

PLANNING COMMITTEE



WEDNESDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2025 - 1.00 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor C Marks (Vice-Chairman), Councillor I Benney and Councillor S Imafidon, Councillor P Murphy (Substitute)

APOLOGIES: Councillor R Gerstner and Councillor M Purser,

Officers in attendance: David Grant (Senior Development Officer), Tom Donnelly (Senior Development Officer), Matthew Leigh (Head of Planning), Hayleigh Parker-Haines (Senior Development Officer), Stephen Turnbull (Legal Officer) and Jo Goodrum (Member Services & Governance Officer)

P73/25 PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of 12 November 2025 were confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

P74/25 F/YR25/0726/PIP LAND SOUTH OF 29 PRIMROSE HILL, DODDINGTON PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR 2 X DWELLINGS

The Legal Officer stated that the application is for residential and workplace use and the issue facing the Council is that there is no power which allows it to impose planning conditions or Section 106 obligations on a Planning in Principle (PIP) application. He explained that the advice that he has given the committee is that it would be better for the application to be deferred in order to allow time for discussions to take place with the applicant to consider amending the application to make it more efficient for the application to be approved or refused and then if it were to be approved it would be framed in the correct way so that members could achieve what they want in that event.

Councillor Connor stated that he is sorry that this issue has not been highlighted prior to today's meeting and apologised to the applicant and agent for the issue which has arisen and also to members who have spent time reading the reports and have undertaken site visits.

Councillor Connor asked members whether they were content with the legal advice which had been provided to them and members unanimously agreed that they were.

Councillor Benney stated that it is disappointing that issue this has not been identified prior to today as the application has been in the planning system for a long time. He asked the Head of Planning to confirm whether the application is going to be brought back before the committee for determination? Matthew Leigh explained that as members are aware a new scheme of delegation is being introduced by Central Government and it is not likely to be heard by the House of Lords for at least another two months and he does not see any reason why this application will not be brought back to committee in January.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Marks and agreed that the application be DEFERRED.

(Councillor Benney declared that the agent has undertaken work for Chatteris Town Council and himself personally, but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open

mind)

(Councillor Imafidon declared that the agent has undertaken work for him personally, but he is not pre-determined, and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Marks declared, in accordance with Paragraph 2 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he had been lobbied on this application)

P75/25 **F/YR25/0729/PIP**
LAND NORTH OF 10 PRIMROSE HILL, DODDINGTON
PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE TO ERECT 4 WORKPLACE DWELLINGS

The Legal Officer stated that he has advised the committee that this application should be deferred due to the fact that the Council cannot currently impose conditions to regulate the development and a deferral will enable discussions to take place with the applicant.

Members confirmed that they agree with the legal advice provided to them.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Marks and agreed that the application be DEFERRED.

(Councillor Benney declared that the agent has undertaken work for Chatteris Town Council and himself personally, but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Imafidon declared that the agent has undertaken work for him personally, but he is not pre-determined, and will consider the application with an open mind)

P76/25 **F/YR25/0730/PIP**
LAND NORTH OF THE QUADRANT, PRIMROSE HILL, DODDINGTON
PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR 2 X DWELLINGS

The Legal Officer stated that he has advised the committee that this application should be deferred due to the fact that the Council cannot currently impose conditions to regulate the development and a deferral will enable discussions to take place with the applicant.

Members confirmed that they agree with the legal advice provided to them.

Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Marks and agreed that the application be DEFERRED.

(Councillor Benney declared that the agent has undertaken work for Chatteris Town Council and himself personally, but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Imafidon declared that the agent has undertaken work for him personally, but he is not pre-determined, and will consider the application with an open mind)

P77/25 **F/YR25/0258/VOC**
LAND EAST OF THE ELMS, CHATTERIS
VARIATION OF CONDITION 7 (SOUTHERN ACCESS) AND REMOVAL OF
CONDITION 16 (LEAP) OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR22/0967/FDL (ERECT
UP TO 80 X DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED
IN RESPECT OF ACCESS)) - RE WORDING OF CONDITION.

Hayleigh Parker–Haines presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Councillor Benney, a District Councillor. Councillor Benney stated that the application site used to be in the ward but is now in his adjacent Council ward. He explained that this was a scheme that he looked at when he sat on the Investment Board and came under his portfolio holder responsibilities which is why he is not taking part in the discussion or voting for the item.

Councillor Benney stated he has always supported the application because when he first became a councillor for Birch Ward, he had several residents contact him with regards to a flooding issue in The Elms, explaining that when the Farriers Gate development was built at a higher level the water runs off from that development and into The Elms causing flooding to gardens which are often underwater as well as being halfway up the wheels of parked cars. He stated that at that time he went to see David Rowen, the Development Manager, and asked him what steps could be taken to overcome the drainage issue, and his professional advice was the best thing to resolve the issue will be to build near it and, in his view, this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to fix the flooding issues in The Elms.

Councillor Benney added that councillors can be unpopular for approving the granting planning permission amongst other things but fixing a situation so that residents houses do not flood is a vital part of a councillors role, which is why he has always supported this application because when he was the Portfolio Holder, he was involved in meetings with Lovells who are the construction company responsible for the build of the development. He added that during the course of one meeting he asked whether the development would fix the problem in The Elms, and he was advised that it would and he asked for a written guarantee that the proposal would fix the problems for the residents of The Elms, and it was confirmed by the Lovells representative that it would, with the response he was provided being as good as you are ever going to get as a councillor to reach a satisfactory resolution.

Councillor Benney explained that there are two attenuation ponds on the site which are located in order to take the water away from the application site as well as to take the water away that is flooding through from Farriers Gate, which is the only chance which will come forwards to fix the issue and it will be a lost opportunity if it does not go ahead. He explained that at the outline stage of the application it was going to be for 80 houses, however, that has now been reduced to just over 50 dwellings due to the amount of land which is required for the attenuation ponds to drain the water away which is why the variation of condition application is needed due to the costs of undertaking the work, which are prohibitive and could stop the development from going ahead.

Councillor Benney added that he appreciates that there is a loss of social housing from the proposal but there have been several houses approved in West Street and as a councillor there is the requirement to have social housing for local need as opposed to people being sent from outside the area because they need somewhere to live. He made the point that Chatteris is a nice place and he fully supports the application for the social housing that was passed which he appreciates is required but if the reduction in social housing means that the issue in The Elms is resolved then, in his view, it is a sacrifice which is worth it and he asked members to support the proposal.

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Marks asked Councillor Benney whether he was able to confirm how much social housing has been approved in Chatteris recently? Councillor Benney stated that he does not know a definitive number, but he explained that there is the whole estate located down West Street and the Hallam Land development will include an element of social housing. He added that there needs to be enough social housing in the first place for local need and it should not be the situation where people are just sent to Chatteris because it is cheap to live. Councillor Benney expressed the view that several years ago the Council were moving

people out of London, where the Housing Benefit equated to £1,500 a month and in Chatteris it was £600 per month. He expressed the opinion that he wants to keep Chatteris a nice place to live and the houses should be for local people. Councillor Benney stated that he does fully support the developments which are being undertaken but his focus with the current application is overcoming the drainage issues for the residents of The Elms.

- Councillor Marks asked Councillor Benney whether he can recall when the last episode of flooding occurred? Councillor Benney stated that he did not know as he is no longer the ward councillor where the site is located but does recall an instance where he was called to a meeting in a resident's home and the gardens were all under water and their cars had water above tyre level with the road at the bottom of The Elms being flooded. He made the point that this is a one-time opportunity to fix the problem and he would rather be unpopular for building something that people do not want than be unpopular for having a house that has 2ft of water running through it as it is a situation that people should not find themselves in.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that it is disappointing that there is a loss of affordable housing, but she does understand why. She asked Councillor Benney whether he is aware if the Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted on the proposal? Councillor Benney stated that he did not know as he is no longer the Portfolio Holder he is no longer involved in briefings.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from John Mason, the agent. Mr Mason stated that the application seeks to amend several key aspects of an outline planning permission granted by the Council in September 2024. He added that the outline application for land east of The Elms, approved the principle of up to 80 dwellings on the site and the principle of access from The Elms and all other matters were reserved.

Mr Mason stated that the site has been purchased by Fenland Future Limited (FFL) for delivery and he explained that FFL is the wholly owned subsidiary of the Council and the purpose of FFL is to deliver much needed housing and to provide a financial return to the Council which can be used to support Council services and local projects. He made the point that the site in Chatteris provides FFL with the opportunity to build a range of homes for local people and to provide a revenue stream for the Council, with the FFL employing highly experienced construction company Lovell Partnerships (LP) to design and deliver a housing scheme which provides much needed local housing and additional revenue back to the Council and maximising the financial return from the site.

Mr Mason explained that following the outline approval FFL and LP have been working with the architects and engineers to fully understand the constraints of the site and this has led to three key changes being proposed which require an amendment to the outline application. He made the point that the site is at risk of surface water flooding and the outline application including limited detail on how surface water could be safely managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Mr Mason added that updates to the Environment Agency's flood map to account for climate change now suggest that the site is more at risk than previously thought and that as a result a cut and fill exercise will be proposed in order to raise some parts of the site and lower others to ensure that the new homes are protected from flooding and any flood waters can be directed out of the site to the east. He stated that as a result this has reduced the developable area and increased the engineering costs meaning that only 54 homes can now be delivered instead of 80 and there cannot be any affordable housing included.

Mr Mason explained that this change has been subject to robust scrutiny with officers and third-party consultants, and he added that whilst there has been some disagreement concerning the exact construction costs, all parties agree that the scheme will not be viable if it provides affordable housing and consequently would not be able to proceed. He added that the second key change is with regards to the vehicular link to the south, however, the outline application only proposed a link

from The Elms, which was on the basis of highways modelling done at the time and this is what was shown on the approved outline plans.

Mr Mason explained that a pedestrian and cycle link to the south will have several advantages and, in his opinion, it will promote walking and cycling through the developments to the east of Chatteris and will link the public footpaths to the town centre and out to the countryside. He added that it will also limit the traffic going through The Elms which will now only have a vehicular link to the homes on the application site rather than a vehicular link to homes across the entire eastern allocation.

Mr Mason made the point that the change has been reviewed with the Highways Authority and Planning Officers who have confirmed that by removing the link it will comply with both the allocation and the outline application. He explained that he is also proposing to remove the public play area from the site and make a commuted sum payment of £67,000 to replace and improve existing play equipment nearby.

Mr Mason stated that the proposed homes are already within walking distance of several play areas and officers agree that it will be better for the local community if the existing play areas are upgraded, making the point that a play area on the application site would duplicate existing provision and would also be located in areas at risk of flooding which may limit its usability. He stated that if the application is approved then FFL will move forward with the reserved matters submission for 54 dwellings which will set out the precise layout and designs of the homes and open space.

Mr Mason made the point that FFL in partnership with Lovells are confident that the scheme is deliverable and they will be able to get on site in good time to ensure that the new homes can be delivered. He added that it is regrettable that the site cannot deliver affordable homes and the site will continue to play an important part in delivering housing, open space and pedestrian and cycle connections for the district whilst fulfilling the aims of the allocation.

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French asked whether the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have been contacted with regards to the existing flood issues which are being experienced? Mr Mason explained that he has already submitted the reserved matters application which contains a detailed surface water drainage scheme and his engineer has been engaging with the LLFA on a pre application basis to agree the plans and the reserved matters application has also been subject to consultation as well from the LLFA and Anglian Water. He explained that their written responses already appears online which approves the drainage strategy and officers will be making their assessment of that shortly. Mr Mason added that it is his understanding that with regards to the surface water flooding issues is that the water comes into the site from a variety of directions and the cut and fill exercise will create contour lines which will channel the water out of the site and out to the countryside to the east taking flood water from the surrounding areas and direct the water in a controlled manner.
- Councillor Mrs French referred to the public open space and the proposed financial contribution that has been stated, and she expressed the opinion that as the Portfolio Holder for Parks and Open Spaces it is far preferable to have better quality play areas as opposed to too many smaller ones.
- Councillor Marks stated that he understands that the £67,000 will be for the park provision, however, he asked for clarification as to what the actual original figure was for the initial proposed park? Mr Mason stated that in the original viability review there was a figure for public open space and it is his understanding that the £67,000 figure was provided by the Public Open Spaces Team.
- Councillor Marks stated that there is going to be a loss of social housing which he is concerned about and he added that there is a very large attenuation pond proposed on site

which will affect land use and he questioned whether that is one of the reasons why there is a loss of social housing. Mr Mason explained that it formed part of the flood engineering works that are creating the areas of raised and lowered land, they can only raise enough land to lower the equivalent amount of land which means that you are not going to flood back into The Elms and as a result it means that there is a tightly defined developable area. He explained that by increasing the developable area to include a play area would mean that there would be the requirement to deepen those channels for surface water which was reaching the point where it would not work anymore. Mr Mason stated that the balance has been struck where the land will be raised and that can only fit 54 homes plus the engineering works means it is no longer viable to provide the 20% affordable homes.

- Councillor Connor stated that whilst he was initially disappointed with regards to the loss of social housing, he is now content that the works being undertaken will alleviate the flooding from the nearby properties which is a very positive step.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Marks asked what the initial figure was which was submitted for the play area? Matthew Leigh explained that officers do not have the information submitted by the applicant in their original assessment for what they were looking to spend. He added that the figure officers have, which has been negotiated in the Section 106 contributions, relates to what the Parks and Open Spaces Team were looking for in 2021 in relation to improvements and enhancements to the existing play facilities and officers have index linked it up to the figure as stated within the officer's report.
- Councillor Marks requested clarity that it was considered in 2021? Matthew Leigh confirmed that the figure has been index linked and is now, therefore, higher as originally the figure was £60,000.
- Councillor Connor expressed the view that £67,000 does not provide much play area equipment and is very frugal amount. Matthew Leigh explained that the issue of the application is viability and the reason that the request for this amount of money is still valid is to make the scheme acceptable because of the shortfall on site.
- Councillor Murphy stated that the land needs to be built on and was earmarked for housing 30 years ago.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that the figure of £67,000 is irrelevant because by the time the reserved matters is submitted and works starts it is likely to be another four or five years. She stated that the Council are working on Inspire and Place and Pride projects and as a result of funding from Central Government, every play area across the district is being assessed and reviewed, which could mean that the play areas in Chatteris will be enhanced. Councillor Mrs French expressed the opinion that she is delighted that the flooding issue has been considered by the agent and applicants as it has been a known problem for some time. She stated that she will support the application and referred to the fact that Chatteris Town Council are of the opinion that the application should have been determined by another authority but made the point that the Planning Committee members are very experienced, and she does not agree with the comments that they have made which she finds to be offensive.
- Councillor Connor stated that he agrees with Councillor Mrs French adding that members of the committee are experienced and he was also the Chairman of the County Council's Planning Committee.
- Councillor Marks stated that £67,000 is only a small amount and he is concerned with regards to the loss of the social housing, but there is community benefit by dealing with the drainage further along the road, making the point that the land was earmarked for housing 30 years ago when the bypass was built. He stated that if there was just social housing on the site then it would be unaffordable anyway, meaning the land would never be built on and the flooding issue would still exist and, in his view, this is the best way forward for the land and for the surrounding community and he will support the application.

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

(Councillor Benney declared that as he was a previous member of Cabinet and sat on the Investment Board who are involved with Fenland Future Limited, he would take no part in the discussion and voting thereon, and following his presentation to the committee he left the meeting for the duration of the item)

(Councillor Imafidon declared that as he is a member of Fenland Future Limited, he would not take any part in the item and left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)

(Councillor Murphy registered, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a member of Chatteris Town Council but takes no part in planning)

**P78/25 F/YR25/0347/F
20 NENE PARADE, MARCH, PE15 8TD
ERECT 2X SELF-BUILD/CUSTOM BUILD DWELLINGS INVOLVING DEMOLITION
OF EXISTING DWELLING AND GARAGE WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA**

Hayleigh Parker-Haines presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Matthew Hall, the agent. Mr Hall stated that the application was deferred by the committee in June, with the committee agreeing to demolish the existing 1970's bungalow which is heavily damaged with subsidence and replacing it with two dwellings being acceptable. He explained that he has worked with officers to bring forward a recommendation of approval for 2 three bedroomed chalet bungalows in the middle of March, and he added that the applicant is happy to sign the self-build declaration and pay the fee.

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French thanked Mr Hall for taking into consideration the views of the Planning Committee and for working proactively with officers.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that if the application is approved, she would like to see a very strong condition added that during demolition and rebuild there is to be no parking allowed on Nene Parade. Hayleigh Parker-Haines stated that a condition for a construction management plan can be included to secure those details.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that the application was heavily debated in June and the agent, applicant and officers have worked successfully together.
- Councillor Benney stated that he welcomes the fact that the agent has worked with officers on the application and the application should now be approved.

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

(Councillor Marks assumed the position of Chairman due to Councillor Connor's declaration and being unable to Chair the item)

(Councillor Mrs French registered, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that she is a member of March Town Council, but takes no part in planning)

(Councillors Connor and Imafidon declared that as they were not present when the item was debated previously, they would not take part in the item for its entirety)

(Councillor Benney declared that the agent has undertaken work for Chatteris Town Council and himself personally, but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Murphy registered, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a Member of Chatteris Town Council but takes no part in planning. He added that he also knows the agent but has had no business dealings with him)

P79/25

F/YR25/0776/PIP

LAND NORTH OF 386 WISBECH ROAD, WESTRY

PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR UP TO 9 X DWELLINGS

Tom Donnelly presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mrs Simmons, an objector to the proposal. Mrs Simmons stated that the A141 is a major road which is very busy and Westry is an elsewhere location. She made the point that the report makes reference to the site being in Flood Zone 1 but according to the Government's flood maps it does state that the area is located in Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Mrs Simmons explained that there has been planning permission granted at The Paddocks and also across the road but the flood zone appears to be closer than a Flood Zone 1 and it also states that it is very close to Flood Zone 2 and she has severe concerns that her property will be flooded as a result. She explained that her property has suffered from frequent power cuts, along with total loss of water and in some instances very low water pressure, with the infrastructure and pressure on the utilities being unreliable at times and Westry is an isolated area with no nearby shops or facilities and poor public transport links with a very infrequent bus service.

Mrs Simmons added that the properties located across the road took over six months to rent out and, in her opinion, the proposed properties will also find it difficult to attract new residents and occupants will also find it difficult to cross the busy A141. She expressed the view that the surface water run off to existing properties needs to be considered as local residents are very concerned if the flooding situation worsens.

Mrs Simmons explained that the road suffers from severe congestion which causes hazards for emergency vehicles when they are trying to navigate the heavy traffic and, in her opinion, any additional development is only going to add to the existing chaos. She expressed the view that the proposal conflicts with LP3 of the Local Plan and is located in an isolated and unsustainable area, with the flood risk having been misinterpreted, the highway safety is of a concern as the application is on a major road and the demand for housing in Westry is low and the site is agricultural.

Mrs Simmons added that she has lived in other parts of March and moved to Westry in 2011 for a quieter environment and, in her view, the land should be left as agricultural as it has been up to October 2025 and there should be no development on that land when there are other suitable places to develop. She added that the objections which were submitted for the development at 433 Wisbech Road are also relevant to this application due to its proximity to the current application site.

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she also lives in Westry and has not experienced any loss of power or water. Mrs Simmons stated that throughout the year she experiences low water pressure, no water and issues with power cuts including twice in the last two weeks, with

the additional dwellings only going to add to the existing problems. She added that she also has concerns with regards to the increase in vehicles which may accompany the new dwellings. Mrs Simmons expressed the view that as the properties will be using cess pits the new residents will not be familiar with how cess pit systems operate and this could also add to environmental issues.

- Councillor Marks asked for clarity that the land was in agricultural use up until October and has the land just now been left as fallow or have they drilled it and left the site? Mrs Simmons explained that until October it was being farmed and there were bales of hay on the site and then following that the land was blocked off and the land was only being farmed at the other end. She stated that neighbouring properties have also noticed that the land has ceased agricultural use in that particular section from October of this year.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Matthew Hall, the agent. Mr Hall explained that the application is for linear development set between residential properties which, in his opinion, follows the form and character of the area even though at the back there are barn conversions. He stated that on the latest Environment Agency maps the application site is located in Flood Zone 1 and whilst he agrees that the land at the back is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 the application site is in Flood Zone 1.

Mr Hall explained that to the south of the site there are two barn conversions that were approved in Flood Zone 3 and they are single storey and referred to the presentation screen and pointed out the application site which, in his opinion, is infill development, making the point that when you review officers' reports for developments in Westry further to the south it does state that they consider that this part of Westry as part of March. He referred to the officer's presentation and stated that the officer pointed out that an appeal was submitted previously for a site 50 metres to the north of the application site and was refused planning permission and the appeal was dismissed about 7 years ago and that site that was dismissed is located between a large construction company and a large farming business.

Mr Hall explained that the current application site is set between residential properties and it faces all residential properties to the east and the north and a continuous built-up form to the south, with the site to the north being included in the emerging Local Plan and whilst it holds limited weight, in his view, somebody must have held the view that the site would be suitable for development even though it is located further north. He made the point that March Town Council support the application and none of the consultees have objected to a small-scale development for infill development for individual dwellings.

Members asked the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that in front of the proposed development there is a riparian dyke and whilst she appreciates that the application is only for planning in principle, it does need to be taken into serious consideration as does the inclusion of cess pits as there are no main sewers in Westry.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that if she wants to turn right out of her property she must turn left and use the roundabout to turn around. She added that she must rely on the traffic lights at Goosetree for her to turn and she asked Mr Hall to take that all those points into consideration.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she does not feel that there is enough information from any of the authorities especially highways. Matthew Leigh explained that when dealing with planning in principle applications there is no ability to really make any consideration outside the principle.
- Councillor Murphy stated that in the officer's presentation they referred to the site being in an elsewhere location but, in his opinion, it should be classed as an infill application. Tom

Donnelly explained that this is something that was considered for the appeal site on the opposite side of the road and at the time the Council in their refusal did contend that this was an elsewhere location. He explained that the appellant suggested that it did form part of the built-up form of March and that due to the distance from services, facilities and lack of public transport links, the Inspector concluded that this part of Westry would be classed as an elsewhere location.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she has lived in Westry for 41 years and over the years she has seen it grow, with there being one footpath which is not particularly good and that is located on the opposite side of the road. She expressed the view that she has concerns with regards to the dyke and cess pits and she explained that the contractor has been chosen for the traffic lights which are going to be installed at the Hobbs Lot junction with work commencing in the new year. Councillor Mrs French expressed the opinion that Westry cannot take anymore development and if the proposal was for 1 or 2 dwellings then it could be acceptable but in her view 9 is too many. She added that the issue at Lime Tree Close has been ongoing for 5 years and there is still no resolution and ,in her opinion, this application is going to be a nightmare waiting to happen and she cannot support it.
- Councillor Marks stated he has listened to the views of Councillor Mrs French who is the Ward Councillor and knows the area very well, with planning being about land use and the objector to the proposal highlighted her concerns with regards to the additional vehicles and he also has concerns with regard to the highways and the entry and exit from the site. He added that traffic can tail back for some distance which could include lorries turning into the factory if it reopens and, in his opinion, his major concern is regarding the highway, and he also feels that there is not enough detail which has been provided. Councillor Marks stated that he recognises the comments concerning problems with cess pits and low water pressure, but he believes that the proposal is for too many houses on too small a plot with too many vehicle movements and he cannot support it.
- Councillor Connor expressed the view that nine houses are far too many and he cannot support the application.

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

(Councillor Benney declared that the agent has undertaken work for Chatteris Town Council and himself personally, but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Imafidon declared that the agent has undertaken work for him personally, but he is not pre-determined, and will consider the application with an open mind)

**P80/25 TPO042025
TAVISTOCK ROAD, WISBECH**

Hayleigh Parker-Haines presented the report to members.

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

- Councillor Benney stated that it does not impede any works which need to be undertaken by having a Tree Preservation Order applied and if works needs to be undertaken to it which deem it to be unsafe then that can be done. He added that it does look to be a nice mature tree, and he feels that the order should be granted.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she concurs with view of Councillor Benney.

Proposed by Councillor Benney, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and agreed that the Tree Preservation Order in respect of 1 x Sycamore tree be CONFIRMED.

David Grant presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Lee Bevens, the agent. Mr Bevens stated that his clients moved into their property in December 1995 and have never suffered from any type of flooding episode or been waterlogged with surface water, with the only occasion where they have had an excess of water was outside their driveway on the road which was as a result of the road drain being blocked. He explained that on investigation the land distributor was blocked solid with mud and dirt which was cleared by highways and there have been no further occurrences.

Mr Bevens explained that report of the annual overflow of sewage detailed in some of the letters of objection has not happened at the address but is a recurring problem at Poppyfields where there is an ongoing issue that Councillor Marks is involved with. He stated that with regards to land drainage, the applicant has been paying drainage rates to Welney Internal Drainage Board on a yearly basis since 1995, and they also pay a farmer to clear the ditches twice a year around their land to cut and to dredge the ditches as and when required, with the applicant being aware that other landowners do not make payments and do not even pay for the pumps.

Mr Bevens added that the applicants' stables, barns, tack room, shed, poly tunnel and paddocks have also been in place for 29 to 30 years and 52 Station Road which is located north of their field also has brick buildings and stables located on the east side of the property which all protrude into the area of the countryside and go beyond the linear frontage of Station Road. He referred to the presentation screen and highlighted the recent planning applications which have been submitted along Station Road, and he pointed out the site to the north at 76 Station Road, which, whilst it had pig sheds located on the site, it still proposed the back land development.

Mr Bevens explained that the Planning Officer has stated that the application does not respect the rural character or linear settlement pattern of Station Road, making the point that the site to the north is also located in Flood Zone 3 and had to raise floor levels of the proposed dwellings. He explained that the next slide demonstrates that it is a triangular shaped area of land where the development is proposed and it is a self-contained parcel of land which is bound by Station Road and existing ditches to the north, south and east, with there being numerous outbuildings established behind the linear frontage of Station Road which were shown on the slide by red squares.

Mr Beven referred to the presentation screen and explained that the slide shows the site layout that formed the permission in principle for the rear of 76 Station Road and highlights the fact that there is a precedent already for back land development along Station Road. He added that whilst the proposed development is behind the frontage of Station Road it is following an example already established by the development already in place and also follows a general concept of development in Manea that has been behind the linear frontage.

Mr Bevens made reference to the developments in Westfield Road in Manea which also has a strong linear frontage and in recent years there have been numerous approved applications including 24 dwellings at Smart Close, 3 approved dwellings approved at land north of 100 Westfield Road, 9 self-build dwellings at 36 Westfield Road, 7 dwellings northwest of 34 Westfield Road and 8 dwellings at 18 Westfield Road, which are all behind a linear frontage. He expressed the view that at some point a scheme sets a precedent for back land development which can be

demonstrated along Westfield Road.

Mr Bevens expressed the view that the site has had the precedent set by the development to the north and is in a more sustainable location being within 10 minutes' walk of the village centre including the school and a 10-minute walk to the station and development is needed to support the station. He added that the applicant wishes to develop the site for a retirement property for themselves and a dwelling for their daughter, with the additional dwellings together with their current property paying for the dwellings to be built as well as supporting the required infrastructure.

Mr Bevens explained that further specific details on drainage, flooding and highways works would be submitted in a future technical details consent and he is confident that all those matters could be addressed without causing flooding to neighbouring properties ensuring highways safety and he asked the committee to look at the benefits of the scheme and support the application.

Members asked Mr Bevens the following questions:

- Councillor Marks referred to the comment made by Mr Bevens in which he was referred to, and explained that Poppyfields is a development which is located by Wisbech Road. He explained that he has been involved with flooding throughout the whole village and he organised a meeting with Anglian Water which Councillor Mrs French also attended to raise the various flooding issues that Manea suffers from.
- Councillor Imafidon asked whether there has been any consultation undertaken with the local Internal Drainage Boards? Mr Bevens stated that he has not consulted with them but there have been comments between the Drainage Board and the Lead Local Flood Authority with regards to the sequential test and it is his understanding that they were satisfied with regards to what has been undertaken and they are looking for further information which would come in as a result of the technical details consent.
- Councillor Marks expressed the opinion that the number of proposed dwellings is too many for such a small area, with Mr Bevens explaining that two of the dwellings will be for the applicant and the applicant's daughter which is only two dwellings out of a possible seven plus the existing house which is there. He added that the other major concern that he has is the actual entrance and exit on Station Road as the existing property stands forward and he has concerns with regards to the visibility as there are vehicles driving more than 40mph along that road and there is also a pavement used by children going to school. Councillor Marks asked whether the proposed properties are going to be joined to the main sewer network or will be using cess pits? Mr Bevens expressed the view with regards to the layout he does not feel that it is a dense layout at all, and the paddock will be retained opposite and the site could take a lot higher density. He stated that the highways have been considered and it is likely that the road would not be offered for adoption and it will be a private road and the visibility splays can all be achieved as that has been reviewed almost as if it was an outline application just committing the access due to the fact that access is the key driver when considering this type of scheme. Mr Bevens made the point that he does not believe that there is an issue with highway safety and visibility at that point even though there are cars which park along that section of road but that cannot be controlled as it is a public highway. He explained that with regards to the drainage for the individual properties that would be committed in the technical details consent and advice would be sought from a drainage expert as to what would be the best solution, but it would not be onto the main system.
- Councillor Connor stated that he has concerns with regards to the site being in the catchment of Manea Town Lots Water Recycling Centre which currently lacks capacity to accommodate any additional flows generated by the proposed development. He added that it is included in Anglian Water's Business Plan and a planned growth scheme investment between 2025 and 2030 but there is no certainty whether this will be undertaken in that time. Councillor Connor made the point that it does state that Anglian Water would object to any connection into the foul network from the proposed development due to the capacity

constraints and the pollution risk. Mr Bevens stated that if the application were to be approved, the technical details consent would be worked out with a drainage consultant to ensure the best solution is achieved and then further discussions would take place with the drainage boards and Anglian Water. He explained that there is an attenuation pond on the planning in principle scheme and with regards to controlling the flow, the flow would be controlled and would go into the ditches. Mr Bevens added that it would form part of the technical details consent and it cannot be committed to in a planning in principle application, but he is aware of the foul water issues and that would be addressed.

- Councillor Connor stated that he does have significant concerns with regards to the foul water.

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

- Councillor Marks stated that he is a member of Manea Parish Council and was not present when this was debated, however, he has read their comments which he agrees with and are all poignant. He expressed the view that it is back land development and whilst the application where the pig sheds used to be located is now taking place, he recalls that it was a requirement to remove pig farms out of villages which was why that was passed. Councillor Marks stated that the application site goes further back compared to the piece of land where the pig farm used to be and the biggest concern he has is still flooding. He stated that across the road from the application site there was an episode of flooding which took place in December 2024 and there was an Anglian Water pump located in the vicinity which then failed and it was discovered that it had backed up all the way from Wisbech Road which is a quarter of a mile away near Poppyfields and the blockage also continued towards Pump Corner. Councillor Marks added that the whole line is struggling to keep up with foul water and whilst the application site could have cess pits installed it is his understanding that the drain at the top of the site is a private drain that must feed in at least a third of a mile into a main drain. He added that the properties will need to be raised to come out of Flood Zone 3 and he made the point that he cannot support the application it is over intensification for the application site and is far too much for the village of Manea.
- Councillor Connor expressed the view that he is not content with the application, and he added that Anglian Water are up to the limit with the flows and, in his opinion, the access is poor and it is back land development, and he cannot support the application in its current state.
- Councillor Marks stated that the agent had referred to Westfield Road regarding various development located there and he added that the committee recently refused an application and the Planning Inspector found against that but there was not a cost implication. He added that the Inspector's report stated that an application further down the road for four bungalows with almost exactly the same entrance of the property being located close to the road was refused by the Inspector and he agreed with the Council. Councillor Marks made the point that he sees this as a very similar application as it is back land with the access and the vision issues.

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

(Councillor Marks declared, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a member of Manea Parish Council but was not present when this item was discussed. He further declared that he is a member of the Manea and Welney Internal Drainage Board)

P82/25

F/YR25/0796/PIP

LAND NORTH OF 120 LONDON ROAD, CHATTERIS

PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE TO ERECT UP TO 1 X DWELLING

David Grant presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure from Matthew Hall, the agent. Mr Hall stated that the application is for an infill plot for a single dwelling to match in with a continuous linear development along London Road and the dwellings along that part of London Road are all individually designed dwellings which have been there for several years. He referred to the officer's report with regards to the bowling green which was a private bowling green and its use ceased in 2014 when the owner passed away, with it never being a public facility and was only for the owner's private use and was never a commercial bowling green as Chatteris already has one located in Wood Street.

Mr Hall explained that in the officer's report it refers to various refusals and appeals on the site in 2006 and 2008 which he agrees with and added that they were considered under a different Local Plan. He stated that all along the front of the site on the opposite side of the road there is a footpath which stretches for almost the whole length of London Road and the site is in Flood Zone 1.

Mr Hall referred to the presentation screen and highlighted the red star which indicates the application site, and he explained that to the northeast of the site the construction for Hallam Land has commenced and to the south of the application site down London Road and Stocking Drove there have been various planning permissions given since 2019 and some of those are built out, and some are partway through construction. He expressed the opinion that the committee have already accepted that this area is part of the built-up form of Chatteris under LP3 of the Local Plan and there are no objections to the application from any consultee or members of the public and Chatteris Town Council support the application.

Mr Hall expressed the view that it is an ideal site for an individual dwelling to match in with the adjacent development in Flood Zone 1 and it has not been used for agricultural land for at least 20 to 30 years. He added that it has a footpath link and matches in with the adjacent built-up form of linear development.

Members asked Mr Hall the following questions:

- Councillor Imafidon stated that he has noted that the bowling green is not a public asset and was last used in 2014 but as it appears to be well maintained he would like to know what it has been used for since that time? Mr Hall explained that it is his understanding that the family just maintain the site as a green piece of land as the family still reside there.

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

- Councillor Murphy stated that, within the presentation, officers have stated that the site floods, but he has lived in Chatteris for 80 years and he has never known the site to flood. He added that the application is for the family and the land is a private piece of land and he added that officers are of the opinion that the site cannot be built on adjacent to the bungalow which the family already own. Councillor Murphy stated that further down the road, there are more properties being built and they are located much further outside of the area and should never have been allowed to be built there. He added that the application is for one dwelling located next to another bungalow which will allow a family to live near each other and, in his view, it should be approved.
- Councillor Benney stated that he agrees with the points made by Councillor Murphy and added that the bungalow which is already there is a replacement bungalow as the previous property on the site suffered from subsidence and had to be demolished and rebuilt. He added that it was a private bowling green and the proposed dwelling will be for a family member to be able to reside next door to their mother which he applauds. Councillor Benney stated that the officer report states that the site is located outside of Chatteris and he disagrees with that as, in his opinion, there is at least a mile in distance from the bottom of Ferry Hill where the sign says Chatteris as you come from Somersham. He explained that this has been very well debated by the committee and there must be at least 10 further

houses which are built further along going out towards the road sign which have already approved. Councillor Benney expressed the view that the principle of development has already been well established in the area and he is confident that the bungalow will be built to a high standard and he will support the application.

Proposed by Councillor Murphy, seconded by Councillor Benney and agreed that the application be GRANTED against the officer's recommendation.

Members do not support the officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they feel that the proposal is located inside the Chatteris area, and they feel that the precedent of development has already been set and members need to be consistent

(Councillor Benney declared, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is member of Chatteris Town Council but takes no part in planning. He further declared that the agent has undertaken work for Chatteris Town Council and himself personally, but he is not pre-determined and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Imafidon declared that the agent has undertaken work for him personally, but he is not pre-determined, and will consider the application with an open mind)

(Councillor Murphy declared, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that he is a Member of Chatteris Town Council but takes no part in planning. He added that he also knows Matthew Hall but has no business dealings with him)

3.19 pm

Chairman