

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**WEDNESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 2020 -  
1.00 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor A Hay (Vice-Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor A Lynn, Councillor C Marks, Councillor Mrs K Mayor, Councillor N Meekins, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor R Skoulding and Councillor W Sutton, Councillor Mrs J French (Substitute)

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor S Clark,

Officers in attendance: Elaine Cooper (Member Services) Jo Goodrum (Member Services & Governance Officer), Nick Harding (Head of Shared Planning), David Rowen (Development Manager) and Alison Hoffman (Senior Development Officer)

**P26/20**

**F/YR20/0417/F**

**STORAGE BUILDINGS AND OUTBUILDINGS EAST OF 5-6 NORFOLK STREET, WISBECH, CONVERSION OF EXISTING STORE BUILDING TO 3 X 1-BED FLATS INCLUDING INSERTION OF 5NO WINDOWS AND CONVERSION OF PART OF NO.6 TO 1 X SINGLE-STOREY FLAT INVOLVING EXTENSION AND RAISING OF ROOF HEIGHT**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Hawes the applicant.

Mr Hawes explained that the two shops at the front are small one-room premises on a narrow one-way street which is usually congested with parked cars and that number 5 last traded as a jewellers and number 6 is let on a 10 year lease to a hairdresser. He expressed the view that Norfolk Street no longer lends itself to retail activities requiring large stock holdings and therefore various storage buildings at the rear of properties have become unused and have deteriorated over time. Mr Hawes advised that pre-application advice was sought with this application using the same drawings as had gained a favourable response during that process and the application provides for a significant upgrade to the amenity space used by the hairdresser. He stated that currently the only access to properties at the rear of 5/6 is through a covered passageway approximately 750mm wide which already provides access to residential units above the shops and that the storage buildings come with a right of access along the same passageway but were they to be brought back into commercial use this could in his view create significant disruption to existing residents, particularly as parking issues would encourage deliveries at anti-social times. Mr Hawes stated that there is a small courtyard/amenity space at the rear of 5 available for the use of all residents but its use is compromised by the poor state of the buildings behind 6 which are insecure and attract vermin, However by converting the buildings behind 6 into one 2 bed unit, reduced from the 2 units agreed in principle during the pre-application process those issues, in his opinion are addressed. Mr Hawes stated that the current national and local policy is that no car parking is required for town centre developments and these units are sized to cater for a demographic unlikely to be car owners. He expressed the view that Wisbech is well served by public transport and added that by reorienting the barn to allow

access from Orange Grove reduces the footfall from Norfolk Street, thus providing an enhanced environment for the remaining residents. Access to the barn will now be either direct from a private car park or via an existing communal staircase at 9 Orange Grove which will mean that the design is able to offer better accommodation than if a stairwell had to be incorporated into the barn. Mr Hawes added that 9 Orange Grove is a recently updated block, which benefits from a communal fire alarm to which the new flats will be linked and refuse provision for these units will be accommodated on the car park, further reducing issues created by properties gaining access from Norfolk Street. He explained that discussions were held before and during the application process with the Conservation Officer for the Council and she has no objections from a heritage viewpoint, with the only comment received during the public consultation phase being from a residential neighbour who is in favour.

Mr Hawes stated that all buildings affected by this application are in the control of the applicant and access from the car park in Orange Grove through the barn provides a one-off opportunity to address the state of the buildings at the rear of 6 Norfolk Street without undue disruption being caused to other residents. He concluded by stating that by allowing this development the following benefits are achieved; repurposing existing buildings justifying their repair, residents of neighbouring properties are not affected by the possibility of disruption caused by future commercial use, additional accommodation is created, the environment for existing residents of 5/6 Norfolk Street is improved, the working environment for the existing hairdresser is improved and the street scene in Orange Grove is enhanced, by a replacement wall in sympathetic bricks.

Members asked officer's the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that the building does look as though it is in need of improvement and asked officers to clarify the situation with regard to the parking provision. David Rowen stated that there are no parking spaces which form part of the proposal and given that the parking area on Orange Grove also services the existing flats, which is also in the applicant's ownership, there could be the opportunity for a very small element of parking where applicable or appropriate however, it will be below policy compliant level. He added that as the proposal is within the town centre the Local Plan does allow for nil provision. Councillor Mrs French stated that if more developments of flats are approved there will be a problem with regard to lack of parking and in her view parking is an area that needs to be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
- Councillor Skoulding asked for clarification with regard to the wooden door in Norfolk Street and asked whether it will be kept locked or left open in case of an emergency? David Rowen stated that this will be an area the applicant will need to look at, however if it is an aspect that members are particularly concerned about, then it could be an additional condition imposed with any planning permission, for details concerning security to be agreed with officers and implemented thereafter.
- Councillor Murphy referred to the Governments parking policy and asked whether the policy still exists, that properties do not need the provision of any parking spaces in the town centre? David Rowen stated that the Government policy has various strands with regard to car parking and one of those is that by providing no parking it discourages car use. He added that the general approach, which is consistent with the Local Plan, is that while it is desirable to have parking in residential schemes in town centres where that is not achievable because of its central sustainable location, then nil provision or under provision of parking can be approved.

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

- Councillor Meekins stated that he disagrees with the comments from Wisbech Town Council, who state that this proposal is in their view over development and has a lack of off street car parking. He expressed the opinion that there is ample car parking in the vicinity of the site, including St Peters Car Park which has 700 spaces and a small parking area in West Street.

Councillor Meekins expressed the opinion that the type of residents who would live in the proposed development are unlikely to have a car and stated that with regard to over development, the current site is an eye sore and improvements do need to be made and to change it into quality accommodation for single residents is something that he welcomes. He stated that Mr Hawes has confirmed the refuse bin provision is adequate and there is an allocated space for the storage of the refuse bins at the rear of the building. Councillor Meekins expressed the view that whilst he respects the Wisbech Society for all their work, he does not agree with their comments concerning the brickwork being worthy of saving. He agrees with Mr Hawes comment regarding the view from Orange Grove towards the proposed building enhancing the street scene and he will be supporting the officer's recommendation to approve this application.

- Councillor Lynn stated that the space to the rear is very small space, but the whole area is in a state of disrepair and needs to be improved. He added that homes are required not just for families but also consideration for housing does need to be given to those people who are living on the streets. Councillor Lynn expressed the view that he does have concerns over fire risk and would like to see the entrance onto Norfolk Street opened up but stated that he will be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Hay stated that she will also be supporting the officer's recommendation and added that currently the site is an eyesore and does need to be improved as it is encouraging vermin. She expressed the opinion that the nature of the building that is being proposed would give an indication that the residents may not own a car, so the lack of car parking provision would not cause a problem. Councillor Hay added that she also has concerns over means of escape in the event of a fire and added that she would like a condition added to address that and to include more than one exit route.
- Councillor Sutton stated that he shares some of the concerns of other members with regard to the lack of parking, however the committee does approve applications without parking. He referred to page 14 of the officer's report which shows the current footprint and the proposed footprint expressing the view that the built form is not much greater and the buildings are in a poor condition, is an eyesore and he will be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Sutton stated that members must be very clear in adding any condition if the proposal is approved. David Rowen stated that the condition he alluded to earlier would be with regard to security, including how the door onto Norfolk Street would be managed and possible lighting to be included from a security perspective with fire exits and regulations being something that would be addressed under building regulations.

**Proposed by Councillor Meekins, seconded by Councillor Lynn and decided that the application be APPROVED as per the officer's recommendation.**

**P27/20**

**F/YR20/0427/F**

**LAND NORTH OF MANEA RAILWAY STATION ACCESS VIA, FODDER FEN ROAD, MANEA.FORMATION OF A CAR PARK (TO SERVE MANEA TRAIN STATION) AND THE FORMATION OF AN ACCESS AND 2M (MAX) WIDE FOOTPATH LINK**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Cornwell stated that he knows the site well and can understand the reason for the car park but questioned whether officers are aware as to how many trains actually stop at the station each day as he wants to relate that to the number of car parking spaces that are being provided. David Rowen stated that he did not have that information and that would be a question to ask the project team behind the application rather than the Planning Officers. Councillor Cornwell added that he is aware that there has been a recent reduction

in the number of trains stopping at Manea and he is keen to ensure that 112 spaces are enough to cater for the use of the station. David Rowen stated that as Planning Officers and putting aside that it is a Fenland District Council application, they would assume that the rationale behind the application has been considered and what has been applied for is sufficient to meet the purposes of the principles of development.

- Councillor Mrs French stated that with regard to the train service query that Councillor Cornwell raised, but it is supposed to be one train an hour. She added that Mayor James Palmer is currently in discussions with the Ministry of Transport to try and get a solution by the 21 September so that trains do stop once an hour at Whittlesey, March and Manea. She added that it is her understanding that it is to help the people of Manea to use public transport rather than drive and they are looking at the future use of the railway not what it is happening at the present time.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated that he welcomes the proposal as it will be a big benefit to the residents of Manea, but also to the surrounding villages that currently travel to other stations. He added hopefully the hourly train service will be re-introduced and if it removes vehicles off the road it will be a good thing.

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

*(Councillor Mrs Mayor declared an interest, by virtue of the fact that she has been a member of the Hereward Community Rail Partnership when discussions concerning the Manea Station Car Park took place and, therefore, took no part in the discussions or voting on this item)*

*(Councillor Marks declared an interest, by virtue of the fact that he is a member of the Manea Rail Board, and he left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)*

*(Councillors Benney and Murphy left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon due to possible involvement in previous discussions on this item as Cabinet members)*

**P28/20**

**F/YR20/0531/VOC**

**THE COLLEGE OF WEST ANGLIA, ELM HIGH ROAD, WISBECH, VARIATION OF CONDITION 20 TO ENABLE AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLANS OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/YR16/0792/F (ERECTION OF 137 DWELLINGS, ALTERATIONS TO RAMNOTH ROAD AND ELM HIGH ROAD JUNCTION TO FORM A NEW VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS & INFRASTRUCTURE)**

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation in objection to the application, in accordance with the public participation procedure from Councillor Sam Hoy, a District Councillor.

Councillor Hoy stated that she is not against the development but has concerns with the variations to the scheme to the northern part of the site, which is adjacent to Falklands Drive and comprises bungalows. She stated that her concern, and that of some of the residents in Falkland Drive, is that the variation to the proposal now includes two storey dwellings which will overlook the bungalows resulting in a loss of privacy and the residents did not object originally as the proposal only included bungalows against their boundaries, but now the variation which includes the provision of 100% affordable homes appears to have been changed.

Councillor Hoy added that officers have also stated that the variation will lead to overlooking and in her opinion that there is no reason that the developer could not have left bungalows in the northern part of the site as bungalows are required in Wisbech and in her view that the two storey dwellings could have been placed to the front of the site, or in the northern part of the boundary of the site, as it appears that only 3 or 4 properties would be impacted. She reiterated that she has no problem with the proposal apart from her concerns with the new layout and she requested that the committee refuse the application on the basis of overlooking and ask the developer to review the plans in consultation with local residents to make the few small changes that are required to make the proposal satisfactory.

Members asked Councillor Hoy the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that Wisbech Town Council have offered no objections to the proposal and asked Councillor Hoy whether she had taken part in their discussions regarding the application? Councillor Hoy stated that she does not sit on the Town Council's Planning Committee and she believes that the Town Council may not have understood what the variations actually were when they were first submitted, as the information on the District Council's website was not clear.
- Councillor Sutton asked Councillor Hoy if she could advise him under what policy the committee could refuse the application, given that the separation distances in the proposal are exceeded by 2 metres in most places and under the national policy the distance allowed is 21 to 22 metres? Councillor Hoy stated that it is down to the Planning Committee members to make decisions dependent on policies. She made the point that she is only speak on behalf of the residents who do not wish to be overlooked and by making a few small changes to the proposal the concerns of the residents could be overcome.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Mr Jake Stentiford, the agent.

Mr Stentiford stated that the officers' report covers all of the issues very thoroughly, but he wanted to make some brief comments in support of the proposal, with the changes that are proposed enabling the scheme to be delivered as 100% affordable homes, which he is delighted to have been able to do this. He stated that the Council's data indicates that no affordable units have been built in Wisbech in the past three years and as a result there are a total of 619 applicants on the Housing Register needing an affordable home in Wisbech, with this proposal providing 137 affordable units and therefore making a substantial contribution to reversing this trend and beginning to tackle the shortfall.

Mr Stentiford expressed the view that the amendments to the scheme are minor, and as highlighted in the officer's report they will not result in any significant harm to residential amenity. He feels that although the scale has changed at certain points along the boundary, achievable and appropriate separation distances are in place and there will be no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy whatsoever.

Mr Stentiford added that the relationships between existing and proposed dwellings are typical of residential areas, and it would be wrong to prevent affordable homes from being provided on this basis.

He clarified paragraph 1.7 of the committee report where it states that there are no implications for the existing S106 contributions and stated that he is going to deliver the requirements of the existing S106 agreement in its entirety, including the financial contribution for affordable

housing, as well as delivering the whole scheme as affordable on site. The scheme will provide a mix of rented and shared ownership homes, encouraging a mixed neighbourhood in the setting of attractive open space and public realm, which will be a great place to live.

Mr Stentiford stated that the development is entirely acceptable in respect of policy. It is strongly supported by officers and most importantly, in his view, it will make a life changing difference to local families who are waiting for affordable homes right now. He added that it is a high quality scheme, which will deliver much greater benefits over the existing permission, and he would be very grateful for the support of the committee with regard to the application.

Members asked Mr Stentiford the following questions:

- Councillor Lynn asked Mr Stentiford to clarify how the relocation of 3 bungalows would stop the development being 100% affordable? Mr Stentiford stated that the whole scheme has been designed to be deliverable from the point of the registered provider and the proposal before members, in his opinion, is a scheme that works, there is no unacceptable impact and the proposal is clear on planning policy and is more than adequate in terms of separation distances.
- Councillor Lynn stated that whilst he appreciates that legally Mr Stentiford is correct and he has no issue with the whole development, there could be an element of goodwill which could be factored into the proposal. He reiterated his question and asked why moving three bungalows from one part of the site into a different part of the site, stops the proposal from being 100% affordable? He added that consideration needs to be given to the existing residents in the locality who will be effected and whilst from a legal and planning perspective he appreciates that Mr Stentiford is compliant, an element of goodwill is required which will appease the local community. He does appreciate the Section 106 contributions, but out of 137 properties, three of those are causing concern and he asked Mr Stentiford to take that into consideration. Mr Stentiford explained that there are procedures in place for the scheme to be signed off by the registered provider and if something had been fixed in place which was then deemed to be unacceptable due to planning policy then it would be revisited, but in this case there is no unacceptable harm and the risk to return to the detail of the proposal at this stage would put the project in jeopardy.
- Councillor Hay acknowledged that clearly there is no harm, but there will be a risk of loss of privacy in the development and overlooking. She stated that that slightly more bungalows are being built as part of this proposal and questioned why the previous scheme could not have been made 100% affordable. Mr Stentiford stated that this scheme has been completely tailored to meet the requirements of what the registered provider believes they need to provide and by looking at the housing register and looking at the requirements as set out by Homes England. He added that the fundamentals of the scheme are then looked at and the size of units and plots and what is provided in each unit, including floor space, with this information is provided to the architects and this is how the proposal has been put together.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated that whilst he would empathize with the 3 or 4 properties that will back on to the new plots that will affect them, there is no difference to many other

developments that have been approved previously. He stated that there is no specific policy in the Local Plan, but the national policy is 21 metres and there have been approvals made by the committee of distances much closer than that. He added that there are no grounds that are defensible at appeal should the application be refused and there are no reasons in

- planning policy terms to refuse the application and he will be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she agrees with Councillor Lynn's comment concerning goodwill. She does not find the proposal acceptable and whilst Mr Stentiford made reference to going back to the fundamentals of the proposal not being an option in this case, she feels for the sake of moving the three bungalows in this case she thinks that he should and she will not be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Lynn expressed the view that he believes the agent has not given a clear response as to why the 3 bungalows cannot be relocated within the site, which will appease everybody, and he will not be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that affordable homes are needed, and her concern is if the application is refused by the committee then the Council is in great danger of incurring great expense and delay much needed affordable homes.
- Nick Harding stated that the scheme that is before the committee today has been changed which is worse for some of the abutting residents than it was before, but members need to decide whether the decrease in amenity makes the scheme unacceptable. The separation distances between the backs of the houses and the existing bungalows is in excess of what is required under national policy and if the application was refused then it would be difficult to provide a reason for refusal on the grounds of unacceptable loss of amenity and overlooking.

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

*(Councillor Connor declared an interest in this item, by virtue of the fact that he is pre-determined and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon. Councillor Mrs Hay chaired this agenda item)*

**P29/20**

**F/YR20/05760**

**LAND NORTH WEST OF 8, JOBS LANE, MARCH, ERECT 1 X DWELLING  
(OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF  
ACCESS)**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation in support of the application, in accordance with the public participation procedure from Mr Ian Gowler the agent.

Mr Gowler thanked the officers for working with him to resolve issues that has meant this application is presented to members with a recommendation to grant the proposal. He stated that he wished to clarify some points in response to the objections raised by neighbours and added that the layout although indicative has been carefully thought out to give sufficient parking and

turning for the new property as well as the existing bungalow and as part of the new access the existing parking for the bungalow will provide turning to allow cars to exit without the need to back into or out of the drive.

Mr Gowler stated that the visibility splays will be improved at the new access improving safety and the design of the dwelling is subject to a reserved matters application, but the indicative bungalow shows it would complement other development in the area. He stated that this resolves any overlooking issues and privacy is made no worse than the existing bungalow garden use creates and in summary he stated that the proposal meets policy and provides another much needed small bungalow to March.

Members asked Mr Gowler the following questions:

- Councillor Connor referred to the point concerning the visibility splay and asked Mr Gowler to clarify whether there is any legal agreement in place with the adjacent landowners with regard to the third party land? Mr Gowler stated that it is currently being looked into and he added that the neighbouring bungalow is also using his clients land and there is the need for the site to have a reciprocal arrangement in place between the two owners that the visibility splay will be included into the transfer documents for both properties.
- Councillor Connor referred to the 45 letters of support and stated that none of them appear to be from residents local to the proposed dwelling, whereas 10 of the letters of the objection are closer to the proposed site, who have raised concerns over visibility and poor access. Mr Gowler expressed the view that the letters of support are from friends of the applicant and where they live is not within his control. He added there have been several letters of objection where he has tried to resolve the issues that have been raised, some of them to do with over development, which are as a result of a knock on effect of other similar pieces of land where bungalows have been built on in rear gardens. Councillor Connor stated that the objectors do need to be taken into consideration as they are all in the locality and they will be impacted in one way or another.
- Councillor Skoulding asked whether the 4ft fence will be removed, which is currently situated at the front of the site, so that there will be a clear view. Mr Gowler stated that a clear visibility splay will be in line with Highways comments and there is a proposed condition for the visibility splay to be kept to the usual height. Councillor Skoulding stated that if you were in a vehicle you would not be able to see cars coming around Jobs Lane. Mr Gowler stated that the fence and brick wall will need to be adjusted to meet the Highways condition.
- Councillor Skoulding asked whether emergency vehicle access and egress had been considered and whether there would be the possibility of an emergency vehicle being able to turn around and exit forward? Councillor Skoulding added that an ambulance is approximately 4.8 metres long and 2.4 metres wide. Mr Gowler stated that he is unsure whether an ambulance would be able to turn around. Councillor Skoulding expressed the opinion that there is no possibility that you could drive in forward and exit forward and that does causes him concern.
- Councillor Sutton stated that in his opinion it is tight, but if an ambulance was required it could reverse out. He added that he did have concerns about the visibility splay and being held in perpetuity but the agent has confirmed that there will be an agreement in the transfer deeds and if the Highways Authority are content with the splay and there will be rules concerning the height of the fencing and the brick wall that will have to be adjusted. He added that he is not enamoured with the idea of properties in back gardens, however March Town Council have supported the proposal and he does not feel that there are any reasons for the application to be refused.
- Councillor Meekins questioned where the parking facilities are for numbers 10 and 10a. Mr Gowler stated that numbers 10 and 10a are neighbouring properties and are separate to the proposed site and added that there is no parking for the proposed site.
- Councillor Cornwell stated that some of the objectors have raised that the plot is narrower

than some of the other development taking place and he asked Mr Gowler to provide the separation distance between the proposed site and that of number 10a. Mr Gowler stated that he did not have the information, but added that in effect it would be across the driveway of the proposed bungalow and the separation distance to the indicative bungalow shown would be 3 metres to the boundary and 4 metres to the physical building.

Members asked officers the following questions.

- Councillor Cornwell stated that if the accepted separation distance is 21 metres, as we heard earlier, then some of the objections associated with the proposal are relevant. He added that previously that particular part of Jobs Lane was associated with nice properties and gardens, however, there now appears to be a situation where there is back garden development taking place and also a dwelling in a front garden which appears to be entirely out of place and does not follow a building line. Councillor Cornwell stated that the plot size in his opinion is very narrow and there has been so much other development, he does not see how the application can be refused. He added that he does not like the particular plot or the access or egress associated with it. David Rowen stated that the 21 metres that was referred to earlier was back to back distances, whereas the 4 metre distance associated with the proposal is a side to side distance which is a fairly common arrangement between semi-detached and detached properties in most residential areas. David Rowen referred members to the pattern of development at page 67 of their agenda packs, highlighting the back land development at 10a immediately north of the site and the other development in the surrounding area and whilst it is a tight plot, taking into consideration the previous approved schemes in the area and the general character, the view from officers is that it would be difficult to refuse this application.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she has listened to the views of Councillor Cornwell and he is correct in what he has stated, but she feels that a precedent has been set and, therefore, she will support the application. However, she recognised there is a nasty bend and she has taken into account the views of Councillor Skoulding and if there is going to be a fence it needs to be at a low level.

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

- Councillor Sutton referred to the comment by Councillor Skoulding and page 68 of the agenda pack, expressing the opinion that he believes that an ambulance would be able to turn around as the turning area is the full width of the plot. He stated that with regard to the question Councillor Cornwell raised with regard to distances, the indicative plan does not show any windows, it shows a bedroom window at the front which only overlaps the dwelling at 10a by approximately 1metre. He stated that he is not enamoured with the scheme and it is infill, however, he will be supporting the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Connor stated that he disagrees with Councillor Sutton and you would not be able to turn an ambulance around in that space. He added that it is back land development, is a narrow plot and has poor access and he will not be supporting officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Murphy made the point that, although he does not particularly like the proposal and it is a tight space, if members refuse this application then it will be appealed and passed and, therefore, he will support the officer's recommendation.
- Nick Harding stated that as the photographs have shown there is a dwelling being constructed on land adjacent to the application site which is on the same bend and the Highways Authority do not object and the splay required to serve that development goes over third party land as does the current proposal. He added that as there are no objections from the Highway Authority, the application cannot be refused on highway visibility grounds and with regard to emergency vehicles being able to access the land there is no policy in place to have a requirement for a turning circle to be provided for emergency vehicles so

the application could not be refused for that reason. Nick Harding stated that as the officer has detailed in their report although this is back land development, the grade of development in this proposal has been compromised by previously approved developments and, therefore, there are no justifiable reasons to refuse the proposal. He stated that this is an outline application and if it is approved when the reserved matters application is received, then officers will look at the location of placement of windows with regard to the relationship of the adjacent development and consideration will be given to the issue of overlooking.

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

*(Councillor Benney did not take part in the discussion or voting with regard to this application, due to the fact that he lost internet connection at the start of the item)*

*(Councillor Connor declared an interest, by virtue of the fact that the Agent for this application is a Doddington Parish Councillor and Councillor Connor attends Doddington Parish Council in his position as an elected member of Fenland District Council)*

*(Councillor Lynn had left the meeting prior to discussion on this item).*

#### **P30/20      PLANNING APPEALS.**

Members considered the appeals report presented by Alison Hoffman and David Rowen.

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

**Planning Application Reference: (Appeal reference) ENF/012/17/UCU  
(Appeal references: Appeal A: APP/D0515/C/19/3224948&  
Appeal B: APP/D0515/C/19/3224949**

- Councillor Meekins stated that this premises has caused considerable problems for local residents, with there appearing to be a complete disregard for the planning process and he welcomed the news that the appeal was dismissed, thanking officers for all their hard work involved on the case.
- Councillor Sutton asked what will be the next steps going forward as the Inspector has given the appellant six months as a period of compliance to explore alternative options. Alison Hoffman stated that no approaches have been received to date from the operator of the premises, so it maybe that they are formulating their proposals to bring forward. Nick Harding stated that if use continues beyond the deadline set by the Inspector then prosecution action could be considered.

*(Councillor Mrs French had left the meeting prior to the discussion on this item)*

4.41 pm

Chairman