

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**WEDNESDAY, 5 APRIL 2023 - 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 C Marks, Councillor N Meekins, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor M Purser and Councillor W Sutton, Councillor A Miscandlon (Substitute).

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Mrs K Mayor and Councillor R Skoulding.

Officers in attendance: Nick Harding (Head of Planning), Danielle Brooke (Senior Development Officer), Nikki Carter (Senior Development Officer), Stephen Turnbull (Legal Officer) and Elaine Cooper (Member Services).

## **P127/22      PREVIOUS MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting 8 March 2023 were agreed and signed as an accurate record.

## **P128/22      F/YR22/1410/F LAND SOUTH EAST OF 186 WYPE ROAD, EASTREA ERECT 2X DWELLINGS (SINGLE-STOREY, 4-BED) WITH DETACHED GARAGES, AND FORMATION OF A FOOTPATH**

Nikki Carter presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Lee Bevens, the agent. Mr Bevens stated he is glad the scheme is being recommended for approval and he has worked closely with the case officer to achieve a scheme that is acceptable. He explained that this scheme was similar to one approved in outline in April 2022 and the proposal for two bungalows on site follows the principle of the consented outline application scheme but more detail has been included in this full application with the designs taking some reference from the adjacent bungalows with good quality materials proposed and additional soft landscaping to improve the biodiversity on the site.

Mr Bevens expressed the view that the proposed two bungalows and attached garages ensure that no significant overlooking or overshadowing is created between the dwellings or adjacent dwellings, with en-suite windows having obscure glazing where they are located on the driveway side. He expressed the opinion that the bungalows have a good level of private amenity and are well set back from Wype Road which is in keeping with the adjacent development previously completed by the applicant with each plot sitting fairly centrally.

Mr Bevens stated that the highway design, together with the position of the access, sight lines and footpath provision, was discussed at some length with the highways officer to ensure consistency with the adjacent bungalows and maintaining pedestrian and vehicle safety. He expressed the opinion that they were advised that a 1.2 metre footpath inside the proposed new hedge planting would be acceptable and this still offers connection back in the north west direction into Eastrea village and there is nothing on the south eastern boundary so there is not a need to extend the footpath any further than indicated.

Mr Bevens stated that the case officer has confirmed the scheme is acceptable noting that it complies with the relevant policies of the Fenland Local Plan 2014 and the applicant is happy with the proposed conditions. He requested that members support the officer's recommendation.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated that he remembers this coming before committee previously when it was granted against officer's recommendation and he voted against it as, in his view, it was too far out of the village. However, it was democratically approved and he cannot see any problems why this now cannot be granted.
- Councillor Mrs French agreed with Councillor Sutton but asked officers to clarify the situation with regards to the footpath as she is aware that the Town Council objected previously. Nikki Carter explained that the 1.2 metre footpath on the inside of the hedge has been deemed to be acceptable as it was included on the previous approval.

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

*(Councillor Miscandlon declared that he is Chairman of Whittlesey Town Council's Planning Committee and took no part in the discussion and voting thereon)*

**P129/22      F/YR23/0072/O  
LAND EAST OF STATION FARM, FODDER FEN ROAD, MANEA  
ERECT UP TO 5 DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS  
COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS) INCLUDING FORMATION OF A  
FOOTPATH ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF FODDER FEN ROAD**

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

Members received a presentation in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Robert Sears, the applicant, and Peter Humphrey, the agent. Mr Sears stated if successful his daughter will be able to have one of the plots as she is taking more responsibility and will very soon take over his responsibilities on the farm, currently being involved in undertaking the farm accounts. He feels it would be useful for her to be living on the farm and near the station as she has young children and it would enable them to go to school in either direction, with her husband being a teacher and it is all about future proofing for future generations.

Mr Sears referred to what he is doing on the farm in relation to the environment, with them being in a mid-tier scheme and are taking 240 acres out of food production, which is approximately one-sixth of their total farm for the next 5 years. He advised that the land will be sown with 5 different sorts of seed mixes, which will provide an all year round source of food and cover for the likes of birds and insects and provide pollen and nectar for pollinators and to complement this they have so far planted 2.3 miles of hedgerow and in the coming Winter they are planting 74 hedgerow trees which will provide shelter, food, nesting sites and song posts.

Mr Humphrey made the point that this application is for 5 executive style plots on the edge of Manea and, in his view, the market shows there is a distinct lack of such plots and if this application is approved it will help address this situation. He referred to the officer's executive summary which refers to the site as being beyond the established settlement of Manea and it is, in his view, on the edge of the village but adjacent to housing and a new development of the Station car park, with this development changing the character of the area and was a Council application and the access for the plots are within the village sign for Manea.

Mr Humphrey stated that from the previous refusal for this application members agreed that the site was within the village. He feels the application will help secure and future proof the Sears

farming enterprise for generations to come, with the site actually being closer to the school and village hall than the proposed allocations on the emerging Local Plan at Fallow Corner for some 29 dwellings by some 300 metres and the site is well related to the existing farm and the spatial characteristics of the village.

Mr Humphrey expressed the view that proximity of the station should not be underestimated and undoubtedly will be used by the residents of these dwellings. He referred to the NPPF, which prioritises new development with access to significant public transport hubs, such as rail stations, to provide a long-term sustainable transport option.

Mr Humphrey stated that the application also proposes a new footpath link for this development to the new rail station plus the village beyond. He acknowledged that the site is within Flood Zone 3, but referred members to the Council's own application in Parson Drove, F/YR22/1187/FDC, which was also in a Flood Zone 3 recommended for approval and he is looking for the Council's applications to be treated the same as his application.

Mr Humphrey advised that they are prepared to provide a further swan report if needed but Wild Frontier say that the results of the habitat survey and desk study indicate that the site is unsuitable for Hooper Swans and there are no known records of such species using the site or nearby fields.

Members asked questions of Mr Sears and Mr Humphrey as follows:

- Councillor Marks stated that he lives within 250 metres of this site and asked Mr Sears whether he has ever known it to flood as he does not? Mr Sears agreed that he has not known it to flood.
- Councillor Benney asked if, as the site is in Flood Zone 3, full mitigation measures will be taken to safeguard the properties? Mr Humphrey responded that similar mitigation measures will be used as on the Fenland District Council Parson Drove scheme. He made the point that they have undertaken their own sequential test and it has been proved that this site passes and he asked that they be given a level playing field so they can provide exactly what the Council is.
- Councillor Mrs Davis made the point that it was mentioned that one of the houses would be for Mr Sear's daughter, but this still leaves four for market sale and asked why only one house is not just being provided? Mr Sears responded that due to the works there is a cost involved, his son-in-law is a teacher so does not earn enormous amounts of money so he wants to help his daughter in building a new home and it is beneficial to have five houses that generate some of the money towards the costs.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she noticed that the road speed limit is 40 – 60 and asked if it had been considered to reduce the speed limit here? Mr Humphrey responded that this has not been considered but if permission is granted this can be discussed with the Parish Council to obtain their support. Councillor Mrs French stated that it is executive homes being proposed and she understands that the speed is bad in this area. Mr Humphrey made the point that vehicles slow up when they approach the rail line.
- Councillor Mrs French asked if the rail line is in Flood Zone 3. Mr Humphrey confirmed it was.
- Councillor Miscandlon questioned the de-restricted road sign by the entrance of the proposed site. Mr Humphrey responded that if the plan goes through this will be something they can look into with Highways and would be happy to accept this as a condition.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Marks questioned if it was necessary to have a Habitat Regulation Assessment as the site is basically a brown field so why does the applicant need to go to all these lengths? Nikki Carter responded that it was a request by Natural England who are a statutory consultee referring to its comments within the report and there is an obligation to follow its advice. Councillor Marks queried whether the same would have been needed for the Manea Station car park? Nick Harding responded that he is not aware that this was the

case in this situation. Councillor Marks made the point that this location is just across the road. Nick Harding stated that he does not have the information to hand so could not say definitively yes or no, but it would be irrelevant as Natural England has made it quite clear the site needs to be subject to the Habitat Assessment process and that is not something that can be ignored. He stated that if planning permission was given today, it would be in the knowledge that it would be unlawful so he would strongly advise against that.

- Councillor Marks asked if the assessment could be made a condition on any approval? Nick Harding responded that it could not be guaranteed that the test would be passed.
- Councillor Mrs French made the point that 240 acres is going to be planted with seeds, hedgerow and trees and she has never heard of an applicant wanting to spend so much money. She expressed her confusion on why there is so much opposition to this development as opposed to the Manea Station car park development.
- Councillor Cornwell referred to the comments about encroaching on linear development but made the point there is development opposite and asked how further it is encroaching when there are properties there? Nick Harding clarified that there might be properties on one side of the road, but it does not necessarily mean there has to be development on the opposite side. Councillor Cornwell expressed the view that he fails to see where it is encroaching.
- Councillor Meekins asked that if it is a legal requirement that has to be undertaken, what are the consequences if this committee passes something today? Nick Harding responded that he would strongly advise against doing something that is knowingly unlawful and the decision could be subject to legal challenge from a third party.
- Councillor Marks questioned why the application has been brought before Council knowing there is a legal requirement and could the application be deferred? Nick Harding responded that a decision has been made as a committee on a similar scheme and there is no point making applicants undertake work when there is already a similar decision made by committee.
- Councillor Miscandlon asked if the applicants are aware of this legal requirement as if not someone was being negligent in not providing that advice. Nick Harding responded that the agent is very experienced and knowledgeable and has access to all the information that comes back through the consultee process so he would have been aware of the comments and on the previous application it was indicated but they did not want to provide it.
- Councillor Mrs French asked if the application could be deferred until the agent has the opportunity to get the information required? Nick Harding confirmed that deferment is possible.
- Councillor Sutton commented this was refused by committee last time as the site is a long way outside of the village and the Parish Council does not support this development and asked if the committee is saying that all the reasons for refusing it last time are no longer relevant as if members are not saying this it is pointless deferring the application for the agent to undertake the assessment.
- Councillor Marks expressed the view that there are two issues, a legal requirement that if the vote goes ahead could be open to legal challenge and is there any point in going forward at this time as the correct information is not before members and would it make more sense to defer it at this time or the officers' recommendation is accepted.
- Councillor Mrs French expressed the view that the last application was considered in September 2021, which is more than a few months ago and information was not previously given on the 240 acres being provided for wildlife and planting of trees. She made the point that these are executive homes and she would not support refusal but would support deferment.

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

- Councillor Cornwell made the point that it was September 2021 when the previous application was refused, with a subsequent application being withdrawn, but he does not remember the September 2021 application so cannot comment on it. He feels that members are going around in circles and they need to make a decision on the face of the application and the easy way may well be to determine the application today and if it is

refused the applicant can either appeal or resubmit but if it is approved the committee is taking a legal decision which puts the Council in a position that they could be challenged, which, in his view, is not an option.

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she would like to see a deferment to clarify what information is legally required. Councillor Marks agreed with Councillor French
- Councillor Benney stated that he remembers the application coming before committee previously and it was one vote that refused it, with, in his view, the decision being subjective. He added that fully supports the application, the area needs executive houses and it is right near the station. Councillor Benney acknowledged the legal position but questioned who would challenge Council? He feels it is a worthwhile development and would be pleased to see the houses built, although he is disappointed that it is an incomplete application.
- Councillor Marks added that he would vote in favour for this development as he feels this is the right place for development in Manea at this time, it is near a railway station, the houses would not add to traffic issues in the village or put any pressure on the sewage system as they will all have cesspits and Manea needs houses to keep the facilities open.
- Councillor Mrs French expressed the view that these are executive homes and Fenland is short of these.
- Councillor Cornwell expressed the opinion that on balance if the Council has not been challenged in the past he would support the application.
- Councillor Marks made the point that it is a field presently and he has never seen swans or habitat on this land.
- Councillor Meekins stated that he has listened to what other councillors have said but still feels uneasy if it was to be passed today knowing it to be unlawful. He feels it should be deferred for the assessment to be undertaken and then he could possibly support it.
- The Legal Officer stated that the legal requirements are unambiguous because the site is near a European site or special protection area the rules are that the Council should not grant planning permission unless satisfied that there will be no adverse impact on that site and the Council does not know that because Natural England who are the experts who advise the Council have said it needs more information on this. He added that if committee goes ahead and approves it today it will be making an unlawful decision and the fact that nobody might challenge that is not a reason to do it and he would never advise the Council as a whole to make an unlawful decision.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that this information was not presented in 2021 when the first application was refused so what law/policy has come into place to require this information now? Nick Harding responded that Natural England were informed in 2021 but at that time the Council did not receive a response. However, a response has been received on this application and it does not mean that it should be ignored now.
- Nick Harding stated that from listening to the debate it seems to be going in the direction in favour of the proposal and reminded committee of the previous reasons for refusal and in what way these were now addressed. He made the point that the Manea Station car park opposite the site was granted consent at the time of the previous applications and it is still considered that the site is an inappropriate location for this proposal. Nick Harding referred to the mention of the Council application at Parson Drove and referred members to the update report which addresses this position and it is not comparable as the application was in the settlement and redevelopment of an existing car park. He advised that if committee is still minded to look at the scheme positively then he would recommend that it is deferred to get the additional ecology information but to address the concerns of the highways officer, whose concerns were not sufficient to warrant refusal of the scheme but perhaps more work could be undertaken by the applicant.
- Councillor Cornwell referred to officers mentioning that it should be determined how this application differs from the previously refused one but he does not have the information as to why the previous scheme was refused. Nick Harding advised that this is in Section 9.3 of the report.
- Councillor Marks referred to the highway concerns being in regard to traffic and speed and

asked if this would not have been the same for the car park? Nick Harding responded that he could not say certainly but he would think it is in relation to the design of the access footway and the order for removing the speed sign and warning signs for the level crossing.

- Councillor Mrs French made the point that the agent and applicant were asked if they would be prepared to look at the speed so if they are the signs could be looked at at the same time.
- Councillor Cornwell referred to the officer's report outlining that the previous application had insufficient evidence so the applicant would have known this and should have complied with it. Nick Harding responded that the refused scheme did not have the objection from Natural England so the refusal reason was just on ecology.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that the committee needs to be sure of the reasons if it does decide to defer the proposal because if only the missing report is included that means members accept all the other reasons for refusal and she would like to see this application refused as all the elements cannot be sorted and for the application to come back again. Nick Harding responded that if members are going to defer for the issue of the Habitat Assessment then they need to be satisfied that all the other reasons for refusal have been overcome. He referred to the highway comments and feels the traffic regulations and signs are more complicated due to the railway and there is more engineering required so it can be demonstrated that it is viable.

Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Cornwell to refuse the application as per officer's recommendation, which was not supported by a majority vote by members.

**Proposed by Councillor Mrs French, seconded by Councillor Marks to defer the application to obtain the required ecology report and to resolve the highway concerns regarding the footpath and speed limit.**

Members do not support officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they do not feel the site lies outside the settlement and is within Manea, it is within the existing village footprint, would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding area, the scale and location is in keeping, it is the right area of Manea to be developed, Manea needs to grow, flourish and thrive, it makes a positive contribution to the local distinctiveness and mitigation measures can be introduced for flood risk and the safeguarding of the properties.

*(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 takes no part in planning)*

*(Councillor Marks further declared that he is a member of Manea and Welney Drainage Board as is the applicant but is not pre-determined and would approach the application with an open mind)*

**P130/22      F/YR22/1053/F  
LAND TO THE WEST OF 167 GAUL ROAD, MARCH  
ERECT 1 DWELLING (2-STOREY 4-BED) WITH DETACHED GARAGE**

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

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Peter Humphrey, the agent. Mr Humphrey stated that this is a resubmission and enables them to hopefully overcome or clarify reasons for the previous refusal, namely flood risk. He compared this site to the Council's own application at Parson Drove, which is very similar and where the application was in Flood Zone 3 with sites that were available but were discounted and this proposal is in Flood Zone 3 and whilst sites are available they are not similar enough and he is sure everyone wants their applications to be determined in a similar manner to the Council.

Mr Humphrey expressed the view that they are offering renewable energy solutions as the Council did in order to make this application more acceptable. He referred to Policy LP16d, which states that the Local Plan requires that development makes a positive contribution to the local distinctiveness and character of the area and he believes this application will enhance Gaul Road as it goes down from the bypass and will add interest and help raise the profile of March

Mr Humphrey made the point that the proposal is on the site of a former dwelling and he has included historic plans to show that there was a dwelling here because the last time it was considered by committee members could not remember or did not realise that a dwelling was on the site which has been demolished. He feels it is unfortunate that this plot is the only area which is undeveloped in the Gaul Road area as developed by Cannon Kirk adding numerous new houses but would hate to see that this site is fenced in with Harris fencing and left until someone else tries to get a new house in the area.

Mr Humphrey expressed the opinion that it is edge of town, in a sustainable location and he believes that the Flood Zone 3 application is similar to one that the Council have had approved in Parson Drove.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Cornwell made the point that in 1.2 it states that the site appears randomly placed but questioned this as it is going to be surrounded by the continuation of the current approved development in Gaul Road. Other members indicated that the development he is referring to is finished. Councillor Cornwell queried how the approval on this development in Flood Zone 3 differs from this particular site and questioned that there is no more development taking place in Gaul Road. Nikki Carter responded that there has been a recently approved application on the opposite side of the road for 55 dwellings within Flood Zone 1. Councillor Cornwell stated then the site is not actually isolated as such. Nikki Carter responded that it is not asserted that this site is isolated just that it is separated from the edge of the existing built form of the estate development on the northern side.
- Councillor Meekins asked the question what is the difference between isolated and separated? Nikki Carter responded that there is not a specific definition in planning but isolated would generally be described as a property in the open countryside that is separated from any kind of built form and in this particular case there is a 40 metre separation, so it is not isolated from the settlement, but it is out on its own in terms of character.
- Councillor Purser referred to the similar project in Parson Drove and made the point that each application is taken on its own merits. Nick Harding responded that the case cited by Mr Humphrey is materially different, this was already developed land being a garage parking court that has been redeveloped and within the settlement of Parson Drove.

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

- Councillor Mrs French expressed surprise that 55 dwellings were approved by delegated powers but feels that one house is not a separation of March, yes there is a small gap but she cannot see any reason why this cannot be approved.
- Councillor Cornwell made the point that further down Gaul Road are two other houses that are already there, which may be construed as isolated so he cannot see where this site is isolated especially when 55 dwellings have been approved on the opposite side of the road.
- Nick Harding reminded members that if they are minded to approve this application, the previous refusal reasons need to be considered and why this scheme overcomes these reasons.

**Proposed by Councillor Cornwell, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and agreed that the application be APPROVED against officer's recommendation.**

Members do not support officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they feel that applications have been approved for a number of dwellings in the vicinity and whilst there is a gap in the built form this proposal is not in isolation, one dwelling will not harm the surrounding area and flooding issues can be overcome with mitigation.

*(Councillors Connor, Mrs French and Purser 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)*

**P131/22**      **F/YR22/1338/VOC**  
**LAND SOUTH OF EASTWOOD END, WIMBLINGTON**  
**VARIATION OF CONDITION 22 (LIST OF APPROVED DRAWINGS) RELATING TO**  
**PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR20/0641/F (ERECT 9 X 2-STOREY 4-BED**  
**DWELLINGS WITH GARAGES INCLUDING OPEN SPACE/PLAY AREA WITH**  
**POND AND FORMATION OF 2.5M HIGH BUNDING, 2M HIGH BUNDING WITH 1M**  
**HIGH CLOSE BOARDED FENCE ON TOP, 3M HIGH CLOSE BOARDED FENCE,**  
**3M WIDE FOOT/CYCLE PATH PARALLEL TO A141 AND 1.8M WIDE FOOTPATH**  
**ALONG EASTWOOD END TO MEET EXISTING FOOTPATH) TO ENABLE**  
**ALTERATIONS TO PLOT 1 (INCREASE IN HEIGHT FROM 8.77M TO 9M,**  
**ADDITION OF CHIMNEY AND WINDOWS TO STORAGE SPACE IN ROOF), PLOT**  
**2 (SITING AND WINDOWS TO SNUG) AND BOUNDARY ARRANGEMENT TO**  
**PLOTS 1, 2 AND 3**

Nikki Carter presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Gareth Edwards, the agent. Mr Edwards stated that he has worked closely with officers to secure support for the revisions in this application which have largely been instigated by a potential purchaser for one of the houses. He advised that the archeological investigation is underway and subject to clearing the remaining conditions the applicant is looking to make a start on the site. He stated that revisions to the scheme are minimal and asked members to support the officer's recommendation.

Members asked questions of Mr Edwards as follows:

- Councillor Meekins referred to the Parish Council's comments on 16 March who objected on the basis of a chimney when it is not going to be used. Mr Edwards responded that it is an architectural feature.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French referred to an e-mail received from a resident saying that the amendments are not minor and asked if they are or not? Nikki Carter confirmed they are minor changes in the context of this development for nine dwellings.

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

- Councillor Benney expressed the view that he sees this as a minor amendment to an approved planning application so he sees no reasons to refuse it and feels that officer's have made the right decision.

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

*(Councillor Marks declared that he knows the applicant and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon)*

*(Councillor Mrs Davis registered, in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct on Planning Matters, that she is a member of Wimblington Parish Council but takes no part in*



planning)

*(Councillor Connor registered that he is a District Councillor for Doddington and Wimblington and does attend Parish Council meetings but takes no part in planning)*

**P132/22**      **F/YR22/1415/F**  
**MARCH AIRFIELD, CROSS ROAD, MARCH**  
**ERECT 1 X DWELLING (2-STOREY 2-BED) IN ASSOCIATION WITH EXISTING**  
**AIR SPORTS ACTIVITY CENTRE, WITH INTEGRAL OFFICE AND ASSOCIATED**  
**FACILITIES, AND THE TEMPORARY (RETROSPECTIVE) SITING OF A MOBILE**  
**HOME DURING CONSTRUCTION**

Nikki Carter presented the report to members and drew attention to the update report which 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 the deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with public participation procedure, from Mr Davies, the applicant, and Craig Brand, the agent. Mr Brand made the point that members were probably unaware of the airfield and the air sports the centre offers as it has never been advertised locally due to its unprotected rural location, with the business being successfully operating from the site since 2013. He stated that last year, at the end of the 10 year lease, the applicant completed the purchase of the field from the landowner and the centre currently relies on electricity from solar panels as a sub-station is required to provide a permanent supply at a cost of £44,000.

Mr Brand advised that fire gutted the applicant's home in 2021 and with the Council aware of their situation they moved into the current mobile home on site and since living here they have realized the benefits to their business which also allows passers by to call in and enquire about the centre's activities. He referred to the committee report stating that the business could be operated with security cameras but without a permanent electricity supply there is no guarantee that they would be operational during the night, especially in Winter.

Mr Brand referred to a report in the Fenland Citizen of a break-in at a builder's yard in Whittlesey Road where security cameras and houses opposite provided no deterrent and the applicants believe that only their full-time presence will provide a sufficient deterrent to protect their continued investment and allow them to advertise locally the recreational activities. He mentioned that the report also states a district-wide sequential test is required but, in his opinion, it is unreasonable to expect an existing business to comply with this and the Environment Agency's flood risk map shows roughly 90% of Fenland in Flood Zone 3, with the towns and villages situated in the higher flood zones.

Mr Brand expressed the view that the business requires an open countryside location for the wind and air sports offered, which Council officers appreciated in granting the original 2012 permission, and the closest dwellings, Cross Road and Burrowmoor Road are also in Flood Zone 3 and related to agricultural farms, none of these are for sale or suitable to provide the needed security. He stated that the applicant wants to make the Fenland community aware of the unique activities the centre offers but needs to be confident that their investment and the recent grant to assist their expansion is protected from theft, living on site they believe will provide that protection and allow an efficient operation being present for business 7 days a week.

Mr Davies stated that Fenland Wind and Air Sports Centre is a unique outdoor recreation centre in East Anglia which has been operating now for over 10 years and since living on site they have

picked up regular additional business that would have been missed in the past when they were only present for pre-booked activities. He advised that they recently received a substantial £55,000 Council grant to purchase an additional 10 blow karts complete with sidecars designed for young children and disabled activities, with them all being delivered later this month.

Mr Davies expressed the view that due to the value of his specialist equipment and long-term delays in getting replacements should a break-in occur they would like to live on site to prevent this possibly from happening and make running the business more efficient and secure. He stated that should he be granted planning permission today this will allow him to invest into the permanent electricity supply for the centre as part of the house build, which includes business reception office, disabled toilets and customer welfare facilities and will also enable them to invest in electric rechargeable segways and go-karts as a replacement activity when there is insufficient wind on pre-booked blow gliding days to run the session, being able to offer an alternative activity to the blow karts will dramatically reduce their refund and cancellation rates making the business more profitable and sustainable.

Mr Davies advised that they will also be looking at employing additional local staff to help instruct and supervise customers. He stated that before Covid they were taking party bookings via Groupon and Virgin Experience Days are waiting to come on board as soon as their blow karts are up and running but he has not felt safe to date advertising their local activities generating business only from out of area using websites specifically related to activities available at the Fenland Wind and Air Sports Centre.

Mr Davies expressed the view that knowing they could protect their business by living on site will allow them to expand and attract more new local business offering their services to the local Fenland community by advertising the centre in various town Discovery booklets distributed monthly in the Fenland area along with other local forms of media.

Members asked questions of Mr Davies and Mr Brand as follows:

- Councillor Mrs Davis asked how many times the property has been broken in to and was it reported to the Police? Mr Davies responded that he has had one break-in and it was reported.
- Councillor Mrs French asked how long has the mobile home been on site? Mr Davies responded for 18 months since his property in Almond Drive suffered fire damage.
- Councillor Mrs French asked if there is planning permission for the go-karts and is he aware of how noisy they are? Mr Davies responded that the go-karts are electric and environmentally friendly.
- Councillor Cornwell stated he understands the need for living on site for security, which is why the Economic Development Team support the business. Mr Davies responded that this is correct and they have an exclusivity deal of 75 mile flying rights. Councillor Cornwell asked was the grant received a Council grant? Mr Davies confirmed it was a growth works grant to help purchase the land.
- Councillor Marks queried what the 75 miles exclusivity deal is for? Mr Davies responded that it is for electric blow karts which have 3 wheels and a sail. He stated that the idea is to also have electric for segways and electric go-karts.
- Councillor Meekins asked what the core business is as there seems to be an emphasis on go-karts? Mr Davis responded that it is paragliding, being one of the largest centres in the UK, and anything wind related. He added that they are also an activity site and provide Virgin Experience Days and now they have purchased the land they want to reinvest into the business and to live on site to keep the business secure.
- Councillor Purser questioned how the business is picking up passing trade as it is not on a main road? Mr Davies responded that since they have been living on site people that bike or walk pass the site have been stopping and asking about the business plus it is used as a cut through from the bypass, hence attracting passing trade.
- Councillor Benney made the point that as Portfolio Holder for Economic Growth he is aware

that a grant had been given but has had no dealings with the site or the applicant.

- Councillor Mrs French questioned the condition of the road to the proposed site as it is known to be in bad condition? Mr Davies responded that it has not been fully resurfaced but some of the pot holes have been filled in. He stated that he tends to direct visitors from Knights End Road as that has been resurfaced.
- Councillor Connor asked if Fenland is open for business or not, with Economic Growth supporting the venture. He recognises the importance of living onsite from his own personal experience and asked Mr Davies for his views. Mr Davies responded that he agrees, Winter is the worst time as being solar powered they cannot keep secure and being 1.6 miles away from the site it could take up to 20 minutes to get it by which time he could have lost everything and he has worked all his life for this.

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

- Councillor Cornwell stated that he can remember when this proposal came before committee previously and there was a certain amount of reticence at that time, but it has proved to be very popular and has been given considerable support from the Council in more ways than one, with Fenland being open for business. He made the point that this type of business cannot operate from the middle of a town due to its nature and has to be located in the open countryside, with the site being chosen being away from most residents and it seems that the business is running successfully. Councillor Cornwell acknowledged that there are security problems in that area as he knows people who live in the vicinity. He can see no issues with this application and as the applicant now owns the land he is trying to make a formal set up and run his business properly.
- Councillor Benney made the point that the committee see several of these applications where members are told there is the need for security and whilst this site may have had one break-in, which was not successful, it is not the damage or theft but the consequences which could lead to the loss of the business. He feels the business needs security as CCTV systems are not foolproof and the best security is to have someone on site and the Council would be failing this business and the applicant if this application is not approved.
- Councillor Miscandlon stated that he was Chairman of the Planning Committee when this proposal was previously before committee and there was all sorts of concerns about noise and nothing has materialized. He feels it has become a solid business, which needs some form of security. Councillor Miscandlon referred to the mobile home currently on site and there is no notification as to when this will be moved or if it will be staying after the building has been constructed and this needs to be looked at should this application be granted.
- Nick Harding stated that there have been multiple noise complaints that have been investigated but it is not an easy thing to assess and have not found to be proven. He stated that during one of the enforcement visits to the site, there was discussion with the applicant regarding a fire at their property and the Enforcement Officer gave permission to live on site for a temporary period once the home was being refurbished but the applicant has lived there longer than it was thought and it was nearly at the point of an enforcement notice being served before this application was submitted. Nick Harding made the point that the recommendation for this application is one of refusal so if the committee seek to approve it then a condition will be placed on the application that the mobile home should be removed on first occupation of the dwelling. He also noted that it has become apparent that the Council failed to contact the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and they had objected to the development on the opposite side of the airfield on Cross Road so if committee is seeking to approve this application it would need to be subject to consultation with the CAA as a condition to make sure they do not have any objections to the dwelling being in the position that it is supposed to be.
- Councillor Sutton applauded the owners for their vision for this successful business, with many members being skeptical at the time of the previous application. He made the point that it could be said that there is not the functional need for a dwelling as the business has been running for 10 years and it would only be desirable to have an office and a dwelling next to the business for its continuing success. Councillor Sutton expressed the opinion that

if the committee feels that it is desirable to have a dwelling in this location then the reason for refusal on sequential test grounds falls away. He feels that he will be supporting the proposal but can see why officers reached the decision they have reached.

- Councillor Cornwell pointed out that the business would need consultation with the CAA but it is not the business that is being discussed but that of a residential property. He referred to the introduction in the report on the application and feels that the application does comply with LP3. Nick Harding disagreed in relation to the CAA, it does not have any powers to remove a development that has been granted planning permission so if the CAA object to a development when consulted as it poses a risk to pilots it should not be granted planning permission. He referred to the comments of Councillor Sutton in relation to LP3 who could not have explained it better as if it is considered there is a justification for this dwelling and whether it is essential then in relation to flood risk if the answer is yes it cannot go anywhere other than this site. Nick Harding stated that if the proposal is agreed today then delegated authority would be required to apply conditions to link the operation of the dwelling to the operation of the business, making sure that the floor height of the property is above flood level, that there is no objection from the CAA and the mobile home is removed from the site after first occupation of the dwelling.

**Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Miscandlon and agreed that the application be APPROVED against officer's recommendation, with authority delegated to officers to formulate conditions.**

Members do not support officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as whilst there is not a functional need for the dwelling there is a desirable need to support the successful operation of the business and therefore the proposal complies with Policy LP3 and the sequential test relating to flood risk is not required.

*(Councillors Connor, Mrs French and Purser 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)*

**P133/22      F/YR22/1217/PIP  
LAND SOUTH WEST OF WOODBURY, MANEA ROAD, WIMBLINGTON  
PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR UP TO 5 X DWELLINGS, INVOLVING THE  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS**

This item had been withdrawn.

**P134/22      F/YR22/1243/PIP  
LAND NORTH OF 8-10 ASKHAM ROW ACCESSED FROM HOSPITAL ROAD,  
DODDINGTON  
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 3 X DWELLINGS (APPLICATION FOR  
PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE)**

Danielle Brooke 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)) during its deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Ian Hickey, an objector. Mr Hickey advised that he lives at 9 Askham Row, which is one of the two properties directly impacted from the proposed application. He stated that he moved from London in September 2018, with the primary reason for the purchase of his property being space, country living, village life, privacy, security, future retirement and a forever home.

Mr Hickey expressed the view that discussions with the original owner prior to the purchase

assured them that it was not his intention of building further properties on this land and would be kept as farmland. He stated that he asked if the land was for sale behind his property but the owner was unwilling to sell individual plots at that time and subsequently he was relieved when three of his neighbours purchased part of the land to prevent any possibility of future buildings.

Mr Hickey stated that in his objections Mr Bolton mentioned that he would never have sold the land to the applicant had he known his intention and he and his wife are also very disappointed with the applicant as the previous statement of his intentions was to purchase the land to prevent any building work going ahead. He referred to privacy and regulations, with the proposed dwellings creating an, in his view, unacceptable encroachment on his personal privacy which will have a direct line of site into his living room and as stated on his formal objection the application clearly goes against local planning policy and adds to the breach of the villages housing threshold which has 192 committed as of 8 March 2022 and is already at 150% of the threshold agreed.

Mr Hickey referred to the District Council recently refusing planning permission to one of the other neighbours that purchased the land from Mr Bolton at the same time as the applicant, with the application at that stage for a change of use to a garden and in the findings it was stated that the application breached Fenland's local planning policy LP12, delivering and protecting high quality environments, and it does not make sense that approval should be given to building 3 domestic dwellings and associated gardens on the same site. He stated that there have recently been two new dwellings approved and built on Hospital Road and there are further planning applications submitted for 5 houses along the same road the field in which the 3 dwellings would reside, which has space for approximately 50 dwellings and approval of this application would, in his view, set a precedent and would support an enormous spike in applications for this field, especially as the person that has purchased the remaining field land has already submitted planning applications for 7 dwellings.

Mr Hickey referred to 2 of his neighbours who purchased land at the same time as the applicant and whilst he has faith in them, the approval of this application would enable them to also apply for planning permission under the same criteria. He expressed the opinion that Hospital Road is a narrow single-lane road with no formal passing places with a lack of pedestrian pavements, it is a key part of Doddington circular route used by many walkers in the area, it provides emergency exit for the hospital and the care home opposite the site and further development will have a severe impact on the character of the road necessitating destruction of many hedgerow and trees, therefore, urbanizing a countryside road and walking route.

Mr Hickey made the point that, as confirmed by the Highway Authority, Hospital Road is a narrow road devoid of opportunity for safe passing, generally ill-suited for further development due to increased risk of vehicle and pedestrian conflict but it does say, however, that the additional 3 houses would not in itself have material impact on Hospital Road but that it does provide a precedent which could result in a severe cumulative impact. He expressed the view that the summary findings of the recent survey conducted by Doddington Neighbourhood Plan Group concluded that 71% of respondents had concerns about traffic, too many houses, public transport and infrastructure and on these grounds he urged members to reject the application.

Members asked questions of Mr Hickey as follows:

- Councillor Meekins referred to the officer's report at 5.3 which shows 9 letters of support have been received but there is nothing to show any letters of objection. Mr Hickey responded that this was not true. Councillor Connor advised that the report does refer to objectors. Mr Hickey expressed the opinion that a lot of the supporters were canvassed.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from John Cutteridge, a supporter. Mr Cutteridge advised members that he is owner of Mega Plants in Hospital Road and the Council did grant them planning permission to extend the garden centre with a shop and café recently so highways did support them and say the road was suitable for

further traffic and he has submitted an application asking to widen the road and pedestrianize it, which he will be paying for but this has not been approved as yet. He stated that he has lived down Hospital Road for over 45 years, since he was a small boy, he has attended the village school, been to the Scout group and been a Scout leader and maintained most of the village most of his life with grass cutting, hedge cutting and tree planting.

Mr Cutteridge agreed that there will be small piece of hedgerow removed for access to these dwellings but the hedgerow is badly diseased being full of Dutch Elm Disease and most of the trees do fall during the Winter time and he has to go along and remove them and the Council has recently granted permission for several hundreds of metres to be removed for 10 Askham Row to move their fence line out, which was granted with no problem, with new hedgerow to be planted at the rear to cover this. He stated that nobody canvassed himself to come to the meeting and speak in support of the application, he was in complete support of it when it was submitted and the people that have objected are mostly from Askham Row and have given reasons for their own properties not to exist as the properties they live in are on the very same piece of agricultural land that this application is for.

Mr Cutteridge stated that he has seen this land farmed all his life and the access to the site is very good as there is clear vision to the end of the road to the public highway and the street lighting at the end of the road lights this road very well and, in his view, there will be more lighting at the entrance to the properties if the application is approved. He made the point that this is a Flood Zone 1 site and, in his view, the photos shown by the Council give a very poor indication of Hospital Road and opposite these proposed dwellings is the extension of Doddington Court, a very large building which the Council did approve and has a bigger impact than these dwellings can have and the opposite side of the field the rear the extension on Askham House is also quite large and substantial and goes a lot further into the countryside than these properties, so this proposal is not really impacting on views.

Mr Cutteridge expressed the opinion that the site is only 0.3 miles from the centre of the village going from the Clock Tower and he does not consider it to be on the outskirts of the village as Doddington spreads out 1.4/1.5 miles. He feels there has been more development on the north-east and south sides to the west, which are further from the centre of the village and a lot of the access roads on the new estates are narrower than Hospital Road.

Mr Cutteridge stated that he is very proud to live in the Fens and where he lives, he realizes that there is the need for affordable homes and the Council have said this proposal is not good use of land and there should be more dwellings but when you go to the Cotswold or the Chilterns there are beautiful homes and people look at these homes in envy and he cannot see why this cannot be the Fens. He referred to the suggestion that there are no passing places down Hospital Road but there is which he had to put in as part of his planning permission.

Members asked questions of Mr Cutteridge as follows:

- Councillor Marks asked how far down the road is the entrance to this new development and are there any passing places before the entrance? Mr Cutteridge responded that it is quite close and there are no passing places between the top of the road and the new development.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Matthew Hall, the agent. Mr Hall made the point that Doddington is a growth village and there have been planning approvals in the last 2 years beyond this site down Hospital Road for residential development approved by the committee against officer recommendation. He stated that the site is within Flood Zone 1 and there are no highway objections.

Mr Hall acknowledged that there have been various concerns about the hedge to the front of the

site but a single access is being proposed approximately 5 metres width through the hedge and various biodiversity features that the officer talks about in the report can be incorporated into the dwellings if approved. He stated that at the top of Hospital Road, similar to what Mr Cutteridge has just said, there is a section of hedge being removed which is nothing to do with this application as it is a different piece of land and another access granted in 2022 under delegated powers and no concerns were raised here.

Mr Hall stated that members have just heard from the adjacent business owner, Mr Cutteridge, owner of Mega Plants, who supports the application. He expressed the opinion that the reason at this stage why 3 indicative plots have been shown are for large executive style properties with large gardens which is similar to Askham Row which is adjacent to this site and as members will be aware Askham Row was originally agricultural field and that was all built out, with the officer recommendation being to refuse which was overturned by committee.

Mr Hall referred to the presentation screen showing the site and an area further north where development was approved by committee for 2 dwellings in 2020 against officer recommendation because it was felt by officers to be in the open countryside and then 2 further approvals were granted in 2022 by committee against officer recommendation which was also felt by officer to be in the open countryside. He referred to the previous speaker talking about three sections of land at the back of Askham Row that were sold off, with one of these being the application site but this is the only parcel of those three that has road frontage onto Hospital Road, the other two, which are not in the ownership of the applicant, only have access from Benwick Road itself and there have been other approvals in Hospital Road for both frontage and backland development.

Members asked questions of Mr Hall as follows:

- Councillor Mrs French referred to the comments of Mr Hickey and his concerns about his property being overlooked. Mr Hall responded that the gardens at Askham Row will be 30-35 metres long and these dwellings will be side on to those gardens, with the windows being 50 metres away.
- Councillor Marks asked again how far down the road is the proposed dwelling and how far are the road passing places? Mr Hall responded that the proposed dwelling is 70-90 metres away from the nearest passing place.
- Councillor Cornwell stated the proposed access is only 30 metres from the rear entrance of the hospital which is a gated fire access so surely there is a passing place here? Mr Hall responded that from a highway perspective this is not a passing place.

Members asked questions of officers as follows:

- Councillor Sutton queried that as the application is a PIP that the access is only indicative and is not committed? Nick Harding confirmed this was correct.

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

- Councillor Cornwell expressed the view that due to past decisions of the Council where developments have been approved further along Hospital Road he does not think the committee can say no to this proposal.
- Councillor Sutton made the point that “two wrongs do not make a right”, he agrees with officers, he does not feel it is the right place and Doddington Parish Council do not either.
- Councillor Marks referred to 1.4 of the report and asked if more development should be proposed on the land? Nick Harding responded that 1.4 says that there are too few houses on the site and it is not the efficient use of the land even if members say the principle of development is acceptable. He referred to the objector mentioning that the immediate neighbour to this site on the left had an application refused by the committee due to the loss of countryside and this site sits next door to this site.
- Councillor Murphy expressed the view that this is the wrong location to be building 3 houses, when members went on the site visit the bus just got into the road and had to move and the road will never be widened as it should be. Nick Harding made the point that

highways is not one of the reasons for refusal.

- Councillor Benney expressed the opinion that this dwelling has merit and it will be a nice home for somebody, others have been approved down this road and only 5 metres of hedgerow is being removed to provide 3 very nice homes that he does not see any problem with. He feels that Hospital Road has lots of traffic going down it and he has never experienced any problems.
- Councillor Cornwell referred to the highway report where it clearly says that the addition of 3 more properties will only have a minor impact on the traffic on the road but further development will have a cumulative impact so if anything further is proposed than these 3 properties they will need to look at the situation again.
- Councillor Benney made the point that highways have no objections and he sees nothing wrong with the proposal.
- Nick Harding made the point that there are two recommended reasons for refusal, the first reason is the key one and members really need to focus on why this proposal is acceptable when the proposal for next door was not and members need to be as robust as possible in their justification so that the decision can withstand inspection further down the line.

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

*(Councillor Connor and Mrs Davis registered that they are District Councillors for Doddington and Wimblington and do attend Parish Council meetings but take no part in planning)*

*(Councillor Benney declared that he knows the agent for this application and he has undertaken work for him but he is not pre-determined and will approach the application with an open mind)*

*(Councillor Murphy declared that he knows the agent for this application but he is not pre-determined and would approach the application with an open mind)*

**P135/22      F/YR22/1351/F  
21 THE STITCH, FRIDAY BRIDGE  
ERECT A 2-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING**

Danielle Brooke 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)) during its deliberations.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Matthew Hall, the agent. Mr Hall made the point that there are no neighbouring objections to the proposal or any objections from the consultees. He feels the key point with the application is the neighbouring property, number 19, which is to the west of this site and when he visited the site he reviewed the street scene in this area of The Stitch and showed a photo on the presentation screen that he had took of the bungalow immediately adjacent to the proposal site and to the left-hand side of this bungalow there is already a two-storey property constructed in 2005, which is approximately a metre from the boundary, set well forward of the adjacent bungalow and is similar to what is being proposed with this application.

Mr Hall expressed the view that on the opposite side of The Stitch, properties 68 and 72, which are further to the east, have a very similar situation where there is a bungalow set well back from the street scene and a two-storey property set well forward. He referred to the officer's report making reference to this property being set forward but, in his view, there are numerous other properties along this side of The Stitch that are set forward and more forward than this dwelling, which can be seen on Google Maps and also on Ordnance Survey.



Mr Hall stated that on the actual street scene he has submitted it does show a 1.8 metre high fence along that boundary so he has shown a boundary treatment but he would be happy to accept a condition here. He expressed the opinion that the proposal still has over a third garden area, parking on site for 3 vehicles, materials matching in with the existing property and there are no doors and windows on this side elevation against the neighbouring building and this proposal is no higher than the existing property with this application receiving no objections.

Members asked questions of Mr Hall as follows:

- Councillor Marks stated that there are no windows or anything on the property itself but asked what about the bungalow? Mr Hall responded that the bungalow's principal elevations are front and rear but he believes there is an opening on the right hand side of the bungalow which faces the proposal site but the bungalow is set back.
- Councillor Murphy asked why the photo shows this side of the bungalow when there is more room as the house here is at an angle away from the bungalow but the side where this proposal is going is right up close to the bungalow and the photo should have been taken the other side. Mr Hall responded that the property on the photograph is parallel with the bungalow and he is trying to show what is on the opposite side and he is trying to match in with it to show that there is a two-storey property against a bungalow. He stated that there is 1.2 metres from the bungalow to the fence on the opposite site and on the proposal side there is fractionally less than a metre from the bungalow to the proposed fence.
- Councillor Mrs Davis made the point that the gap between the photo of the house that Mr Hall has taken to the bungalow is bigger than the one on the other side and in the report it says a fence is to be built as the hedge has to be taken down to accommodate the build and the fence to be replaced will be right up against the edge of the bungalow. Mr Hall reiterated there is a 1.2 metres on the side of the bungalow to the fence on the opposite side and slightly less than a metre once the hedge is taken down and replaced with a fence, so the proposal side is probably about a foot closer.
- Councillor Murphy queried why a photo was being shown of a property on the other side of the bungalow and not showing the proposal site against the bungalow.
- Councillor Sutton remarked that there seems to be confusion on the distance between number 19 which is on the left-hand side and is 1200 to the boundary fence and on the right-hand side is a metre to the boundary fence. He feels what Councillor Murphy is referring to is number 17 and the distance from the end of No.17 to their boundary fence. Mr Hall asked for the photo to be displayed again and explained the photo shows No.17, which is not the site that is proposed to be extended, and he has tried to show that there is already a two story building approved in close proximity and stepped forward.
- Councillor Murphy made the point that when members walked along the road from the right hand side of the photo to the bungalow's gate a lady came out of the bungalow and members were shown a house on the right hand side which is going to have the extension on it and the house in the photo has nothing to do with the application. Councillor Sutton stated that Mr Hall is trying to show that one side is built out the same as he is proposing. Councillor Murphy disagreed that the other side is built out, it is not going to be built out the same as the property shown on the photo.
- Councillor Miscandlon expressed the view that the confusion arises from the Ordnance Survey map because it shows No.17 set well in front of No.19 which looking at the photo it is not and it is No.21 that is going to have the extension.
- Councillor Cornwell agreed with the comments of Councillor Miscandlon as the Ordnance Survey clearly shows that No.19 is behind No.17, however, the site for this application is No.21 which is forward of No.19 and No.23 and he thinks the agent is trying to say that the gap between the property is OK but he feels the closer you are to a boundary the more problems it causes. He feels on the face of it it does look very close.
- Councillor Sutton asked who actually owns the hedge? Mr Hall responded that the applicant does own the hedge.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that in the report the neighbour is happy for the hedge to be taken down and a fence put up in its place and has no objections to the build. Mr Hall

confirmed this to be correct and that the neighbour has e-mailed and it is on public access but has asked for a fence to be put back up, which is being proposed.

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

- Councillor Sutton made the point that there is not any neighbour complaints and the neighbour at No.19 has asked for a fence and it should be insisted upon a reasonable sized fence. He understands what the officers are saying about the 45 degree viewpoint but out of the window to the right of the bungalow if you looked out of it now you would not see any further than you do when the extension is there as the hedge is already 2½ metres at least. Councillor Sutton referred to street scene and his own personal view is that the proposal improves the street scene as it makes the house symmetric and the proposed extension does not come any further forward than the right hand wing of the dwelling. He has no problem with the proposal as particularly on that side of the road there is not any development line and there is no neighbour objection.
- Nick Harding made the point that as presented by the officer the proposal will be bringing the side elevation of the property much closer to the boundary so it is going to be much more obvious to the adjacent occupiers of the bungalow in terms of their outlook and quality of outlook as it is going to be a significant blank elevation which would be detrimental to their amenity.

**Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Mrs French and agreed that the application be APPROVED against officer's recommendation, with authority being given to officers to apply conditions.**

Members do not support officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they feel that due to the height of the hedge already in situ the extension will not be demonstrably harmful from the current situation and the proposal will improve the street scene by making the property symmetrical.

*(Councillor Benney declared that he knows the agent for this application and he has undertaken work for him but he is not pre-determined and will approach the application with an open mind)*

*(Councillor Murphy declared that he knows the agent for this application but he is not pre-determined and would approach the application with an open mind)*

**P136/22      F/YR22/1389/F  
LAND SOUTH WEST OF 27A WIMBLINGTON ROAD, DODDINGTON  
ERECT A DWELLING (2-STOREY, 3-BED)**

Danielle Brooke presented the report to the members and drew their attention to the update report which had been circulated.

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

- Councillor Sutton expressed the view that "postage stamp" springs to mind, he feels that officers have made the right decision and he will be supporting the recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs Davis agreed with Councillor Sutton as she feels it is shoehorning onto a too small plot.
- Councillor Miscandlon agreed, it is shoehorning and the amenity space left for the residents will be detrimental to their health and wellbeing.
- Councillor Cornwell expressed the opinion that officers have got the decision right.

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

*(Councillor Connor and Mrs Davis registered that they are District Councillors for Doddington and*

*Wimblington and do attend Parish Council meetings but take no part in planning)*

5.02 pm

Chairman