

PLANNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - 1.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor Mrs M Davis (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor Mrs K Mayor, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor R Skoulding and Councillor W Sutton, Councillor A Miscandlon (Substitute)

APOLOGIES: Councillor C Marks and Councillor M Purser,

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

P66/22 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting of the 19 October 2022 were agreed and signed as an accurate record, subject to the following clarification/amendment:

- Councillor Sutton clarified that under reference F/YR21/1072/FDL, first bullet point of the members debate where he mentioned that the anomaly between the two schedules is unprofessional, that he was referring to the person who produced the plans and the comment was not aimed at any of the Council's officers;
- in reference to F/YR22/0604/F, first bullet point of the members debate, the word 'not' is missing and it should read "it does NOT alleviate the overlooking he can foresee from looking out of the window into the back garden of number 60 and he agrees with officer's recommendation".

P67/22 F/YR22/0381/F LAND SOUTH OF 88 WEST STREET, CHATTERIS ERECT 22 X DWELLINGS (4 X 2-STOREY 2-BED, 15 X 2-STOREY 3-BED AND 3 X 2-STOREY 4-BED) WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING AND THE FORMATION OF ATTENUATION PONDS INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS

Nikki Carter presented the report to members and drew members attention to the update that had been circulated.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ian Salter, an objector to the application. Mr Salter stated that he lives in Fairview Avenue, which is adjacent to the area of the planning application, and he is also the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator of the Fairview Estate of 65 houses, with the proposal causing great consternation amongst the residents of the estate and many people have approached him to represent their views, fully supporting the officer's recommendation for refusal. He stated that he intends to comment on four matters, drainage and flooding, employment, Middle Level Commissioners and the Local Plan.

Mr Salter stated that D&M Engineering occupy the buildings and the residents of the Fairview estate are proud to have them on the site and none of them have complained about the company or have supported the application. He pointed out that the company were key workers during the pandemic, and they had and continue to have the contract to look after the Amey waste treatment and collection vehicles including large metal structures at their waste tips. He stated that in the first report it explains that the company are in the process of relocating, however, in his view, this is not correct and the company does not wish to move from the site and has not identified another alternative site in the Chatteris area and he had requested that the Planning Officer should make contact with the company to clarify the situation, however, he appreciates that this was not the normal procedure.

Mr Salter stated that the applicant was contacted and in the latest report the applicant has now stated that the buildings are in a poor and unsafe condition, contain asbestos and are unsuitable for further use. He expressed the opinion that there have been no recent inspections of the buildings and the company is of the view that the buildings are safe for continued use into the foreseeable future but made the point that if the application were to be approved the company would be forced to move and the business would be likely to have to leave Chatteris and change its business model and possibly reduce its workforce.

Mr Salter stated that with regards to drainage and flooding there have been objections to the application which have included concerns about flooding in numbers 1 and 3 Fairview Avenue caused by drainage issues and the two properties in question suffer from annual drainage problems and flooding at the bottom of their gardens and it appears that the level of the new housing will be higher than the land at the two bungalows which will clearly make the situation worse. He stated that he has a scrapbook of when a similar situation arose at Lode Way in Chatteris when new buildings were built adjacent to all dwellings and the local paper at the time carried many stories about the situation with the Council and Local MP becoming involved and it took two years for a resolution to be found and he expressed the view that he does not want to experience the same situation in Fairview Avenue.

Mr Salter stated that with regard to the Middle Level Commissioners (MLC), in the previous report the Environment Agency and the County Council Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) strongly recommended that the applicant should contact the MLC with regards to flood risk associated with the proposed watercourse and surface water drainage proposals and in the latest report it states that the LLFA have recommended that the MLC should be contacted but there is no evidence to suggest this has happened. He referred to the Local Plan, with neither the 2014 or the emerging Local Plan identifying the land as being suitable for development and the emerging Local Plan draws a red line around Chatteris and inside the red line there is sufficient land identified to meet all of the development needs of Chatteris and the line runs along the rear fences of Fairview Avenue, with the barns and associated land being outside of the red line and have not been recommended for development.

Mr Salter made the point that the officer's report suggests that it is too early to use the emerging Local Plan when considering the application, which he disagrees with and he feels that the MLC will have had an important input into the emerging Local Plan and in particular they will have taken a strong line into the positioning of the red line. He expressed the opinion that the planning process is somewhat daunting for individuals who have not dealt with the planning process, and it would be something he would be happy to discuss with officers going forward and thanked the Planning Officer for her professionalism when assisting the residents with queries.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Kate Wood, the agent. Ms Wood thanked the officers for their help in bringing the application back to the Planning Committee, with members resolving, at the committee meeting in August, that the proposal was acceptable but had requested further detail with regards to the improvements to the byway that serves the site which is to be improved with the proper surface and footway. She

explained that updated plans have been submitted which show the changes to plot one to improve the relationship with number 88 and plans showing the road and pavements, which as a result of those changes has meant that the drainage strategy also needed to be updated because the roads will now positively drain into the existing surface water system rather than running off into the grass verge which the LLFA have stated they are now happy with this as well as the EA and Anglian Water.

Ms Wood explained that an arboricultural method statement and ecological survey has also been undertaken for the extra area where the road is being improved which shows how the works to the pavements will be carried out in a way which protects trees on the adjacent land and which the arboricultural officer is happy with. She added that there is no further impact on biodiversity and she anticipates that these matters will be subject to conditions which will require compliance should the application be approved.

Ms Wood explained that a Construction Management Plan was a matter which had been raised by Councillor Mrs French and, therefore, one has been submitted which officers are content with apart from the working hours and the wheel washing machinery to be used and she would expect a condition to be applied requesting an amended Construction Management Plan with preferred construction hours should the application be approved. She referred to highway matters and stated that the process for providing the new tarmac part of the roads and pavements at the end of West Street involves requesting a Definitive Map Modification Order (DMMO) due to the fact that the route is a byway which is open to all traffic on the definitive map which the County Council is responsible for maintaining.

Ms Wood explained that the County Council does not hold a record of the width of the byway or its alignment for which she would normally submit a request for a Section 278 Works Order for works within a highway boundary, however, in this case the definitive map needs to be modified first by way of adding information about the width and alignment of the byway so that the Highway Authority can then deal with the Section 278 application for highway works. She stated that the process has already been commenced and a Countryside Access Consultant has been instructed to carry out extensive historical investigations which has resulted in the width of the byway being clarified as being 30ft and this research work will form part of the application for the management order which will reduce the time taken to deal with that order as the research has already been undertaken.

Ms Wood stated that once the order is made, and the byway is clearer, the application for the 278 works can be applied for, with the only risk that she can foresee in the process for the order may result in another landowner coming forward to claim ownership of part of the subsoil and if that happens the applicant will need to purchase that land from them, however, in her view, that is unlikely as she has already served Ownership Certificate C with the planning application which includes sites and press notices. She made the point that if anybody was going to come forward and claim ownership of any unregistered land they would have done so by now and the current owner of the application site is in the process of registering the land adjacent to the byway with the Land Registry.

Ms Wood pointed out that the County Council have been maintaining the byway for a long period of time with nobody claiming the subsoil and the DMMO process has to be carried out but, in her opinion, it is clear that the risks are minimized with the research work having been carried out and, therefore, she is confident that planning permission could be granted with conditions, preventing any works prior to the access being approved under the Section 278 highway process which will ensure that the development will not be constructed or occupied. She added that conditions preventing any works prior to the access being approved under the Section 278 highway process will not be constructed without the proper standard of road being in place.

Members asked Ms Wood the following questions:

- Councillor Murphy stated that the committee are here to make a decision and from the presentation it would appear that the level of detail is still not available and the DMMO is still to be signed off. He asked why committee should consider the application when the information required is still incomplete or missing? Ms Wood responded that, in her view, the answers have been provided as the process to ensure the highway is able to be provided securely is now clear. She added that there has been a great deal of work which has been undertaken directly with the County Council Rights of Way Officer and the Highway Officer, with the Rights of Way Officer being concerned that the information concerning the byway was missing even though the County Council have been maintaining it for many years. Ms Wood explained that a very large report was completed containing a great deal of historical detail which identified that the byway has been in place since the 1800's. She stated that the land is not registered which is very often the case in rural areas and the farmer who is selling the land to the applicant is now registering the land as he has been maintaining the land which is not the highway. Ms Wood made the point that in August the committee were content that the land could be utilized for housing but had asked for clarification on the use of the highway which, in her view, has been provided.
- Councillor Murphy stated that permission for land ownership takes some considerable time as he knows from experience and if the applicant has only just requested for the land to be registered there is at least a two year wait. Ms Wood stated that there are two processes for the registration of land with Land Registry and she does appreciate that they have a backlog which she believes is three months. She explained that the DMMO process is necessary to clarify on the definitive map that the byway is 30ft and that is the process that can take two to three years but the main reason that gets delayed is because the County Council does not have the time to do the research which is the process that takes the longest, hence she commissioned someone to do that research and they have consulted with the Highway Team and potentially it could be a year for the process to be finalised but it could be expedited if planning permission is approved.
- Councillor Miscandlon expressed the opinion that the application is incomplete and does not contain the information and detail required. He added with regards to Land Registry and ownership in his experience the process can take up to five years and anyone can come forward during that time to put a claim on the land.
- Councillor Sutton stated that at the meeting in August another member had questioned the level of detail around the Section 106 contributions which, in his opinion, resonated with members, and they may have supported the application. He made the point that he has noted that the over and above the already committed Section 106 contributions, the NHS have now requested £13,222.33 and he asked whether that request was going to have any effect on the provision of the other monies and social housing and will that request be agreed to? Ms Wood stated that there is no option other than to agree to it and she added that if she does not sign up to the Section 106 then the planning permission will not be granted. She added that she is aware of the NHS late response, but it has set out proper planning reasons why that money is required, which is to support the local Health Centre providing actual nursing staff. Councillor Sutton addressed Ms Wood and stated that one member had previously questioned whether she would be coming back with a viability assessment to avoid paying the Section 106 monies and at that time she had categorically stated that would not be the case and he questioned whether that opinion was still current. Ms Wood stated that she has not brought a viability assessment back as the applicant has carried out his viability work and has stated that he will pay an appropriate amount of money for the land should planning permission be granted that reflects his costs of building and all the other associated costs. She added that the applicant has calculated that he can recover money by selling plus the standard amount of profit and that is why she has not brought a viability assessment back. Councillor Sutton asked Ms Wood whether she can guarantee that she will not be submitting one and Ms Wood responded that she cannot guarantee anything but there is nothing to suggest that there needs to be a viability assessment.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that there have been many instances where applicants state that they are not going to come back with viability, however, they do and especially in the

current economic climate with regards to the increase in building costs that really does concern her.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Connor advised the committee that Shane Luck from the Highway Authority is also present to answer members questions and queries.
- Councillor Mrs French asked the Highway Officer whether he is satisfied with the proposal before the committee or whether he has any concerns? Mr Luck responded that he is satisfied with the design as the applicant is proposing a five-metre carriageway and a 1.8 metre footway, however, he does not have certainty that the highway works are deliverable under highway legislation. Councillor Mrs French asked whether the Public Rights of Way Officer has any thoughts on the proposal? Mr Luck stated that the Public Rights of Way Officer has the same views to his own and he added that based on the report commissioned by the applicant, the views of both himself and the Public Rights of Way Officer is that the width of the highway is probably 30 feet, however, until the time the DMMO is made that is probable and not confirmed and until that is in place there is no certainty on the extent of the byway and the area in which highway works can be carried out.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he can recall an appeal decision where a planning committee agreed that an application was granted due to the fact that members were content with the detail encompassed in the application as there was some benefit to the town and then subsequently the application came back and at that stage it was refused because the applicant had not provided what had originally been promised. He stated that at appeal stage it was upheld, and asked officers if they recalled the application that he is referring to albeit at another authority? Nick Harding stated that he does not recall that application and appeal and stated that the scenario is not something that is being used to determine the application, it is something that may happen in the future and the application now needs to be determined in its current state. He added that if planning permission is granted subject to a Section 106 Agreement, the agreement is entered into and if the applicant and developer subsequently comes back and asks for a reduction to their Section 106 offer, the Council does have to consider that request and then makes a decision on the evidence provided which is based around viability.
- Councillor Cornwell asked officers to clarify that today the committee are only considering the highways elements of the application or is the application being considered as a whole? Nick Harding stated that the resolution at the previous committee was to defer the application to obtain greater clarity in respect of the highway proposal and the committee did not agree with the other reasons for refusal that were put forward by officers at that time. He explained that the officer's presentation today, along with the agent's presentation, has resulted in alterations of a slight nature to some elements of the scheme and, therefore, the committee are looking at whether the access proposal is acceptable or not. Councillor Cornwell stated that as he was not present at the previous committee when certain elements of the application were discussed he will take no further part in this item or vote on the proposal.
- Councillor Benney stated that the application was deferred on highway grounds previously and the agent has submitted plans to bring the proposal forward and the Highways Authority have stated in the report that they suggest that the proposal should be deferred for further information. He asked that if the proposal was granted, could there be conditions applied to state that the site can only be built out if the land issue can be resolved and if all the requirements can be met then the scheme can proceed? He added if it gets approval, and the Highway Authority are not happy and the detail or the land ownership does not come forward then the proposal would not be built out anyway as it would not meet the criteria for it to proceed. Nick Harding stated that the officer recommendation is for refusal which includes highway grounds, and the Council should not be granting planning permission for a scheme which might end up being incapable of implementation. He added that it is a principle of the planning system that approval should only be given to developments which are physically capable of implementation.

- Stephen Turnbull, the Legal Officer, stated that should the committee be minded to grant planning permission today, even if the view is that there is not a strong prospect of the highway's issues being resolved then the committee can legally do so. He added that the policy is that such permissions should not be granted normally if the views of the committee are that they do not think that the proposal will ever be built out, however, legally there is no reason for the committee not to do so if that is the want of the committee. He added that the applicant has advised that there is a plan of sorts to deal with the highways issues and, therefore, it is legally possible for planning permission to be granted subject to a Grampian type of condition that the highways issues have to be dealt with before the build can commence.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that the view of the Highways Authority is that they are not convinced that the proposal can be built out which does put the committee in an awkward position. She added that if it were approved and built out and then a situation arises what would happen? She made the point that she has seen it happen in other areas, such as March and Christchurch, where the top layer on a highway is still incomplete after 15 years as the developer went bankrupt and she does not want to see this situation arise again.
- Councillor Connor stated that he agrees with Councillor Mrs French and made the point that he is very reticent to get the committee to approve the application without the highway issue being satisfied. He asked the Highway Officer to reiterate his opinion. Mr Luck stated that based on the information available at this stage his honest answer is that he does not know because the defined width of the byway has not been provided. He added that any third party works of the highway needs the consent of the Highway Authority and with an extension of byways to carry out any works there is the requirement to know what area of land you have to work within and that is what the DMMO would define. Mr Luck stated that in the absence of that information he does not know whether the highways will be able to enter into such an agreement because he has not seen what the boundaries will end up being.

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

- Councillor Benney stated that when the application came before the committee previously, he was content with the proposed development being built out and at that time the application was deferred in order that the highways issues and technical details for the scheme could be brought back. He made the point that the level of detail is not complete, and the Highways Officer has stated that he cannot give a definite opinion. Councillor Benney stated that the application could be approved and then there could be issues further along and for that reason he feels that the committee have no option other than to refuse it as it is incomplete, as the agent has not undertaken what they were asked to do. He stated that he can see no other way than to refuse the proposal only on the grounds of access as the information is missing and a determination cannot be made.
- Councillor Mrs Davis expressed the view that the application is incomplete and incomplete applications should not be coming before the committee to determine. She made the point that if the application is not refused then there is the opportunity for other to submit incomplete applications and that is a waste of everybody's time.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees with the comments made by Councillors Benney and Mrs Davis. She added that a request was made for the Highways Officer to be in attendance which has happened, but she cannot support an application in its current form and not knowing further along in time as to whether the proposal will end up causing issues and concern for the local residents and the Highway Authority and she cannot support it on highway grounds.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he disagrees and made the point that the agent has listened to the feedback from the previous attendance at committee and has reduced the first dwelling near number 88. He added that the Agent has no control over the process of the DMMO and they have improved the water run off with the new scheme and, in his opinion, the Agent has carried out everything that has been asked of them. Councillor Sutton expressed the opinion that he cannot see any reason as to why the application could not be approved

subject to the DMMO process which is ongoing.

- Councillor Benney stated that he would like officers to give their opinion with regards to the DMMO process.
- Nick Harding stated that the officer's recommendation is one of refusal which includes the highway reason for refusal based on the lack of certainty that there is the necessary space available to implement the proposed highway improvements. He added that the Legal Officer has advised the committee that to grant planning permission with a Grampian style condition would not be unlawful and, therefore, it is for members to decide whether they are comfortable with taking a risk of granting planning permission for a scheme that is not implementable or whether the committee refuse the proposal because of the lack of certainty that there is with regards to the amount of space that there is on a public highway to make highway improvements.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs Davis, seconded by Councillor Skoulding and agreed that the application should be REFUSED for refusal reason 3 only of the officer's recommendation in relation to access.

Members do not support the other recommended reasons for refusal as their position has not changed from when the application was deferred on 24 August 2022.

(Councillors Benney stated that he knows the female occupant of 88 West Street in a professional capacity, but it would not make any difference to his decision making and voting on the application)

(Councillors Benney and Murphy declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they are members of Chatteris Town Council but take no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Cornwell took no part in the discussion and voting on this item as he was not present when the item had been previously determined by the committee.)

P68/22

F/YR22/0332/F

LAND SOUTH OF 33 MARCH ROAD, WIMBLINGTON

ERECT 4 X SELF/CUSTOM BUILD DWELLINGS (3 X 2-STOREY 5 BED AND 1 X 2-STOREY 4-BED) AND THE FORMATION OF AN ACCESS

Nikki Carter presented the report to members.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Craig Brand, the agent. Mr Brand stated that the applicant had recently inherited the property which was originally owned by his grandparents who lived in the former farmhouse that was situated in the north-east corner of the application site amongst the trees which have Tree Preservation Orders attached to them. He expressed the view that the application falls to be determined by the Local Plan adopted in 2014 and, therefore, Section 9.4 of the officer's report should be ignored as it refers to the future replacement Local Plan which is only at its early consultation stage.

Mr Brand stated that under Policy LP3 of the Local Plan, Wimblington is shown to be one of the four growth villages and the next tier down from the four Fenland market towns, with in growth villages, development being acceptable within the existing urban area or as a small village extension and the proposal is for a small village extension which partially fills the present gap between Eastwood Hall and number 33, the old Toll House, with frontage development. He referred to the presentation screen and pointed out a photograph which shows on the western side

of March Road continuous frontage development extending from 33 to 69 March Road on the parish boundary and then a further photo which shows 33a March Road which is one of several properties of the scale to the north with deep rear gardens up to Linwood Lane byway.

Mr Brand referred to a further photograph which shows three recent executive dwellings built at New Woods Drive with a shared private access road opposite the site and made the point that the current application proposes the same arrangement of a shared private access road with executive self-build dwellings. He pointed out that the application is also considered to be against rural area policy, LP12 (a) , even though Wimblington is a top tier growth village and referred to the policy at paragraph 4.73 which states that the Local Plan has no fixed area boundaries around each settlement and the report states that the proposal is contrary to five points of the policy as well as the two footnotes which are related to the first point.

Mr Brand stated that on the first point there is continuous development opposite the site and further to the north which, in his opinion, is developed footprint and it makes the proposal acceptable as there is nowhere in the Local Plan where it states that there is a limit mentioned for infilling gaps opposite existing developed frontage. He questioned what is special about this view compared to all other Fenland views to justify the point made which states that the development will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the current countryside as, in his view, a rural view will still be maintained through the remaining gap between the sites northern boundary and the old Toll House.

Mr Brand stated that the proposed frontage form of development is in keeping with the existing dwellings on the western side of March Road and does not extend the existing linear features of the village and, in his opinion, it infills a gap in the road frontage. He pointed out that the site retains the healthy trees and the only ones to be removed are structurally unsafe and multi stemmed poor specimen and self-set trees.

Mr Brand explained that Eastwood House and the former Toll House do not require a heritage statement in order for the application to be processed as neither are Listed Buildings or in a Conservation Area. He referred to the presentation screen and pointed out that Eastwood Hall is well set back behind the application site and is screened from view by a tall hedge and trees set in the grounds and the proposed dwellings will have no impact on the setting of Eastwood Hall.

Mr Brand explained that the application is for four self-build building plots and the application is submitted in full due to the custom design dwelling for the applicant on plot 1 which has already been agreed with them as submitted and the other three plots have full designs to show prospective purchasers what scale dwellings can be built and it is anticipated that any future purchasers will tailor their plots to suit their life style requirements. He pointed out that a search in Right Move has found that there are no individual plots in Wimblington for sale and the nearest property being marketed was in Hospital Road in Doddington and three off Elm Road in March, with the applicants already having had enquiries concerning available plots in the village and, therefore, he feels there appears to be the demand for the dwellings.

Mr Brand referred to the officer's report and made the point that Eastwood Hall and all the land around the applicants property are unlikely to consent to any sand or gravel extraction adjacent to Eastwood Hall.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs Davis asked officers to clarify whether or not there is another application which has been submitted for a property to be built on the other side of Eastwood Hall which would mean that the whole gap is beginning to close and there will be the loss of the open view in that part of the village. Nikki Carter confirmed that there has been an application submitted for a dwelling to the south of Eastwood Hall which is currently in its very early stages of determination.

- Councillor Sutton stated that where the point that was made with regards to the fact that there is no identified need he presumes that is taken from self-build and custom build register that the Council holds? Nikki Carter confirmed that is correct. Councillor Sutton asked what the current figures are that are held on the register? Nick Harding stated that the last time he reviewed the register the Council were granting twice the number of applications that were needed at least in comparison to the number of people that it had on the register and that is corroborated by the information that the Council receives each year from HMRC in relation to the actual build outs of self-build and custom build properties and the Council is delivering at least 50% more than the number of people on the register.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that he cannot see any mention in the officer's report that the entrance to the development is on a blind bend and he asked the officers whether this has been taken into consideration? Nikki Carter stated that this is something that she raised with the Highways Authority, and they confirmed that the visibility splays are suitable for the 30mph road and did not raise any concerns. The Highways Officer, Shane Luck, clarified that the highways internal policy is that a single driveway which is proposed onto a road where the speed limit is 30mph or less in an existing settlement does not require visibility splays to be provided.
- Councillor Miscandlon made reference to the officer's report where Anglian Water have stated at 5.11 that there is no connection to Anglian Water sewers and, therefore, it has no comment to make and asked whether the intention is for the proposal to have septic tanks installed? Nikki Carter stated that the proposal is to use sewerage treatment plants, adding that Anglian Water were contacted and asked to provide some further information with regards to where the nearest foul sewers were, with Environment Agency guidance indicating that the connection to an existing foul sewerage network should be considered potentially feasible where the distance is less than the number of properties multiplied by 30 in this case 120 metres. She added that the sewer near Linwood Lane would appear to be within that and, therefore, it would be necessary to condition details of foul drainage if the application is approved. Councillor Miscandlon stated that the committee are all very well aware of problems within that area when considering the sewerage disposal issues and as there is no detail having been provided it is very difficult to make a judgement of what may happen going forward.

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

- Councillor Cornwell stated that the development so far has been on the eastern side of the road and, in his opinion, he can see pressure coming to develop the western side of the road as well. He added that the plot appears to fill in part of the area between the entry to the Rectory and the Toll House and made the point that the link to both parts of the village of Wimblington is beginning to fill up and it appears to be a natural progression to infill on the western side.
- Councillor Connor stated that he used to live in the Toll House many years ago.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he recalls an application on the east side of that stretch of road and at the time he voted against the proposal for highway reasons and he views this existing development as being more of a danger compared to the current proposal in highway terms. He stated that on the site inspections he noted that the pavement had been marked to indicate where the highway was coming out which he found to be very helpful, and, in his view, there is easily 43 metres as it goes both ways and he does not foresee any particular problems especially with there only being one access.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that the Parish Council is against the proposal on the grounds that it is felt that Wimblington has no green space left in the village apart from the war memorial playing field, which luckily is for perpetuity and can never be sold. She added that the village is becoming more like a town rather than a village and the residents are very fed up. Councillor Mrs Davis made the point that there is no development on that side of the road but there has been development on the other side. She referred to the 88 dwellings which the Parish Council objected to and stated that application followed a natural progression of filling in but the other side has always been open and, in her view, it will

change the look of the landscape of the village because there will be further applications that are submitted to fill the rest of it.

- Councillor Connor stated that he does feel sorry for the Wimblington as they have had the lions share of development and, in his view, enough is enough. He added that the development on the east side of the road was approved, and he agrees with the point made by Councillor Mrs Davis that there is no green space left and the villages appear to be receiving more development compared to the towns. Councillor Connor stated that he supports the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Cornwell referred to 5.9 of the officer's report where the Parish Council have stated that they object to the application on the grounds of access to the site, with there being no other comment about the position of the site, only the point about it being on a blind bend. He added that he is surprised that they have not made a stronger objection.
- Councillor Connor stated that the Parish Council do object to the proposal but only on one basis.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that at 5.15 there are supporting comments and she added that it would suggest that not everybody opposes the application.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor referred to the trees which have a Tree Preservation Order on them, with there being an application for them to be removed. Nikki Carter stated that there is an application which has been submitted to fell four of the protected trees which are covered by the application before members. She added that the Tree Officer has considered the report that has been submitted as part of the application and has not raised any issues, although there was a query raised over replacement trees and that may form part of a condition on the application. Nikki Carter explained that she is waiting for the Tree Officer's formal comments as part of the tree application. Councillor Mrs Mayor asked whether the trees have to be removed to facilitate the area for the proposed houses which, in her view, may only effect one or two of the plots. She expressed the view that they are beautiful trees although she does accept that one does not look to be in the best condition, and she does not see why they should be removed to provide space for four building plots. Nikki Carter explained that the Tree Preservation Order is in the north-eastern corner of the site and the report indicates that they need to be removed for health and safety reasons. She added that there is an arboriculture report that has been submitted and they were waiting for this application to be determined but have since needed to speed up the process which is why the application has been submitted to remove the trees regardless of whether the proposal before the committee is approved or not. Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she does not agree that they need to be removed and she referred to the point made by Councillor Mrs Davis with regards to the loss of green space which also includes trees.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and agreed that the application be APPROVED against officer's recommendation with authority delegated to officers to formulate suitable conditions including a Section 106 Agreement as these will be self-build dwellings.

Members do not support officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they do not feel that the site is a heritage asset where a heritage statement needs to be provided, that the proposal would enhance the area and does not detract from it, and that sand and gravel extraction is not an issue.

(Councillor Connor declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he represents Doddington and Wimblington as a Fenland District Councillor and attends their meetings but takes no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Mrs Davis declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that she is Chairman of Wimblington Parish Council but takes no part in planning matters)

LAND WEST OF 27-35 NEW STREET, DODDINGTON
ERECT 3 X DWELLINGS (2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED AND 1 X 2-STOREY 4/5-BED), A
2.1M HIGH WALL, AND WIDEN EXISTING ACCESS, INVOLVING THE
DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDINGS AND FRONT BOUNDARY BRICK PIERS
WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Craig Brand, the agent. Mr Brand made the point that he was not the agent for the previous two refused applications or for the pre-application enquiry, with the pre-application enquiry being for seven dwellings would have made use of the whole paddock extending beyond the rear boundary of Thistledown, creating a finger of development into the open countryside. He stated that this proposal only seeks to extend to the Thistledown rear boundary and to develop the former vegetable garden and a small section of the paddock enclosed within this area.

Mr Brand expressed the opinion that there are two main issues which need to be determined which are whether the application complies with policies LP3 and LP12 and whether or not the proposal will harm the Conservation Area. He expressed the view that the application complies with Policy LP3 as Doddington is a growth village, which is the highest village category with elsewhere the lowest, and growth villages allow development within the existing urban area or as a small village extension and the scale of three proposed dwellings is in accordance with this policy.

Mr Brand stated that Part A of LP12 for rural areas lists requirements to comply with the policy and stated that the first is that the site is in or adjacent to the existing developed footprint disagreeing with the officer's assessment where it states, at 10.3, that the site borders Thistledown to the south and New Street to the east. He made the point that the site is in the heart of a village location and meets the three further qualifications mentioned in the report as the site is not on the edge of the settlement or detached from the continuous built-up area.

Mr Brand referred to 10.5 of the report where it describes the site as being in an elsewhere location, but disputes that point as LP3 states that elsewhere applies only to developments outside the four listed village categories which are above elsewhere. He referred to paragraph 4.74 of the Local Plan which clarifies elsewhere locations and the types of development permitted and stated that the proposals' location is fully compliant with Policies LP3 and LP12 as Doddington is a growth village, and the Local Plan has no fixed development area boundaries which is detailed in paragraph 4.73.

Mr Brand made reference to the 2011 Doddington Conservation Area Appraisal at paragraph 8.75 which refers to 25–53 New Street as a group of essentially unified detached and semi-detached dwellings which hold significant visual prominence warranting their Conservation Area inclusion. He stated that at paragraph 8.79 it specifically mentions number 35 due to the open entrance giving a view through to the paddock at the rear.

Mr Brand referred to the presentation screen and pointed out that the only alteration to the new street scene is the widening of the access by removal of the gate piers and sections of the post war railings, with the photograph from the 1930's showing the original front boundary treatment being a wooden fence. He pointed out that number 35 was built in the 1880's for their general building business with workshops, cart shed and stables which extended to the paddock and was detailed in the 1927 ordnance survey map and a timber seasoning storage rack was also on the opposite site of the courtyard.

Mr Brand explained that the next slide shows the current important open space which is mentioned in the officer's report at 8.79 and across the former builder's yard to the paddock which offers no privacy to the rear of the now solely residential dwelling. He stated that following the Conservation Officer's initial comments, the site layout has been reviewed and the position of the semi-detached house was adjusted so that the view through to the grass paddock and the countryside beyond was retained.

Mr Brand made the point that the proposal provides a private amenity area immediately to the rear of number 5 which can be deepened, and the proposed house designs are more sympathetic to the Conservation Area than the previously two refused applications.

Members asked Mr Brand the following questions:

- Councillor Sutton asked Mr Brand to provide further detail with regard to the comparison in the view drawing that had been provided. Mr Brand stated that at the moment the building with a storage rack on the southern boundary means the current view is from the street across the private courtyard and into the paddock. He added that there is no view into the open countryside and farmland beyond whereas the proposal includes the positioning of the semi-detached house closer to the detached house and removal of the seasoned storage rack creates a view to the rear boundary of the paddock and beyond which will also include privacy to number 35. Mr Brand stated that it is not up to the standard, but it can be deepened.

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

- Councillor Cornwell made the point that the proposal, in his opinion, is back land development.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he agrees that it is back land development but questioned whether the proposal is any further back than the properties in Thistledown. He questioned if Thistledown was ok, why is the proposal not?

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

(Councillor Connor declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he represents Doddington and Wimblington as a Fenland District Councillor and attends their meetings but takes no part in planning matters)

**P70/22 F/YR22/0764/F
LAND NORTH WEST OF SUNNYSIDE, COXS LANE, WISBECH
ERECT 4 X DWELLINGS (2-STOREY 5-BED) WITH DOUBLE GARAGES**

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Lidbetter, an objector to the application. Mr Lidbetter stated that, since September 2021, he has resided in a property called Rathsome which was shown on the officers presentation and is the new build house adjacent to the north-west boundary of the applicant's site. He stated that prior to purchasing his property he called the Council's Planning Department to ascertain the future planning policy for Coxs Lane and its locality and the Planning Officer advised him categorically that no further development was planned for Coxs Lane and, therefore, he purchased his house.

Mr Lidbetter stated that a few weeks later a large sway of the adjacent orchard was cut down and also an oak tree which was on a site outside of the applicant's ownership and soon after that a

planning application was submitted, which is linked to one in 2019 which was refused by the Planning Committee by a large majority. He expressed the view that Coxs Lane has a charming rural countryside appearance and is very well used by walkers, runners and dog walkers, however, it is a very narrow lane with no passing places between his property and Sunnyside which is further south of his property.

Mr Lidbetter stated that the only passing places on the lane are the driveway entrances serving the five properties which are on Coxs Lane, plus the access road which serves the houses located on Barton Green, and that the increase in vehicular traffic from the proposed development will create a far more hazardous scenario for pedestrians using Coxs Lane. He expressed the view that the proposal before the committee appears to be an exact copy of the previous planning application submitted except for the provision of a pedestrian footpath which is routed over land owned by the applicant, with this footpath being a cul de sac path and only of use to the residents of plots one to four of the application site and the regular users of Coxs Lane will not benefit from it.

Mr Lidbetter stated that location of plot 1 is extremely close to his property and will invade his family's privacy. He stated that should approval be given, in his opinion, it should be limited to a maximum of three properties but preferably two in order to retain some severance of a rural environment along Coxs Lane.

Mr Lidbetter referred to the comments made by Wisbech Town Councillors, some of whom are very familiar with Coxs Lane and who discussed the proposal on the 18 July and stated that the proposal will constitute over development of the site and the nature of the proposed development is more suited to an urban area and is out of keeping with the existing properties in the vicinity of the application site and they also expressed the view that Coxs Lane is inadequate in width to serve residential development on the scale proposed by the application. He stated that, in his view, a terrace of four two-storey five bedroomed houses will be totally inappropriate in a rural environment.

Mr Lidbetter explained that he has discussed the planning application with the applicant and advised him that he would be objecting to the proposal. He added that the condition of Coxs Lane is poor as it is narrow, bumpy, has no footpath or street lighting and no plans as far as he is aware to make improvements to the lane.

Mr Lidbetter stated that the applicant informed him that he was certain that his proposal will be approved which has perplexed him somewhat.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Slater, the agent. Mr Slater stated that members will be aware of the ongoing development taking place, including the new school on Barton Road, the nursing home to the East and the new housing along Barton. He added that he is aware that the character of the area has changed over recent years and members will be aware that the site was discussed by the committee in February and at that time the committee resolved to refuse the application due to highway passing and pedestrian safety concerns.

Mr Slater stated that the refusal was limited in its scope in that the principle of development on the site was accepted as was the house design and layout so it appears that members were largely supportive of the scheme in terms of the scale of infill housing and were encouraging in relation to the provision of executive homes, but the committee did request additional highway improvements be incorporated into the scheme to make it acceptable. He made the point that although members did not approve the scheme the clear direction to the applicant was that the developer should go away and revise the scheme and bring back a proposal to mitigate highway implications with the inclusion of passing places and a footpath.

Mr Slater stated that the applicant has redesigned the proposal with the agent to address the

concerns and the confirmation of the appropriate visibility splays has been achieved by carrying out a speed survey. He added that the appropriate visibility splays are now shown both north and south of the access points and the revised scheme incorporates two passing bays along the site frontage to the general benefit of users of Coxs Lane which is achieved by pairing the access points as each pair provides a passing bay along the application verge to Coxs Lane.

Mr Slater stated that the applicant has asked him to advise the committee that the application is similar to one at Bar Drove in Friday Bridge which included three plots on a narrow road which was approved at committee with the passing bays incorporated within the entrance details. He stated that in terms of the footpath link, the applicant has undertaken extensive possibilities of incorporating a footway along Coxs Lane linking to Barton Road, but unfortunately the verge on Coxs Lane is physically not wide enough to accommodate this, and particularly at the northern end with its junction of Barton Road, but as a result the applicant has offered an innovative design solution in the form of a private footpath through his orchard to the rear of the site linking onto Barton Road and through the development to the north.

Mr Slater stated that the path is owned by the applicant and can be conditioned which will require provision in advance of first occupation with access and maintenance in perpetuity. He added a further condition could also be added to impose a lighting scheme and the footpath would link to the existing footpath on Barton Road which is being upgraded as part of the off-site highway works for the school.

Mr Slater stated that the previous scheme on the site was refused by the committee in respect of specific concerns over the passing bays on Coxs Lane and the pedestrian access to Barton Road and he made the point that the applicant and agent have provided the amended scheme to address those concerns.

Members asked Mr Slater the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French made the point that Mr Slater had made reference to the school, and she asked him whether the school has actually been approved as she was not aware. Mr Slater stated that it has had a conditional discharge submitted on it and there is an agreed footpath link along the northern side of Barton Road so it must have permission. He added that it is a special education needs school. Councillor Mrs French asked for clarification from officers as to whether the school has permission and is going ahead.
- Councillor Murphy stated that the Mr Slater referred to a speed survey being undertaken and questioned where that survey took place as, in his view, it is not possible to speed in Coxs Lane. He added that he feels that the road is unique to Cambridgeshire and to consider building on it and utilising people's entrances into their homes as a passing bay is not acceptable. Mr Slater stated that a speed survey was required to ascertain what the appropriate visibility splays are. He added that it is a non-classified road as it is clear that you would not be able to drive at speed down the road, with the actual speed being measured and then 80 percentiles of it is taken which gives the detail of the visibility splay and that has been detailed on the approved plans. Councillor Connor asked what the speed was and Mr Slater stated that he believes it was between 30-40mph.
- Councillor Connor expressed the view that he was astounded at that result as he would not drive more than 15mph along that road.
- Nick Harding stated that he can confirm that there is a planning consent granted on planning application reference 21/215 and subsequently there have been discharge of condition applications and more recently a non-material amendment to that original planning permission. He confirmed that planning permission has been granted for a 60-place social, emotional and mental health school for pupils in key stage three and four, which is ages 11 to 16. Councillor Connor stated that he is very happy to hear that news.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Cornwell stated that the speaker made reference to the previous application, and

it would appear that there are no issues with the scheme apart from the highway elements and he questioned whether that is correct. He added that it may be the case that the application was refused for highways being one of the reasons, but he cannot recall the committee ever confirming that they support the design layout and other elements of the scheme. Nick Harding stated that the recommendation before the committee only has one reason for refusal which is the only issue that officers are concerned with in relation to scheme. David Rowen stated that when the previous application came before the committee, there were three or four reasons which members did not agree with, which left the highways matter the only reason for refusal of the previous application.

- Councillor Connor asked the Highways Officer for his thoughts on the proposal and Shane Luck stated that the question surrounding speed based on the visibilities as shown in the drawings are interpreted to an observed speed of in and around 40mph. He added that the reason that a visibility speed survey was requested is that it is unlikely that vehicles will travel at 60mph on such a road, although they are legally allowed to do so but the reason for the survey in this particular case is to demonstrate that the achievable visibility was acceptable based on the actual observed vehicle speeds. Mr Luck made the point that the main concern is the width of Coxs Lane, and it is of a width only suitable for a single vehicle and there are no passing places for other vehicles to pass each other. He added that whilst they could pull onto the grass verge to pass, he does not advocate this as it is unsafe to do so and could drag any loose debris and mud into the carriageway which in turn could endanger other road users. Mr Luck added that the presentation referred to a precedent being set for nearby permissions and it is his understanding that one was for a replacement dwelling and one replaced a mobile catering unit operated as a catering business and, therefore, in both cases the highway position would not have been a material intensification above the existing positions, however, four new dwellings will bring an increase in traffic flows to Coxs Lane and typically two to three two way vehicle movements per dwelling per day is what officers would anticipate. He added that although that may appear to be a modest figure it does increase the risk of vehicles meeting and being allowed to pass. Mr Luck stated that he does not agree with the applicant that the shared accesses can be used as passing places as they are access points to private dwellings which may or may not be occupied by private vehicles at any time. He reiterated the point that was made by highways officers in the report which was that vehicles entering and exiting or using the access passing places may obstruct visibility for other road users. Mr Luck stated that Coxs Lane is a minor road in the sense of the traffic it accommodates under the construction specification of it but each new dwelling that is permitted slightly increases the risk of conflict occurring due to the substandard cross section. He added that the total magnitude of safety impacts may be modest, however, in his opinion, the application would adversely impact the risk along the road.
- Councillor Murphy stated that he totally agrees with the comments made by the Highway Officer and added that when members went on the site inspections, they saw just how difficult it can be for vehicles to pass each other and, in his view, the more dwellings built there will only exacerbate the already problematic situation. Mr Luck stated that he would agree, and each dwelling adds a modest worsening situation and over time it is a cumulative impact and the risk of vehicles meeting up in the past can be mitigated by the inclusion of passing bays or character widening works but it is his understanding that no such works are proposed.

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

- Councillor Skoulding stated that he agrees with the point made by Councillor Murphy with regard to the issues encountered when vehicles are trying to pass and added that one of the existing properties must be getting frustrated with vehicles using the driveway as a passing place as they have no installed gates. He made the point that the officers have made the correct recommendation and he will be supporting them.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that he agrees with the view of other members and made the point that Coxs Lane is not suitable for the traffic. He added that he agrees with the

officer's recommendation, expressing the view that it is an undesirable development in a very narrow dangerous lane.

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees with Councillor Miscandlon and expressed the view that the road cannot take anymore development, with there being a request in years to come for a highway improvement which will cost a significant amount of money. She thanked the Highway Officer for his input and his professional opinion.
- Councillor Sutton stated that at the last application he had raised the issues of passing places and had at that time given the opinion that he would be more in favour of the application if there were some decent passing places, but they still have not been brought forward. He added that Mr Slater raised the Bar Drove site and he is incorrect in saying that there are passing spaces on Bar Drove, however, he does not think that those passing places are deliverable in the same fashion because one of the passing places on Bar Drove is associated with an entrance into three dwellings but the other one is on the opposite side of the road. Councillor Sutton expressed the view that the application is not deliverable in the proposed location and he cannot support the application.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she agrees with the officer's recommendation and made the point that the Highways Officer has attended today and given his professional opinion to the committee and that needs to be taken into consideration. She stated that on the site inspection, the bus also came across two joggers who were only within a few feet away from a very deep ditch. Councillor Mrs Davis stated that pedestrians also need to be considered especially as there is no lighting and expressed the view that she does not think that the proposal is in a safe location.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that it is her understanding that the SEN School would be built first and then another which will be from nursery school age up until post 16 years of age. She added that she is delighted to hear that the school has commenced construction.

Proposed by Councillor Murphy, seconded by Councillor Skoulding and agreed that the application should be REFUSED as per the officer's recommendation.

P71/22

F/YR22/0078/F

92 ELM ROAD, WISBECH

FORMATION OF 1 ADDITIONAL BEDSIT (1-BED) INCLUDING ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BEDSIT/FLATS AND INSTALLATION OF 5 NO ROOF LIGHTS

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Lunn-Towler, the agent, and Mr Popat, the applicant. Mr Lunn-Towler stated that there are no objections received, the refuse team do not have any concerns and Wisbech Town Council are in support of the application and although there is no parking as detailed in the officer's report that is acceptable, with there being room for cycle storage as indicated on the site plan which is in the rear garden and the site is located in an area of low flood risk. He referred to a statement from the Highway Authority who have expressed the opinion that the site is in a sustainable location with very good connections with public footpaths to the amenities and services of Wisbech Town Centre and accessible to commercial and employment areas in Weasenham Lane.

Mr Lunn-Towler stated that the application is supported by Policy LP3 with regards to the settlement hierarchy, with the proposal itself being for one additional bedsit which is bedroom six which would be on the first-floor level, and it is of the scale similar to those shown on the plans as bedroom 2 and bedroom 3. He added that the proposal will provide a cost-effective form of living accommodation, with reduced living costs due to the layout it will require limited heating and the reduced costs are further incentivised by walking, cycling and transport links.

Mr Popat stated that he has been renting the flats to local people for a number of years and many of them have been referred by the Housing Options Team, with many of the residents being single people with ties to the area or are employed locally. He expressed the view that he is aware that there is the need for this type of smaller unit in this location due to the engagement that he has had with the Private Sector Housing Team, and he explained that he has been in contact with them along with the Fire Service since 2017 to look at way to improve the layout of the communal staircase, with there being plans in place to have the issues with the staircase rectified before the pandemic but due to Covid those plans have been delayed.

Mr Popat made the point that there are plans in place to refurbish the building completely with energy efficient heating systems, a full insulation program along with new kitchens and bathrooms and a new fire alarm system, with these improvements allowing all the units to be self-contained making it a more pleasant environment for the residents to live in. He explained that the main reason for the application was to assist an elderly resident currently residing on the top floor, who needs to reside on a lower floor due to mobility reasons.

Mr Popat stated that he has spoken to Councillors Hoy and Wallwork along with Wisbech Town Councillor Peter Human about the application and they do support the proposal and have stated that they recognise the need for small cost-effective rental units locally. He asked the committee to support the application as he will be providing high standard, energy efficient units to rent locally whilst restoring a large building.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Miscandlon asked for clarification as to how many of the properties are non-compliant with the requirement for this type of accommodation? Alison Hoffman stated at 3.3 of the officer's report it shows the details of the existing accommodation which demonstrates that 3 of the 5 properties exceed the technical housing guidance and 2 fall below. She explained that should the proposal be approved, there would be 2 out of the 6 over the technical standards and 4 of the 6 would fall below the technical standard.
- Councillor Murphy stated that he understands that it is the landlord's intention to implement further refuse bins and asked whether it could state that there 'has' to be the right amount of waste receptacles at the site? Alison Hoffman explained that colleagues from the refuse team have made her aware that Mr Popat has been engaged with them to order and get the bins in place. She added that there would be a requirement for the new development, should it be approved, to make provision for the refuse bins.
- Councillor Connor referred to 5.3 of the report where it states that the Council's Private Sector Housing Team have no objection to the proposal, whereas the views of the Planning Officer are totally different. Alison Hoffman stated that there are two totally different legislative frameworks and policy considerations, explaining that the housing team does work to a prescribed space standard and the current Local Plan does not have prescribed space standard. She added that the technical housing standards come after 2014 and the underpinning requirement of LP2 and LP16 is to create a high-quality environment. Alison Hoffman added that if an existing development has an element of sub-standard residential accommodation and it is compared against the National Technical Housing Standards, if the number of units is being increased, in her opinion, it would be remiss of planning officers to not highlight that level of detail to members. She explained that the agent and applicant have reduced the level of residential units proposed but she made the point that there is only so much that can be factored into the existing footprint.

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

- Councillor Benney stated that there are good properties that blend well into being divided up and then there are some that are over developed and, in his view, the officer's recommendation of refusal is correct. He added that if the application was approved the people that live there would suffer and their standard of living would be poor and the

reduction in their living standards would also be reduced as well as the quality of life of those people that should be protected, and he will support the officer's recommendation.

- Councillor Sutton stated that as part of the planning process, efforts should be made to improve the accommodation for people to have a better life and not make it any worse. He added that to have four units below the standard and only two above does not satisfy him and he will support the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Miscandlon likened the units to rabbit hutches, and stated that he agrees with the officer's recommendation, making the point the proposal is trying to fit too much into the existing footprint. He expressed the view that the health and wellbeing of the residents is paramount, and the proposal is detrimental to both current and future residents.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she notes from the photographs that there is a basement property and she made reference to a previous application in Wisbech which the committee refused because it was not up to standard. She asked whether officers could advise what the basement property consists of? Alison Hoffman stated that the basement flat is established through a certificate of lawfulness, explaining that the basement is a one bedroomed self-contained flat with separate kitchen, living room and bathroom which is one of the larger units.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that on the photographs it showed the refuse bins which are cited outside the window and if the proposal includes each property having its own bin, it will be detrimental to the resident who lives in that flat as they will be looking out of their window onto an array of dustbins. Alison Hoffman stated that officers did consider that fact and historically one of the flats had two bins and the other four had a bag service, however, she made the point that ideally residents should have proper waste receptacles. She added that all officers can consider as part of the planning application is the impact of the additional bins and work on the assumption that two extra bins would be further away from the window, in her opinion, it could not be argued that the bins would actually impact on residential amenity.

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

P72/22

F/YR21/1037/F

LAND SOUTH OF MILLCROFT, MILL LANE, GOREFIELD

CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FOR THE USE OF TRAVELLERS INCLUDING SITING OF 2 X MOBILE HOMES, ERECTION OF TIMBER SHED, STABLE/TACK ROOM AND 1.2 POST AND RAIL Paddock FENCING AND CONSTRUCTION VEHICULAR ACCESS AND 1.502 (MAX) METRE HIGH EARTH BUND

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

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Muriel and Martin Aldin, the applicants. Mrs Aldin stated that she has moved from Scotland with her animals to be nearer her family due to her age so that they are able to look after her. Mr Aldin explained that his mother is 86 years old and the family suggested to her that she moved back to the area so that the family can care and look after her as a family unit.

Members received a written representation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Alexandra Patrick, the agent, read by Member Services. Mrs Patrick stated that the application has the support from the gypsy traveller liaison officer, a family tree to show the links of the applicants to the Aldin family along with confidential evidence of the situation her clients are in. She expressed the view that evidence has been shown the site is imperative to aid Mr Aldin's

mother and wife's mental well-being and safety as a family unit together.

Mrs Patrick expressed the opinion that this is a very similar application to the approved F/YR22/0338/F- Seadyke Bank, Murrow, F/YR21/0309/F- Garden Lane, Wisbech St Mary, and F/YR21/1501/F- Wolf lane, Leverington, which are all small plots in nature, all in Flood Zone 3 and all within close proximity to one another. In relation to the Flood Zone 3 area, if the committee consented to this application, she feels this could be addressed by installing an emergency loft window for access to the roof in the event of a flood if it is agreed appropriate.

Mrs Patrick stated that Mr Aldin is self-employed and fully self-sufficient, they will not put a stress on Council services, and they do not own any other property that they can move to, they bought this piece of land on the basis that it can also house their beloved horses and such.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she has noted from the report that there is no up to date GTNA (Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment) and asked when that is likely to be available? Nick Harding stated that a new team of consultants are now engaged with this assessment, however, there are no timescales available as to when the completion date will be. Councillor Connor stated that he has been advised that the timescale is likely to be approximately six months before that will be ready.
- Councillor Mrs French made the point that it is commendable that the family are going to look after their mother.
- Councillor Sutton stated that, in the last version of the five-year land supply, it indicated that there is a five-year supply of GTNA sites. Nick Harding stated that he would expect that the figures in that document will be comparing the planning permissions that were granted in relation to the most recent GTNA that is known to be out of date. He added that Central Government requires an assessment to be carried out to understand what the other needs that there might be, which have not been identified purely by surveys of existing families.
- Councillor Sutton stated that with regard to flood risk he can recall historically the views of an officer from the Environment Agency who had stated that in no uncertain terms that a caravan can be sited on Flood Zone 3 land, but now it appears to be acceptable, whereas there is a great concern about siting a 2-storey house on such land.
- Nick Harding stated that there is Government policy and guidance that identifies the vulnerability of different types of land uses and by using that against the flood risk matrix it determines in what circumstance the flood risk assessment needs to be submitted and whether or not a sequential test needs to be undertaken.

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

**P73/22 F/YR21/1343/O
LAND EAST OF 137 UPWELL ROAD, MARCH
ERECT UP TO 9NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS
RESERVED)**

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

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Shanna Jackson, the agent. Mrs Jackson stated that the application is for up to nine dwellings and has been submitted in an outline form with all matters reserved, with the application being an

excellent opportunity, in her view, to provide high quality executive style housing which has the support of March Town Council and also from many local residents. She stated that the application has been recommended for refusal on four reasons which include the impact on the character of the area, flood risk, highway safety and ecology issues.

Mrs Jackson stated that the committee report considers that the proposal would cause harm to the character and rural nature of that particular part of Upwell Road, and whilst the comments of the officer are noted, in her opinion, that view is subjective. She stated that the site will provide large executive dwellings which will positively promote this particular part of March and, in her opinion, it would be of a significant benefit rather than cause harm.

Mrs Jackson stated that the proposal sits comfortably in the natural boundaries of the site, whilst still providing an access for modern farming equipment to access the rear land and provide an easement for the drain to the east. She expressed the view that the generous plot sizes will still enable the views of the open countryside which will still be visible from the Upwell Road highway and the semi-rural character of this part of March will not be lost as a result of the development.

Mrs Jackson stated that she is aware that part of the site falls within Flood Zone 1 and also that plots 6 to 9 are within Flood Zone 3 but the submitted Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that all of the dwellings will be technically safe from flooding and the Environment Agency has raised no objections. She explained that the finished floor levels will be consistent across the site and technically no dwelling will be at greater risk than another despite the change in flood zones and, in her opinion, there is no increased risk to people or property in terms of flood risk.

Mrs Jackson referred to the third reason of refusal which relates to highway safety and expressed the view that she finds the reason somewhat harsh given that the details of access are not committed for consideration at this current stage. She stated that within the indicative drawings the individual access points have been shown as this is a requirement for planning validation and she pointed out that there are concerns with regards to the access points which are in the 40mph zone due to the insufficient visibility at those points but, in her opinion, there are two simple solutions to those concerns, with one solution to overcome the highway concerns being to extend the 30mph limit to the extent of the development site so that a lesser visibility requirement is necessary, and the other solution would be to bring a single point of access within the existing 30mph zone to serve the whole of the development and she feels that either of these options could be secured by means of a planning condition and submitted as part of the reserved matters submission.

Mrs Jackson pointed out that with regards to the ecology concerns, the detail of those can be required if deemed necessary. She added that a neighbouring resident who supports the application asked Mrs Jackson to read out a few words on their behalf. 'I would like to support the application as I feel that it would be beneficial to the road scene coming into town. This application will return the view coming into town to ribbon style development instead of the blocked view that would be created by application F/YR19/0931 when that is built. This was mentioned at the time of the application in 2019 by officers and if approved the current application will correct the street scene by masking the back land development in a beneficial way which is already approved at 137 Upwell Road. The application also appears to be a high quality of good-sized properties, setting a good impression of the town on entry.'

Mrs Jackson stated that there are considerable benefits which outweigh the harm as stated in the officer's reason for refusal, with the benefits including the opportunity for high quality housing in a primary market town and setting a positive scene on the approach into March. She pointed out that there is demand for such development as the applicant has already been approached by people wishing to purchase the plots and the application has the support of March Town Council and local residents and there are no objections from any technical consultees which cannot be easily overcome.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French pointed out that the Environment Agency have no objections to the proposal as issues concerning drainage falls under the remit of the Internal Drainage Boards.
- Councillor Miscandlon pointed out that historically there was another development slightly further along from the application being determined and at that time there were concerns raised with regards to visibility and access onto the highway and the solution was to cut down the trees on Upwell Road. He made the point that it is a lovely avenue of trees, and he would hate to see that happen again. Councillor Miscandlon asked officers for their thoughts with regards to the removal of any further trees along that section of Upwell Road? Nick Harding stated that the trees in that location fall under the remit of the County Council as they are on the highway and, therefore, it would be their decision as to whether they are removed. David Rowen stated that the officer's report makes reference to the cumulative impact that the verges and trees have on creating the verdant character as you approach March and whilst the trees are the responsibility of the Highway Authority, if they were to be removed, the officer's view is that it would be detrimental to the character of the area.

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

- Councillor Cornwell made the point that in the report the map highlights the site in red, but if you go north and south there is nothing and the application site is totally isolated and, in his opinion, it does not make any environmental sense. He stated that if you are considering an area plan it would totally ruin any vision for anything that was being considered for that particular area. Councillor Cornwell expressed the view that he does not think that the application is sustainable and he does not support it at all.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees with the point made by Councillor Cornwell and stated that the proposal will not enhance Upwell Road at all. She pointed out that in December 2020, Upwell Road suffered from a severe flooding event, and it has only recently had some of the drains piped near Eastwood Cemetery. Councillor Mrs French stated that it is a main drain which runs along there, and she explained that she has been working with the County Council to map out all of the ditches and dykes in the area and the March area has been fully completed. She added that every step will be taken to mitigate any kind of flooding and made that point that it is a main drain and there are endangered species in the drain. Councillor Mrs French stated that as a riparian dyke it will always belong to the County Council, and she questioned who would be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the other side if the proposal was built out. She stated that as part of the March Area Transport Study that she is involved in some work has been undertaken concerning Upwell Road where speed cushions are being introduced and the speed limit is being lowered in some areas from 60mph to 40mph and from 40mph to 30mph. Councillor Mrs French expressed the opinion that there is no way she could support the application.
- Councillor Connor made the point that riparian drains do cause issues as nobody wishes to take ownership of them.
- Councillor Skoulding expressed the opinion that he disagrees with some of the points made as there is still farmland behind and the farmer will keep the drains clear in order to maintain his crops. He added that he is familiar with that road, and he made the point that the road does flood near the cemetery but not near the site. Councillor Skoulding stated that when you come past the railway line, in his opinion, that is when you are entering the town of March and he does not see any problem with the application. He added that there are two roads, Coleseed Road and also another road which goes round to Barkers Lane which all have drains and are kept clear. Councillor Skoulding added that if the last three dwellings are going to be built up higher, they will be an asset to the town and look nice upon entry into March.
- Nick Harding pointed out to Councillor Connor and also to Councillor Skoulding a dyke shown on Google Street view from 2010 which is not maintained.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that if the dyke is at the edge of the highway it belongs to the

County Council and there is no knowledge of it being piped. David Rowen stated that when he visited the site recently there was no evidence of the drain having been piped as it looks as it did in the 2010 images. Councillor Mrs French stated that she will raise this issue with the County Council to ensure the information held is up to date.

- Councillor Skoulding made the point that he is able to identify the manhole point and the part of Upwell Road which has been piped.
- Councillor Mrs Davis referred to 1.5 of the officer's report where it states that the proposed dwellings plots 6, 7 and 9 are in Flood Zone 3 and it also states that it has failed the sequential test. She added that it does not matter that only half of them are in Flood Zone 3 as it has failed the sequential test and there are places around where those houses could be built quite safely.

Proposed by Councillor Cornwell, seconded by Councillor Miscandlon and agreed that the application should be REFUSED as per the officer's recommendation.

(Councillors Connor, Mrs French and Skoulding declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they are members of March Town Council but take no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Skoulding declared that he owns property in Upwell Road, but it would not make any difference to his decision making and voting on the application)

**P74/22 F/YR21/1439/O
LAND WEST OF 78-88 STATION ROAD, MANEA
ERECT UP TO 4NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS
RESERVED)**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Archie Hirson, the applicant. Mr Hirson stated that he is seeking approval for four dwellings on Station Road in Manea, which was previously before the committee in July 2022 when it was deferred for an ecological report and sequential test details to be provided. He explained that the documentation is in line with the plans for the village and meets the critical tests applied and that the key points are fully supported and there are no objections to the pre-submitted documents from the consultees.

Mr Hirson stated that Manea is identified as a growth village and the adopted Local Plan reflects its range of local services, school, pubs, shops, modern dwellings as well as the railway station which has recently seen a major upgrade. He expressed the view that the recent developments have resulted not only in the historic core of the village now being almost entirely linked to the previously outlined development areas but now the plan looks to create accessible and desirable dwellings in Manea.

Mr Hirson stated that members will have seen when they visited the site that the plot is exceptional in the fact that it is under utilized for needed housing and represents a gap in the shape of the village and the existing linear development precedent set on Station Road. He referred to the issues arising from the previous deferral and stated that in terms of the potential ecological impact, an additional ecological report has been carried out and it has concluded that the potential ecological impact is unlikely in every category with no requirement for any additional surveys and this aligns entirely with the assessments from Natural England and there is no evidence of any potential impact on wildlife in the area.

Mr Hirson stated a detailed sequential test has been submitted and met which has demonstrated that there are no other reasonable available relevant sites at lower risk of flooding. He added that as a result of the sequential test being met an exception test was carried out and was again met and he made the point that the exception test is made up of two points, firstly exception test A where the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk and, in his view, there would be considerable sustainable, economic and social benefits in addition to the immediate economic benefits to the local construction professionals and businesses with the economic, social and cultural contribution being ongoing as the residents of the proposed dwellings would bring additional spending to the village as well as using the local services and facilities.

Mr Hirson stated that the dwellings will be built to a modern and green specification which will benefit from triple glazing, heat source air pumps and solar panels on the roofs. He expressed the view that by walking to the train station and village amenities it will reduce the need to use private vehicles which is a key environmental consideration.

Mr Hirson stated that on exception test B, the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk overall. He stated that although the site is positioned in an area marked as Flood Zone 3, the mapping is based on the assumption that the land is undefended which is not the case as it is widely accepted that the Fens has the best defended and managed river system in the country and the actual risk of flooding is not reflected in this categorization.

Mr Hirson stated that in common with most of Fenland the area is subject to layered engineering management defences and specifically the Mid-Level Barrier Bank provides a 1 in 100 year plus climate change protection and this is further reduced by free board in the Manea and Welney District Commissioners system and the Environment Agency has raised no objections. He stated that as the land owner of the site he can confirm that it has not suffered any effects of flooding, historically or in more recent years.

Mr Hirson hoped the information he has provided supports what he hopes is an exciting and progressive part of Manea's ongoing development.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that David Rowen had made the point that there have been 61 applications and, therefore, there are 61 other places that houses could be built that have passed the sequential test. David Rowen made the point that by reviewing the sequential test information that has been submitted by the applicant it identifies a number of extant planning permissions for a number of dwellings which equates to 61 dwellings within Manea which would be sequentially preferable.

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

- Councillor Cornwell made the point that the application maybe near the station, but it is not near the centre of the village.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that the application was deferred previously for the ecology report and the sequential test and that it why it has come before the committee having still not met the requirements. She expressed the opinion that she will support the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Benney stated that the land does need development and Manea needs houses, with the Combined Authority having worked with the Council to invest and rejuvenate the Station Car Park and there is the need for houses in Manea. He added that there is the want for the station to survive and growth is needed in the villages but whilst there may be a significant number of other places that potentially could be built on that does not mean that any of those plots will be built on compared to the proposal before members that might be.

Councillor Benney stated that the ecology report is fine and that the sequential test has been done and the proposal will bring much needed houses to the area so he could consider supporting the proposal.

- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she disagrees with Councillor Benney, and she made the point that if there is the demand for houses there are 61 places that are not being built on and developers build to demand, and she questioned whether the demand is really there otherwise they would be built out.
- Nick Harding stated that consideration does need to be given to the planning consents that are still in place and are available to implement and the rules that officers have to follow state that they do have to be counted and should not be ignored. He added that with regards to the need for residential development the Council does have a demonstrable five-year land supply that is quite healthy, and the Council is also meeting that housing delivery test as well.

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

P75/22

F/YR22/0884/PIP

LAND NORTH OF HILL VIEW, EASTWOOD END, WIMBLINGTON

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 9 X DWELLINGS INVOLVING THE FORMATION OF AN ACCESSES (APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE)

David Rowen presented the report to members.

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Matthew Hall, the agent. Mr Hall stated that he is pleased to see the officer's recommendation is to approve the application and explained that there was an appeal decision at 32 Eastwood End in July 2021, which advised that Eastwood End was more consistent with a growth village than an elsewhere location and since the date of the appeal, applications have been approved at Eastwood End. He stated that although technical details would be considered at the next stage, the trees that are located at the far eastern corner of the site would be maintained.

Mr Hall pointed out that the site is located in Flood Zone 1 and a full measured survey of the road has been undertaken in the area and access and visibility splays can all be achieved in accordance with the County Council requirements. He stated that members will be aware of a condition for a footpath to be set from the development to the east of the site and discussions have taken place with the designer and the County Council and technical approval is to be given, with the footpath extending all along the front of the site which has been approved under a previous application in 2019 for three dwellings to the east.

Mr Hall referred members to the presentation screen and pointed out that the plan indicates three other planning applications that have all been approved by the committee in 2019, 2021 and 2022 and explained to members where the proposed site is on the presentation slide. He pointed out the site where an application was approved in 2021 for three dwellings, with works already having commenced to two of those properties, the site which received approval in 2019 for three dwelling, with two having already commenced construction and the northern site indicated on the map was approved in 2022 for nine further dwellings.

Members asked Mr Hall the following questions:

- Councillor Cornwell pointed out that from the presentation it appears that there is a piece of land which seems to be land locked and he asked whether there is any likelihood of another

application being submitted to overcome that? Mr Hall explained that the proposal before members and the site directly to the east for three dwellings are under the same ownership, however, the parcel of land that Councillor Cornwell referred to is owned by somebody different.

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

- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that in the emerging Local Plan the proposed site would not be permitted, and no further sites would be allowed at Eastwood End in any event. She made the point that the entrance to the site is very close to the A141 and any vehicles coming off the A141 at speed could cause a road traffic accident and there is a danger there.
- Councillor Skoulding stated that he cannot see any reason why the application could be refused as the others have been passed although he does have concerns with regards to any children needing to cross the main road, however, to remain consistent he will support the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Benney stated that he agrees with the officer's recommendation and there are no reasons to refuse the application.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that there is no provision to cross the A141 and when the technical details come forward, he would like to see the developer include some provision for crossing the A141 which is an extremely dangerous road.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees it is a very dangerous 50mph road and there have been several accidents there over the last few months.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that the accidents have been vehicular to the best of her knowledge.
- Councillor Mrs Davis asked for a request that at the technical stage there would need to be some form of street lighting included which needs to be adopted by the Highway Authority.
- Nick Harding stated that if permission in principle is granted there will be the subsequent technical application submitted and then the County Council Highways team will identify whether or not they feel that any improvement measures are required at that crossing or whether a lit footway has to be provided as part of the application. He added that he is mindful that no such improvements were required in relation to the application to the north. Nick Harding stated that if they identify that improvements are required, they will then need to determine what those improvements will be.

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

(Councillors Benney, Connor, Cornwell, Mrs Davis, Mrs French, Mrs Mayor, Murphy, Skoulding and Sutton declared, under Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they had been lobbied on this application)

(Councillors Benney stated that the agent for this item is known to him in a professional capacity, but it would not make any difference to his decision making and voting on the application)

(Councillor Connor declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he represents Doddington and Wimblington as a Fenland District Councillor and attends their meetings but takes no part in planning matters)

(Councillor Mrs Davis declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that she is Chairman of Wimblington Parish Council but takes no part in planning matters)

P76/22

F/YR22/0939/FDC

LAND SOUTH OF 55 WOOD STREET, CHATTERIS

ERECT UP TO 2NO DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED)

David Rowen presented the report to members.

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

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

- Councillor Skoulding stated that he is happy with the officer's proposal now he has seen the road layout.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that he notes that Chatteris Town Council are not in favour of the proposal and expressed the view that it is a loss of a piece of open space which he would prefer to see left as an area of open grassland with planting as it has been there for a very long time and has never been built on.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that it is mentioned in the report about issues with regard to visibility when leaving the car park which may cause problems in her view.
- Councillor Benney stated that the land has never been built on and you can still access the leisure centre without any problems. He added that the Highway Authority have not raised any concerns and explained that the site has also encountered issues of fly tipping. Councillor Benney pointed out that Chatteris Town Council have expressed the opinion that it is over development, but he does not agree with that view, and he does see any problems with the proposal at all.
- Councillor Connor stated that he does not see any issues with the proposal, and he will also be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs Davis expressed the view that she does not see how the committee can say that there should not be development on this parcel of land when, in her opinion, it is a much more insignificant piece of land compared to the piece of land that has just received approval for four dwellings to be built on in Wimblington.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that there is a hedgerow which surrounds the front of the properties and if that is not maintained it could end up restricting the view of those people exiting the car park and he questioned whether a condition could be applied to ensure that they are maintained regularly.
- David Rowen stated that would be something that could be considered at the reserved matters stage when it is submitted.

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

(Councillors Benney, Mrs French and Murphy declared that whilst a Cabinet decision was made in relation to this application, they are not pre-determined on this application and will approach it with an open mind)

(Councillors Benney and Murphy declared, under Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that they are members of Chatteris Town Council but take no part in planning matters)

P77/22 CONFIDENTIAL - PREVIOUS MINUTES

The confidential minutes of 19 October 2022 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

(Members resolved to exclude the public from the meeting for this item of business on the grounds that it involved the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)

5.25 pm

Chairman