report, which refers to the National Planning Policy Framework, where it summarises how the applications should be determined and highlighted to members the national guidance and other key considerations for determination of the application. He added that reference has been made to the other residential development which has been approved in the grounds of the Listed Building and he referred to the case history and the analysis that took place by officers, who found the development to be wholly appropriate in the context of the setting of a Listed Building and there was no harm arising and no conflict of that residential development with planning policy. Nick Harding referred to the application from 2019 which came forward accompanied by a structural report which identified that the roof and rainwater gutters were leaking and he stated that he would hope the owner of the building has addressed those issues to stop the further deterioration of the building.

F/YR20/0586/LB

A proposal was put forward by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Meekins to refuse the application as per the officer's recommendation. The proposition failed.

It was proposed by Councillor Marks, seconded by Councillor Murphy and AGREED that the application be deferred, to give members the opportunity to carry out a site visit at a time and date to be arranged.

F/YR20/0585/F

It was proposed by Councillor Meekins, seconded by Councillor Lynn and AGREED that the application be deferred.

(All members of the committee registered, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been lobbied on this application)

P55/20

F/YR20/0854/F

**25 VICTORIA STREET, CHATTERIS, ERECT 3 X 2-STOREY DWELLINGS
COMPRISING OF 1 X 3-BED AND 2 X 2-BED INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF
EXISTING BUILDING WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Lawrence Weetman from the Civic Society - Chatteris Past, Present & Future.

Mr Weetman stated that he strongly agrees with the Planning Officer, and the Chief Archaeologist's comments, and he urged councillors to apply the archaeological conditions to this application as presented. He stated that the proposed development at 25 Victoria Street lies within the boundary of the medieval Chatteris Abbey and it is merely a matter of yards from a previous archaeological survey, at 19 Victoria Street, where at the November planning meeting, the committee was advised that "a body was found", but the report from that archaeological survey actually references six skeletons by number and these human remains were found very close to the surface - between two feet and three-and-a-half feet underground.

Mr Weetman referred to the report which said "The number and extent of inhumations and disarticulated human skeletal remains revealed across the length of the trench, combined with the mixture of age ranges of the individuals, strongly suggests that the proposed development is located within a secular or lay cemetery within the abbey precinct." He stated that the report goes on to say: "The depth and extent of the burial ground is not known but could be considerable.", with the report even speculating that: "It is possible that the burials uncovered in the trench are part of a parochial cemetery that was in use over a long period of time (perhaps hundreds of years)."

Mr Weetman stated that given the close proximity of the proposed site to the previous survey at 19 Victoria Street, the probability of a potentially extensive burial ground, and given that the remains were discovered so close to the surface, there is a very real possibility that the proposed development could disturb human remains. He made the point that the Senior Archaeological Officer has reminded the Council that disturbing burials without a licence is against Section 25 of The Burial Act of 1857 and the cost of exhuming human remains can be extremely prohibitive, so it seems as though it would be in the best interests of the developer, the Council, and local residents if a proper survey is carried out ahead of any building work .and, in his view, would help avoid a part-complete development being left abandoned within the town.

Mr Weetman expressed the view that there are substantial opportunities here and stated that it is the earliest settlement in Chatteris, but it remains largely unexplored since most of the buildings in this area pre-date the times of routine archaeological surveys. He stated that the lack of an archaeological survey would not only miss an important opportunity to learn more about Chatteris'

past but could completely destroy any opportunity to ever learn more.

Mr Weetman expressed the opinion that Councillors should ask themselves whether there is any need to reject the archaeological conditions that have been proposed, since there seems to be no source of opposition to these conditions. He added that the officer's report says that the applicant has indicated that they would accept an archaeological condition and this reflects what the applicant told Chatteris Town Council's Planning Committee in September when Mr Welland was asked if an archaeological dig would be carried out, with the minutes recalling that "Mr Welland said if required an archaeological dig would be carried out".

Mr Weetman concluded by expressing the view that he can see no reason why the committee should reject the archaeological condition that has been proposed. It has the support of the applicant, it benefits our understanding of Chatteris' past, and it provides important protection to both the Council and the developer.

Members asked officer's the following questions:

- Councillor Meekins asked officers to confirm how long an archaeological survey would take to be carried out in a small area and questioned why the application has come back before the committee. David Rowen stated that the application is before members as part of planning procedure. The County Council's Archaeology Officer, Kasia Gdaniec, explained that the evaluation of such a small plot is a very rapid process and she expressed the view that only a couple of trenches would be required in that area as there are already standing buildings and yard surfaces on site. She stated that normally a small area would be surveyed within a day or two, depending whether there are any stratified Medieval deposits of the priory buildings and any burials which would prolong the process. She stated that an evaluation must be carried out in properties such as this, because there needs to be an understanding of any heritage assets which may be there and also the integrity of them as it may mean that previous land use associated with the 19th century redevelopment of Victoria Street removed a great deal of the deposits.

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

- Councillor Sutton noted from the report that the applicant and agent appear to be content with the conditions and, therefore, members should also be satisfied with the conditions.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that he can fully understand why an archaeological investigation would need to take place at this site as there does not appear to be anything above ground in existence from the original abbey, apart from a few stones, which was the important part of the heritage of Chatteris. He added that everybody appears to agree that an investigation should take place and in his opinion it should proceed.
- Councillor Meekins stated that the developer has agreed to the conditions and the Archaeological Officer has advised that a survey will only take a couple of days, therefore, the works should commence without delay.
- Councillor Marks expressed the opinion that a reasonable time frame should also be added to the conditions. Nick Harding stated that a timetable cannot be added as the detail concerning when the development and archaeological works will commence is not known. He added that members need to make their decision based on the heritage

asset and carrying on without any archaeological input would risk the non-designated asset and, therefore, conflict the advice of the national policy guidance on that issue. Nick Harding clarified that the reason the application is before the committee today is because officers were aware of what was said at the Planning Committee meeting in relation to the 'sister' application and, therefore, officers felt that members should have the opportunity to make a decision on whether they felt an archaeological condition should be added on this application.

- Councillor Sutton stated that the timeline is entirely down to the developer as to when he wishes to commence work on the site.

Proposed by Councillor Cornwell, seconded by Councillor Sutton and decided that the conditions as set out be AGREED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Following comments made by Councillor Benney in relation to a conversation he stated had taken place with himself and the agent regarding the proposed conditions being added to the application, and legal advice sought from Stephen Turnbull, Councillor Benney left the meeting for the remaining duration and determination of this item, and took no further part)

(Councillor Mrs Mayor left the meeting prior to the commencement of this item, and took no further part in the Planning Committee meeting)

P56/20

F/YR20/0943/F

86 CHARLEMONT DRIVE, MANEA, CHANGE OF USE OF SINGLE-STOREY WORKPLACE BUILDING FROM BUSINESS USE TO 2-STOREY ANNEXE BUILDING (2 X 1-BED ANNEXES) ANCILLARY TO EXISTING DWELLING INVOLVING RAISING THE HEIGHT AND INSERTION OF DORMER WINDOWS, REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING WORKPLACE DOOR WITH DOOR/WINDOW, ERECTION OF CONSERVATORY TO REAR AND INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL STAIRCASE (PART RETROSPECTIVE)

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Alan Melton on behalf of Manea Parish Council.

Mr Melton stated that there have been no objections raised by the Parish Council, County Council or Network Rail and the Environment Agency have made no further comment on the application and residents have also raised no concerns regarding the application. Mr Melton referred members to the list of conditions and highlighted LP2, facilitating health and wellbeing of Fenland residents and pointed out the key issues where it states residential amenity, health and wellbeing.

Mr Melton referred to 9.3 of the officer's report where it states that the application seeks to provide an annexe for the applicant's mother and he stated that the existing type of annexe building already in place in the vicinity for industrial use have proved to be unsuccessful. He added that he takes issue with the point at 9.4 of the report where it states that the proposal is prominently visible from the street scene, expressing the opinion that from the photograph it is tucked right at the back and a single storey building can be seen with solar panels on the top and the proposal will be raised up and the design will be a lot better than what is already in existence.

Mr Melton expressed the opinion that Government and moral policy is that members of the community should take the time to look after the elderly population rather than placing people into care homes, which is costly to the families and the state, and he is pleased to see that officers

have acknowledged this and it is something that should be encouraged. He added that the report states that the north and eastern side is bounded by agricultural land and he feels that this is irrelevant as the south of the site is the workplace home of 82-84 Charlemont Drive, who would be impacted the most by the proposal and they have not raised any objection.

Mr Melton referred to the point regarding the introduction of a sensitive use in closer proximity to a workplace, which could result in constraints on the existing business and stated that he does not agree with that statement and also questioned the comment made with regard to the proposal altering the character of the estate. He pointed out 9.14 where it states that the development is in closer proximity to the railway line than the main dwelling and concerns have been raised by the Council's Environmental Health Team regarding the noise impact of this and expressed the opinion that this is not a planning reason and should not be taken into consideration. He concluded by stating that the opinion of Manea Parish Council is that this application should be approved.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation procedure, from Ann Marks.

Mrs Marks stated that she is speaking in support of the application and as a neighbouring property that would be most affected by the addition of second storey from overlooking, she confirmed that, in her opinion, she does not feel that this would be the case. She stated that the proposed Dormer windows would not intrude or affect her properties privacy in any way and following the revised plans where the architect has moved the external staircase to the north side and with the undertaking of no windows or doors to the south side, it will ensure the privacy of her home is maintained and does not adversely affect the street scene.

Mrs Marks added that as there is already a property in the vicinity that was built 15 years ago, whose unit is a similar height to the neighbours proposal so there is no reason why the character of the estate will be harmed and she highlighted that there have been no objections from any of the neighbouring properties and the Parish Council and Rail Track also support the proposal. She expressed the opinion that having moved her own elderly relative into her home, it has provided her family peace of mind and she would hope that the planning application will be successful, so the applicant can also have the same reassurance for their own relatives as well.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the Public Participation procedure, from Mr Lee Bevens, the Agent.

Mr Bevens stated that the Planning Officer makes reference to poor design, which he appreciates is a subjective matter. He added that in correspondence, officers have suggested that a ground floor extension should have been considered, rather than a first floor, however, this was not viable for 2 reasons which were, the whole of the site and Charlemont Drive is in Flood Zone 3, which would preclude bedroom accommodation on the ground floor and the position of existing foul and surface water drainage would make the proposal unviable.

Mr Bevens stated that it was felt that minimising the impact of the additional accommodation on the existing change of use was actually good design, because it has led to less land take up and minimal disruption to the ground floor plan. He expressed the view that after feedback from the adjacent neighbour, the position of the external staircase was moved to the opposite gable and the first-floor plan amended to suit, again causing minimal impact to the ground floor accommodation and the staircase will actually be more hidden from the street scene than before. He explained that dormer windows have been inserted to both soften the impact of the proposal, but also maintaining a sensible internal ceiling height at first floor and he added that it was felt that making the proposal a full storey and putting a standard trussed roof would have been poor design and over-dominated the host dwelling.

Mr Bevens expressed the view that the proposal is at the end of the Charlemont Drive estate and is unusual in that it is one of few plots that is in an 'L' shape configuration, with the annexe at right angles to the main house. He stated that, in his opinion, this proposal offers the opportunity to make a positive contribution with the first floor which is still sub-servient to the main dwelling and maintains the status quo of car parking on site and, therefore, he would argue this does comply with both local and national planning policy.

Mr Bevens stated that the accommodation will allow for a dedicated, qualified carer to look after the applicant's mother and explained that a separate email has been provided by the applicant to the Planning Officer to explain the domestic situation, which he read out to members.

'In Sept 2018 my mother, had a fall at her home and broke her pelvis, resulting in a 5 week stay in hospital and care when she returned home. She fell again in December that year, this time breaking her hip. Surgery followed and 7 weeks in Addenbrookes. In Feb 2019 she fell and broke her leg so severely that this resulted in a 2 month stay in Addenbrookes before 2 months in The Grange for re-habilitation. The bone has not healed well but a knee replacement is impossible due to her osteo-arthritis. She also has a heart murmur and COPD.

It was clear to us that she could no longer remain in her beloved grade 2 listed home in Ely with its spiral staircase and multitude of steps, so in March 2019 we began work to make the annexe habitable for her.

When we bought the house, the annexe had already been 'converted' and we had previously been using it as a playhouse for our children. We took out the toilet and put in a bathroom with grab handles and a seated shower as well as a window facing the railway line and ripped out the kitchen and replaced it with a modern one that would be easier for my mother to cope with. We also put in a door to the outside area at the back. We built a fence between the two buildings so that our dogs cannot get out and accidentally knock her down and then we decorated and bought new furniture for her.

My mother is 79 and is beginning to show signs of dementia and Alzheimer's. I cook for her every night, do her shopping and errands and drive her (when we weren't shielding her) to places that she wanted to visit. I have a family of my own and a full-time job and I do not feel able to take on any more than I already have. We have applied to build a flat above the annexe so that we can have a live-in carer for her so that she does not need to go into a home (which she has always made me promise I would never do to her). There is already a full 2 storey annexe in Charlemont Drive and the annexe is set far back from the road, and we already have the support of 4 of our immediate neighbours, who have all verbally agreed to support if required'.

Mr Bevens concluded by stating that he hopes that members can see that given the site constraints, that the design is not poor and is a sympathetic proposal that not only meets the clients brief, but adds a positive contribution to Charlemont Drive.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated when she was a member of the Planning Committee previously this development was approved in the 1990's and added that from 1999 to 2006, there were repeated applications to remove the workplace home policy and the Planning Department at that time refused them, which were lost at appeal. She added that proposal before members today, has received no objections and she does sympathise with the applicant. Councillor Mrs French stated that the applicant wishes to remove the workplace home and she cannot see anything detrimental about the proposal and the alterations that the agent has made are, in her opinion, suitable and she will be

supporting the application.

- Councillor Sutton stated he concurs with the comments made by Councillor Mrs French and stated that had it not been a workplace home proposal it would never have obtained planning permission at that time. He expressed the opinion that given that a precedent has now been set, he feels that he could support the application but emphasised that planning decisions must be made based on land use and not on personal or financial circumstances. Councillor Sutton added that he does have an issue that the proposal is a separate unit to the unit that is being looked after and he does not understand how 24-hour care can be administered with the proposed design which includes an external staircase.

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

Members approved the application against officer's recommendation for the following reasons; a precedent has already been set and the proposal does not result in significant detrimental harm to the character and visual amenity of the area.

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

(Councillor Marks declared an interest in this item as the applicant is known to him and he took no part in the discussion on this application and voting thereon)

5.14 pm

Chairman