

**APPLICATION NO: F/YR17/0304/F**

**SITE LOCATION: Land East Of 88 Sutton Road, Leverington,  
Cambridgeshire**

## **UPDATES**

As a correction, paragraph 9.35 on page 32 should refer to paras. 155-165 of the NPPF.

Since the officer report was drafted several additional comments have been received following re-consultation on the latest submitted plans. These are reported below:

Leverington Parish Council have expressed concerns that the raising of land levels potentially moves the issue of flooding to other land and the numbers of vehicle movements. The lack of a public consultation in Leverington is also raised.

Wisbech Town Council has no comments.

Three further letters of objection have been received from local residents reiterating previous issues but also raising health concerns, concerns over future residents' insurance position and reservations over the impact of a development of this scale on the future of the town.

One letter expressing support for the application has been received.

In addition a neutral response from a resident of Horseshoe Terrace supporting the principle of housing growth in Wisbech generally and welcoming the amendments to the development in respect of access from Horseshoe Terrace. However some concerns are also expressed regarding the pedestrian facilities in Horseshoe Terrace, as well as concerns over the drainage of the site in relation to the increase in land levels.

It is considered that these issues are already largely addressed within the Committee report.

However to address the issue of Horseshoe Terrace, it is acknowledged that this is a narrow road with limited pedestrian facilities. However it is not considered that the development of four additional houses would significantly worsen this situation and that any impact would be balanced by the improvement to the turning head.

In addition the comments raised regarding the future situation of residents in respect of insurance is not a material planning consideration. Comments received regarding existing residents health and the impact of the development are not considered to be so significant as to be able to demonstrate an impact warranting the refusal of planning permission.

In terms of the Parish Council's issue regarding the lack of a public consultation, the appeal decision at Manea in 2017 concluded that only limited weight could be given to this matter if no other planning harm was identified. As such the absence of a community consultation is not considered to constitute a reason for which the application could be refused.

**Recommendation: Grant planning permission as per the recommendation at page 35 of the agenda**