

# PLANNING COMMITTEE



**WEDNESDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2021 -  
1.00 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Connor (Chairman), Councillor I Benney, Councillor Mrs M Davis (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Mrs J French, Councillor Mrs K Mayor, Councillor P Murphy, Councillor M Purser, Councillor R Skoulding and Councillor W Sutton,

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Mrs S Bligh, Councillor M Cornwell, Councillor C Marks and Councillor D Topgood

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

## **P45/21      PREVIOUS MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the 28 July, 11 August and 18 August 2021 were confirmed and signed as accurate records.

## **P46/21      F/YR21/0339/F LAND NORTH AND WEST OF 47, FRIDAYBRIDGE ROAD, ELM CONVERSION OF EXISTING BARNs TO 1 X 4-BED AND 1 X 5-BED TWO STOREY DWELLINGS AND ERECTION OF 8 X DWELLINGS WITH GARAGING (6 X 2-STOREY 4-BED AND 2 X 2-STOREY 5-BED) AND ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING**

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Jamie Burton, the agent.

Mr Burton explained that the proposal is a full application, which has an officer recommendation for approval and since the original submission he has worked very closely with Planning and Conservation Officers through numerous iterations to overcome their concerns and ensure that the proposal complies with all policy requirements and achieves officer support. He added that the amendments have also been developed to address and respond to concerns raised by residents and the Parish Council and the concerns primarily relate to amount of development, highways implications and drainage.

Mr Burton stated that the scheme has evolved significantly in response and has reduced in number from 13 to 10 dwellings, 1 of which is a replacement, including retention of the existing barns for conversion, the closing off all 3 access points on to Wales Bank one of which is directly on the junction and a single access point on to Fridaybridge Road, and the provision of a drainage scheme which has been accepted by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). He added that the officer's report comprehensively details the evolution of the scheme and their response to concerns raised to ensure the proposal is acceptable and can be supported and the intention of

the application is to be able to deliver a high-quality development in the desirable village of Elm, which is a Growth Village in which small village extensions are appropriate.

Mr Burton explained that the site is not located within the Elm Conservation Area, neither is it close to any Listed buildings, however, the scheme has been amended in consultation with the Conservation Officer noting the non-designated heritage assets on the site. He stated that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is within the built-up area of the village with houses to the north, south, west and east and, in his view, the proposal fully complies with LP3 and LP12 as it would not result in coalescence with any neighbouring villages, not adversely impact the character and appearance of adjacent countryside, would not extend the existing linear features, would not result in a loss of important open space or agricultural land, and it can be adequately drained as confirmed by the drainage strategy and LLFA and will not put people or property in danger.

Mr Burton pointed out that the impact of the development upon existing trees and biodiversity is assessed in detail with the application and the impacts and mitigation proposed are acceptable as confirmed by the technical consultees and the site, therefore, meets all the criteria set out in LP3 and Part A of Policy LP12. He explained that the revised layout demonstrates an effective use of land, one which is appropriate for its surroundings, and the density of the scheme is in keeping with the existing residential development along Fridaybridge Road and Wales Bank, with the layout also retaining a larger curtilage to No 47.

Mr Burton expressed the opinion that the existing housing surrounding the application site is very mixed in terms of its design and appearance and the well-designed new houses are appropriate for this context and are in keeping with the form and character of the area. He stated that good quality materials can be secured by planning condition and that all the plots are generous in size, and incorporate the retained trees around the edge of the site, with the separation distances from neighbouring properties and the position of the proposed dwellings also ensuring there is no overlooking, and the development will afford the occupiers of the new properties a high standard of amenity.

Mr Burton stated that that scheme has the support of the Highways Officer and highlighted that vehicular access points to Wales Bank have been removed with a single access on to Fridaybridge Road, which highways have deemed as acceptable. He made the point that the application is supported by an Extended Phase 1 Ecological Survey Report which has assessed the site for protected species and management measures have been set out in the report to ensure that the works and mitigation measures can be incorporated and secured by condition, which have been accepted by the Wildlife Officer.

Mr Burton concluded by stating that he believes the application proposes a well-considered and high-quality design and will not result in any unacceptable highway impacts, would not harm the amenity of existing residents, and would afford future occupiers a good stand of amenity. He added that the new landscaping and measures to enhance biodiversity can be incorporated into the scheme and secured by planning condition and he stated that Elm is designated as a 'limited growth village' where village extensions will be supported.

Mr Burton stated that the scheme will not result in overdevelopment and will retain and respect the non-designated heritage assets. He expressed the view that the site can be adequately drained and has no technical consultee objections and officers support as a policy compliant proposal.

Members asked Mr Burton the following questions:

- Councillor Sutton asked Mr Burton whether his drainage consultants have been on site to measure any levels including the level of the ditch? Mr Burton stated he was not aware whether any measurements had been undertaken. Councillor Sutton stated that the Parish Council and Internal Drainage Board officers have raised concerns regarding the levels, and they do not think that the water can drain off because the bottom of the ditch is level with the surface of the plot. Mr Burton stated that he will consult with the drainage consultants again and stated that there are solutions to overcome such issues such as attenuating on site and pumping into the drain at an agreed rate.
- Councillor Sutton stated that the ditch is in a poor condition and the dwellings that are being erected on site are installing 450 diameter pipes, one of which is invisible as there have been no headwalls put in place and the hardcore has fallen into the ditch. He asked Mr Burton what steps he will put in place to overcome the issues as well as ascertaining and contacting the riparian owner to obtain permission to pump into the drain? Mr Burton expressed the view that it is likely that the Internal Drainage Board will insist that he makes good the drain and maintain it with any improvement measures required and the piping and cross overs from the individual plots should have had permission before they were installed and if they have failed then Internal Drainage Board could insist that element is put right, but it is something that he can pick up as part of the improvement works to the drain.
- Councillor Sutton asked if those works are not achievable what other mitigation steps would be put in place? Mr Burton stated that he would look to attenuate on site further and increase the amount of infiltration on site and soakaways. He stated that there is the shared roadway on site and there is the potential to use clean stone on site with larger gaps to allow it to attenuate water within it and allow it to percolate. Mr Burton added that there was another proposal which came forward to the LLFA for a deeper soakaway, but their preference was to use the drain and if that cannot be achieved through the hierarchy, then the deep soakaway on site would be the option.
- Councillor Mrs French asked who would be responsible for the running costs and the maintenance of the pump that Mr Burton had referred to? Mr Burton stated that the site has a shared access drive and there will be a management committee which each of the dwellings will be involved with and the committee would be responsible for the management and maintenance of the pump which the occupiers would be expected to make a financial contribution towards. He stated he would be happy to accept a condition for the management scheme to come forward for the roadways and drainage scheme.

Members asked officers the following questions:

- Councillor Benney asked whether the drainage issue is something that can be dealt with by way of a condition? Alison Hoffman stated that the LLFA have responded and provided a comprehensive bespoke condition which states that no laying of surface, creation of hard surfaces and erection of buildings should take place until the detailed design of the surface water drainage of the site along with the timetable for implementation is put forward which gives a level of certainty that has been requested and at Part F of their robust condition they require full details of the maintenance adoption of the surface water drainage system going forward, with the agent accepting the detail in that condition.
- Councillor Murphy stated that he agrees with the refuse collection strategy which has been detailed for the site and referred to condition 16 which states that it will be in place for perpetuity. He questioned as to how assurances can be given that the perpetuity condition

will be adhered to? Alison Hoffman stated that she would hope that if any concerns were raised by the Refuse Team, these would be passed to the Planning Enforcement Team for any action deemed necessary.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated he would like it noted that the agent and officers have worked together to make the scheme acceptable, however, he still has concerns over the drainage issues. He added that he has spent six years trying to resolve flooding issues in Birch Grove which goes into the same ditch and he stated that 1 and a half litres a second does not sound very much but over an hour it equates to 5400 litres. Councillor Sutton made the point that if the drainage issues are not sorted out and the water flows north it will add to an already existing problem, of which the Parish Council have also raised concerns. He expressed the opinion that the condition stated appears to allay any problems, however, he is unsure whether it should be put in place before permission is granted.
- Councillor Mrs Davis asked Councillor Sutton whether he is aware of how often Wales Bank has flooded? Councillor Sutton stated that there is a crossroads in Wales Bank, when accessed from Fridaybridge Road, where he is aware of two houses who have suffered from flooding issues, although he has not witnessed it himself and he is not aware of any reports of flooding of properties on Wales Bank itself.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that Cambridgeshire County Council are currently looking at all dykes and ditches across the county following the flooding episodes which affected the area over recent months.

Nick Harding stated that the drainage strategy is in place which the LLFA are satisfied with, however, if through the discharge of conditions, it becomes apparent that the strategy cannot be complied with, then a variation of condition application would have to be submitted for an alternative drainage strategy to be submitted and subsequently approved.

Councillor Connor asked whether that variation of condition application would be brought before the Planning Committee and Nick Harding explained that not necessarily, but if the application was called in by members it would be brought back to the committee.

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

**P47/21      F/YR21/0157/F  
LAND EAST OF 60, STATION ROAD, MANEA  
ERECT 2 X DWELLINGS (2-STOREY, 2-BED) AND FORMATION OF ACCESS TO  
60 STATION ROAD**

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

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

Mr Gowler stated that the application is for 2 semi-detached, 2 bed dwellings and explained that, if permission is granted, the dwellings would be constructed for the applicant's two daughters and although this is not a material planning consideration the applicant is looking for somewhere to build a pair of self-build properties within Manea. He explained that the site is in Flood Zone 3 and the officer's report mentions that the site does not pass the sequential test because of other similar

land being available in a lower flood zone.

Mr Gowler stated that currently the only land with permission available for purchase is under permission F/YR19/0970/O and it is being marketed at £200,000 and is also unfortunately susceptible to contamination due to its previous use. He added that this gives the plot value of £66k per plot with a build cost of £120k and would mean the value would need to exceed £186k excluding the contamination work when complete and he stated that a 2-bed property in Manea is likely only to be worth £175k and, therefore, in his opinion this site is overpriced and in reality, not available, or viable.

Mr Gowler explained that the other site mentioned in the report is not being marketed and, therefore, not available and that it is proposed that the new properties will have significant rear gardens that can be used to sustainably dispose of the drainage from the development, with these dwellings, albeit behind existing properties, not having a significant impact on the street scene of Station Road any more than the large 3 storey properties opposite. He stated that properties 58 and 60 are modest single storey bungalows, but all the other nearby properties surrounding the site on Station Road are two storey houses and, therefore, the chalet style bungalows are in keeping with the two styles.

Mr Gowler explained that whilst there are currently no 'backland' dwellings in this area there are other buildings extending out the rear, including the large agricultural buildings to the north, and stated that the site is located within walking distance of the local facilities of Manea and close to the developing train station, which adds to the current sustainability aims of Local and National Planning Policy to encourage less car usage. He concluded by stating that the two dwellings will create two small and affordable self-build dwellings in a sustainable location and hoped the Committee are in favour of the proposal.

Members asked Mr Gowler the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she is concerned over the possibility of flooding and asked Mr Gowler how he intends to overcome the issue? Mr Gowler stated that the whole area is at risk of flooding and added that the gardens are very large and there would be enough space to install soakaways or an attenuation system.

Members asked officer's the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French asked officers whether, in their opinion, it is possible to resolve the issue of flooding? Alison Hoffman stated that within the report it states that the Environment Agency withdrew their objection to the original Flood Risk Assessment and a revised Flood Risk Assessment was submitted. She added that the sequential and exception tests are two stranded and the sequential test looks at directing development to the area of lower flood risk and as the proposed site is within Flood Zone 3, it fails on that part and the two component parts of the exception test look at whether the site itself is physically able to accommodate the development without flood risk both on and off the site, which the proposal does satisfy. Alison Hoffman added that the wider issue of the sustainability benefits remains in terms of delivery of the two dwellings on the site and in Flood Risk Assessment terms the scheme demonstrates that the residents would not be at risk of flooding, the proposal is contrary in terms of location of the site, and it fails to address the sustainability aspect. Councillor Mrs French stated that it is the issue of sustainability that she has concerns with.
- Councillor Murphy stated that the Agent has advised that there are no other parcels of land in Manea for the proposal to be built and asked officers to confirm how much land is available in Manea when considering the five-year land supply?. David Rowen stated that when applying the sequential test, the Supplementary Planning Document adopted by the Council sets out the land that should be considered, it does not identify land which is being marketed and only details extant planning permissions which is sufficient to carry out the sequential test and, therefore, if there are a couple of sites with extant planning permissions

which could accommodate a couple of dwellings then they would be sequentially preferable. Councillor Murphy asked whether there is any more land available, and David Rowen stated that Mr Gowler had indicated that there were two sites, one which was not being marketed and another which was being marketed at a high value. Councillor Murphy asked whether there were any other sites available, and David Rowen stated he was not aware of the extant planning permissions, but he would be surprised if there were only two sites available but for the purposes of the sequential test it has been demonstrated that there are other sites with extant planning permission within the settlement and, therefore, the proposal site is not sequentially preferable as a result.

- Councillor Mrs French stated that she is aware that she has read a document which states that there are 6.92 years of land supply available. She expressed the opinion that the marketed value of the land in Manea is not a material planning consideration.
- Councillor Connor concurred with the comments made by Councillor Mrs French with regard to the marketed value of the land.
- Councillor Sutton agreed that the value of the land is not a material planning consideration when determining the application.

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

- Councillor Mrs French stated that the Parish Council do not support this proposal and their views must be taken into consideration. She expressed the opinion that the proposal is over development, she has concerns over the issue of flooding and access and she cannot support the application.
- Councillor Skoulding expressed the opinion that officers have made the correct recommendation.
- Councillor Sutton stated that in his view the officers have made the correct recommendation and it is consistent with previous planning decisions and he will support the officer's recommendation.

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

*(Councillors Connor and Mrs Davis declared that the Agent for this application is known to them as he used to be a Doddington Parish Councillor and Councillors Connor and Mrs Davis attend Doddington Parish Council in their positions as elected members of Fenland District Council)*

**P48/21**

**F/YR21/0702/O**

**LAND NORTH OF 15, SANDBANK, WISBECH ST MARY**

**ERECT 1NO DWELLING (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED)**

Alison Hoffman presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Jamie Burton, the agent.

Mr Burton explained that the application is before the committee because of the amount of support both locally and from the Parish Council, with 8 of the 9 letters of support being from residents or landowners in Sandbank. He explained that the proposal is an outline application with all matters reserved to allow full details of the design, layout, and access to be considered upon submission of the reserved matters application, with the site itself not being agricultural but paddock land.

Mr Burton stated that the indicative site layout plan demonstrates that the proposal can deliver a high-quality development that follows the existing built form and will accord with the development pattern of Sandbank, with the intention of this application being able to deliver a high-quality self-

build plot in a growth village in which small village extensions are appropriate, and added that it should be noted that early communications with officer's during the application process indicated that the application was likely to be supported. He stated that some amendments to the scheme were incorporated working with the officers, and these amendments included reducing the width of the proposed plot to ensure it lines up with the extent of residential development opposite thereby ensuring the proposal does not result in linear ribbon development and reinforcing that the proposal respects the 9m easement of the IDB culverted drain that runs along the boundary.

Mr Burton explained that the access location was altered to improve the relationship with the transformer poles and the proposal extends the footpath network to meet the proposed access point ensuring that the occupiers would have safe pedestrian access to the facilities of Wisbech St Mary and the nearby bus stops. He expressed the view that the access achieves adequate visibility and has no objections from highways and stated that if members were minded to approve the application, the applicant is willing to accept a condition to relocate the transformer in liaison with UK Power Networks if deemed necessary.

Mr Burton stated that the Parish Council are also bidding as part of a highway improvement scheme to extend the 30mph limit along Sandbank as there are a number of properties beyond the proposed site, with many residents walking along the road into the village and, in his view, this proposal may assist in reinforcing their bid. He stated that the scheme has no objections from technical consultees or local people and has numerous letters of support and the support of the Parish Council and local Councillors.

Mr Burton explained that he has worked proactively with officers throughout the process and has noted the reasons for refusal, but with regards to flood risk the Environment Agency have no objection to the proposal and drainage is intended to connect to the sewer with rainwater into the water course, which is acceptable to the Internal Drainage Board subject to a contribution, which will be forthcoming. He explained that with regards to the sequential test there are no reasonably available alternative sites within the village as confirmed in the Flood Risk Assessment.

Mr Burton referred to other planning applications stating that one of the plots is out for tender and will commence shortly, the second will not be built at this time and the new owners of The Poplars are not pursuing this development and, therefore, it is not reasonably available. He referred to another application which is not currently available to purchase, and a search on the website Rightmove earlier confirmed this and the plot is, therefore, not reasonably available.

Mr Burton expressed the view that to the best of his knowledge other sites within the village have either commenced, are in the same flood zone, have been sold for development or are not currently for sale, all of which are not reasonably available, therefore, meeting the sequential test. He stated that there have been a number of approvals across the District at significantly higher risk of flooding than this proposed site and with regards to the exception test he is willing to accept a climate change mitigation condition as suggested by officers.

Mr Burton expressed the opinion that he believes the scheme abuts the built form, will not result in harm as it is not extending linear development past the current residential development into the countryside, and it should be noted that development exists past this proposed site further out of the village. He added that the proposed site does not mirror grassland opposite as suggested, the proposal mirrors the dwelling opposite, the remainder of the grassland will be retained, retaining

the gap and they are willing to accept an ecological improvement condition to ensure they are enhancing the biodiversity of the site.

Mr Burton stated that the scheme will not adversely affect neighbour's amenity and will respect the form and character, and this can be controlled as part of the Reserved Matters application. He drew members attention to the presentation screen and stated that the slide shows the former development boundary for Wisbech St Mary and clearly shows the proposed site abutting this boundary and, therefore, abutting the built form as required by policy to allow a small village extension.

Mr Burton expressed the view that the scheme is consistent with recent approvals within the village and is also consistent with a number of recent approvals by the Planning Committee within Fenland to deliver high quality development. He feels the proposal complies with policy, will result in a high-quality self-build development without causing harm to the form and character of the area or residential amenity and has local support.

Mr Burton asked the committee to support the proposal and approve this application with the conditions they deem appropriate.

Members asked Mr Burton the following questions:

- Councillor Mrs French asked Mr Burton to clarify whether the applicant would be prepared to install a footpath? Mr Burton confirmed that they would be willing to do that.
- Councillor Connor asked whether the footpath could be installed before construction on the site commenced? Mr Burton stated that the applicant would accept it if it formed part of a condition.

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

- Councillor Sutton stated that he understands why the officer has recommended the application for refusal, but, in his opinion, it is adjacent to the built form, it is in a growth village and as long as the flood risk mitigation is in place when it comes to the Reserved Matters stage, he does not see anything wrong with the proposal.
- Councillor Benney stated that the application has the support of the Parish Council and it is ideal land for the proposal. He expressed the view that he would not deem the application site to be in the open countryside as it is within the village boundaries and, in his view, LP12 and LP16 of the Local Plan are subjective either way and he will support and approve the application.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she agrees with Councillor Sutton and stated that all the Statutory Consultees have no objection. She added it is a growth village and she will support the application.

Nick Harding highlighted to members the flood risk reason for refusal, and referred members to the Policy LP12 (A) Section E where it says that regard should be given as to whether or not a development proposal would extend the linear features of the settlement or result in the development taking place and he stated that this development would result in that and would be contrary to the adopted Local Plan Part LP2.

**Proposed by Councillor Sutton, seconded by Councillor Benney and agreed that the application be APPROVED against the officer's recommendation, with conditions to be**

applied as deemed appropriate by officers.

**Members do not support the officer's recommendation of refusal of planning permission as they do not feel that the proposal causes demonstrable harm to the surrounding area, but will improve the setting and the risk of flooding can be overcome by applying flood mitigation measures on the Reserved Matters application.**

Councillor Connor stated that he would like a condition included at the Reserved Matters stage that the path should be in place before any development commences. Councillor Mrs French stated that the top layer of the path should not be included.

Nick Harding stated that he appreciates that members require the early delivery of the path, but he is mindful that the County Council might not want to adopt the footway until it is completed.

**P49/21      F/YR19/1106/F  
LAND EAST OF ST MARYS CHURCH HALL, WISBECH ROAD, WESTRY  
ERECT 6 DWELLINGS (4 X 2-STOREY 2-BED AND 2 X 2-STOREY 3-BED) AND  
ASSOCIATED WORKS**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**P50/21      F/YR21/0555/O  
LAND EAST OF STATION FARM, FODDER FEN ROAD, MANEA  
ERECT UP TO 5 DWELLINGS (OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH MATTERS  
COMMITTED IN RESPECT OF ACCESS)**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Shanna Jackson, the agent.

Mrs Jackson stated that this is an outline application for up to 5 dwellings with all matters are reserved expect for access and, whilst the application has been recommended for refusal, it is before the committee as it has received a number of letters of support from the local community. She expressed the view that the primary concern appears to be the locational aspect of the proposal as it has been considered that the site lies outside of the main settlement of Manea, however, as members will have seen from the presentation and site visit, the site is no further out of Manea than the existing dwelling and buildings at the pet care centre over the road and it is within the village sign.

Mrs Jackson expressed the view that the proposal will not encroach any further into the countryside than the exiting development and it is wholly reasonable to consider that the site is within the village. She expressed the opinion that it is further argued within the report that future residents are likely to depend on private modes of transport given the lack of footpath to the front of the site, however, it is widely accepted that Fenland is a rural District and a commuter District, therefore, the reliance on private cars is inevitable, as it is with nearly any new development within the district.

Mrs Jackson added that the benefit that this site has is that it is close to the railway station, whose car park is currently being developed and the site, therefore, has great sustainable transport links, much better than a lot of other areas within the District. She stated that concerns have been raised with regards to the noise from the railway and that it could cause harm to future residential amenities, but the dwellings can be constructed using noise mitigation measures such as triple

glazing and use acoustic fencing and these noise concerns can be overcome.

Mrs Jackson expressed the view that the noise mitigation measures can be secured via a planning condition which would be duly accepted, and she added that, in any case, there are other dwellings in the area to the south of the site and at Charlemont Drive which are closer to the railway line than the application site. She questioned that if these properties were allowed in such close proximity to the railway, why it is different for this application?

Mrs Jackson stated that a further objection relates to the site being located within Flood Zone 3 and stated that members will note from the Committee report that the Environment Agency has no objection to the development and that the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the scheme can be made technically safe from flooding. She stated that the final reason for refusal relates to the lack of a habitat survey to establish the ecological potential of the drains on site which may be affected by the potential access should permission be granted and added that the ecology details on the drain would be covered by the Internal Drainage Board as part of the application to culvert the ditch. She stated that the ecology details would be considered by the Conservation Officer on the Drainage Board who would make recommendations and approve mitigation measures accordingly and, therefore, given that the ecology details are dealt with by other legislation it is not necessary for these details to be required as part of the planning application.

Mrs Jackson stated that the applicant is committed to improving ecology and biodiversity within the area and would be willing to incorporate new woodland features and create new habitats elsewhere within his land ownership in order to promote the biodiversity and geological interest within the area. She expressed the opinion that the location of the site is acceptable, given that it extends no further into the countryside than the existing development and it is within the village sign and the proposal will represent a unique opportunity to provide new high-quality housing in a sustainable location which is next to Manea Station.

Mrs Jackson expressed the view that the technical objections set out in the Committee report can be overcome and she stated that she hopes the committee are able to see that there are significant benefits to this scheme and that they are able to grant planning permission accordingly.

Members asked Mrs Jackson the following questions:

- Councillor Benney asked whether, if the application is approved, as part of the flood mitigation measures will the houses be built up? Shanna Jackson stated that the Environment Agency were content with the Flood Risk Assessment and they recommended a condition to incorporate mitigation measures which the applicant will be happy to accept.

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

- Councillor Benney stated that the development falls within the village sign and the open countryside is on the opposite side of the road. He added he is content to arrive in a village and see nice houses as it sets the tone of what to expect in the village and 5 houses would change the perception that visitors have when they arrive in the village of Manea as currently upon arrival there is a derelict barn. Councillor Benney stated that the proposal will not impact anybody in the village of Manea and the station opposite means that the proposal is well connected for transport links. He added that the proposal will smarten up the area and provide good homes for people and the residents will have cars and use the village of Manea which will help the village progress. Councillor Benney pointed out that the Council have invested money into the car park on the opposite side of the road and the application will enhance that part of the area. He stated that, in his opinion, any prospective purchasers of property will be aware that there is a train station near to the dwellings and they do have a choice as to whether they buy a property knowing there will be an element of noise from the station. Councillor Benney stated that the application site is in a field, and although there is the need to be mindful of taking agricultural land away there are thousands of acres taken out of use and, in his opinion, it is a good use of land for Manea, it will

enhance and welcome people entering the village and he will support the application.

- Councillor Sutton stated that Manea Parish Council do not support the application and it has always been said that the railway is the boundary and to be consistent there have been applications previously in Manea where the car park is, and they were refused and held on appeal. He stated that to remain consistent he cannot support the application and will support the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Murphy stated that he agrees with the comments made by Councillor Sutton and expressed the view that the application site is too far outside of the village of Manea to class it as being in Manea. He stated that it is in an unsustainable location and Part 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework refers to the Environment Agency and the sequential test and the exception test, which has not been carried out and the site falls into the highest flood risk area of Flood Zone 3. Councillor Murphy expressed the view that Fodder Fen Road has no footpath or lighting and highlighted that the Parish Council have strongly objected to the proposal and he will be supporting the officer's recommendation for refusal.
- Councillor Mrs Mayor stated that she fully agrees with the comments made by Councillor Murphy and fully supports the officer's recommendation. She expressed the opinion that she is concerned about the remarks made by the Environment Agency who have recommended that the floor levels be raised in order to make the dwelling safe provided that there is no ground floor sleeping. Councillor Mrs Mayor added that she has been a member of the project board involved with the development of the car park at Manea Station which has taken a while to come to fruition and some of that has been due to issues surrounding water.

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

**P51/21**

**F/YR21/0603/F**

**42 TAVISTOCK ROAD, WISBECH**

**ERECT 4 X 3-BED 2-STOREY DWELLINGS; 1.8 METRE HIGH TIMBER FENCE AND PARKING FOR NO. 42 INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DOUBLE GARAGE INCLUDING FORMATION OF A NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

Members received a presentation, in accordance with the public participation procedure, from Shanna Jackson, the agent.

Mrs Jackson stated that the application is for the construction of 4 dwellings on land to the rear of 42 Tavistock Road, Wisbech, with the dwellings taking the form of 2 pairs of semi-detached houses, positioned in the extended rear garden area serving the existing property and the site represents a great opportunity to provide 4 affordable family homes within Wisbech Town centre. She stated that the site is in a prime location which is within walking distance to education, retail, employment, and health services in the town, which she feels is a rarity, and each plot will be provided with a generous rear garden and two parking spaces, with a large garden and sufficient parking also remaining to serve the host dwelling at number 42.

Mrs Jackson explained that concerns have been raised in the committee report that the proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the area, however, from the submitted site plan the scale and layout of each plot is entirely commensurate with the existing development to the south along Colville Road. She added that, in addition, she would argue that the glimpses of the dwellings you would see from the Tavistock Road frontage would not be harmful, instead they would appear very typical of a town centre location such as this.

Mrs Jackson pointed out that concerns have also been raised with regards to there being an overbearing impact as a result of the proximity of the dwellings to the south western boundary,

however, the rear garden areas serving the properties along Colville Road and Trafford Park are approximately 20m and 10m long respectively and are separated by fencing and landscaping and the length of these gardens and the fact that the roofs of the dwellings will be fully hipped provides a significant amount of visual relief from the rear aspect of the neighbouring houses. She expressed the view that the situation is no worse than that at the Trafford Road/Colville Road junction located to the south east of the site.

Mrs Jackson stated that the application is supported by Wisbech Town Council and no objections have been received from County Highways or FDC Environmental Protection Team. She added that there have also been no objections to the principle of the development or to the design or general appearance of the proposed dwellings.

Mrs Jackson expressed the opinion that the proposal represents a rare opportunity to provide 4 new family homes within Wisbech Town Centre where there are significant sustainability benefits, and she asked the committee to agree and approve the application accordingly.

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

- Councillor Skoulding stated that he agrees with the officer's recommendation.
- Councillor Mrs French stated that she also agrees with Councillor Skoulding and added that, in her view, she believes that the application is over development. She made the point that she does take the views of Town and Parish Councils very seriously, but on this occasion, she agrees with officers.
- Councillor Connor stated that he agrees, the committee must be consistent, it is over development and he will not support the proposal.
- Councillor Mrs Davis stated that she will support the officer's recommendation and expressed the view that the development will have a serious impact on the residents of Trafford Road and Colville Road, with this proposal for four dwellings being in the wrong location.

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

*(Councillor Sutton had left the meeting prior to this application and any remaining applications being considered)*

**P52/21      F/YR21/0611/PLANOB  
LAND SOUTH EAST OF ORCHARD LODGE, JOBS LANE, MARCH  
MODIFICATION OF PLANNING OBLIGATION ATTACHED TO PLANNING  
PERMISSION F/YR15/0290/F (ENTERED INTO ON 27/09/2016) TO ALLOW  
ACCENT HOUSING TO CHARGE THE DWELLING FOR MARKET VALUE  
SUBJECT TO TENANCIES AS OPPOSED TO EXISTING USE VALUE AND  
REMOVE THE REQUIREMENT TO ENTER INTO A NOMINATION AGREEMENT IN  
RELATION TO OCCUPATION OF THE UNIT**

David Rowen presented the report to members.

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

*(Councillor Purser declared that he had a close relative who resides in the vicinity of the application site and left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and voting thereon)*

3.07 pm

Chairman