

**PLANNING COMMITTEE DATE: 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022 AGENDA ITEM 11**

**APPLICATION NO: F/YR22/0811/O**

**SITE LOCATION: Land South Of, Hall Bank, Tydd St Giles, Cambridgeshire**

**UPDATES:**

**Tydd St Giles Parish Council:** In response to the reconsultation respond as follows:

*'The members of the Parish Council's Planning Committee reconsidered this application at their meeting this evening. They noted the addition of three passing places to the plans, two of which are outside the site boundary. However, the fundamental issues remain, namely that this proposed development is outside the village and of a scale and nature that would be out of keeping with its setting, as well as establishing a precedent for similar unsupported development elsewhere in the locality.'*

**CCC Highways:** *'Visibility Splays added runs over private verges. Visibility splays for each access should not be over neighbouring plots. This makes it unreliable to ensure unobstructed visibility splay or sight line in perpetuity.'*

One further letter of objection (Tretton House, Eaudyke Bank, Tydd St Giles) which reiterates many of the points raised by the consultees as captured in the report; stressing that the scheme is not infill, surrounded as it is on three sides by agricultural land and noting that the development will erode the character of this country lane. It is further noted

*'Over recent months it would appear a dozen or so residents have decided that in their opinion in order for Tydd St Giles to 'thrive' our village needs to have new developments on every single blade of grass. With many of these residents or their family having had applications recently granted or still in the consultation phase, they are swapping comments of support on each other's applications, with extended family members from outside the village doing the same. While I understand there is nothing to say they cannot do this, it skews the evidence of support for these applications & I would also add that in the majority if not all cases the comments of support have no basis in local planning policy'*

Writer considers that the village is thriving citing property values, community groups operating and various events held locally along with well-subscribed Facebook 'village group' and 'business page' and highlighting that the local sense of community is more than evident. It is contended that *'we don't need developments which breach local planning policies in order to thrive when we are already thriving. We are fast losing all that gives our village its rural character and charm, Tydd St Giles is becoming an overdeveloped housing estate surrounded by agricultural fields'*.

Three further objections have been generated in response to the reconsultation from residents at Dunton Hall Tydd St. Giles, Chard House, Hockland Road and 10 Newgate Road who have previously raised objection to the proposal. These reiterate the earlier objections, in respect of the highway improvements indicated the following observations are made:

- *'There may well be a footpath painted in on the new drawing, now, together with three small passing bays, but those two elements change nothing; this remains a one-car-narrow road and the main issues have not been addressed.'* They also query where visitors will park if any of the future occupants of these dwellings host a large gathering.

- Does not consider footpath as shown will work due to existing land constraints and established trees, and notes that the footpath does not connect to the pathway in High Broadgate as suggested on the drawing. Queries whether landowners have agreed to pathways being built on both sides of Hall Bank where they would run over their properties and questions the width of available land to accommodate without removal of boundary treatments which would be outside the developers control and may require additional engineering works. Also queries whether they have they been consulted.
- Notes that the soft verges provide opportunity for vehicles when meeting to pass, however introducing a path will limit this and that if the passing bays are not immediately existing convenient they will not be used. Concern raised regarding general highway safety.
- Highlights that *'The possible addition of a couple of passing bays will not help as they do not extend to the further reaches of Hall Bank which is what would be required to make this in anyway a slightly safer road'*.

It is also contended that TSG has exceeded its quota of development, especially if properties at the Golf Course are included.

One further letter reiterating support for the scheme from an earlier contributor (Sherwood, Hockland Road) noting that *'now they are going to put passing spaces in this is even better'*

**Officer assessment:** The principle of the scheme remains contrary to policy as outlined in the officer report and it is noted that several of the earlier contributors have reaffirmed their objections to the scheme citing the relevant development plan policies and providing a detailed evaluation of why the scheme should not be supported.

It remains the case that the scheme does not demonstrate a physical link to the main village and that issues highlighted with Hall Bank do not appear to have been reconciled through the details as submitted. Albeit the consultation response of the LHA remains silent regarding the passing bays and footpath delivery. Further input has been sought from the LHA in this regard, however the failure of the footpath to link into the existing infrastructure and the limited information provided regarding the same, shown as it is on a 1:2500 scale drawing does not provide sufficient comfort that this is indeed deliverable.

**Recommendation:** Refuse as per recommendation on pages 172 -173