
MAIN CASE

Reference No: 21/00208/FUL

Proposal: Single storey side extension forming kitchen

Site Address: Broomstick Cottage 28 The Cotes Soham Ely
Cambridgeshire CB7 5EP

Applicant: John & Pat Walsh

Case Officer: Molly Hood Planning Officer

Parish: Soham

Ward: Soham North
Ward Councillor/s: Victoria Charlesworth
Alec Jones

Date Received: 10 February 2021 **Expiry Date:** 7th April 2021
Report Number [V168]

1.0 **RECOMMENDATION****1.1** Members are recommended to refuse the application for the following reason:

The proposal creates substantial harm to the Listed Building due to its location and scale, which is not outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme as required by Chapter 16 of the NPPF relating to heritage assets. The proposed development would not respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, resulting in an unharmonious form of development. Additionally, the proposal would have a cumulative impact with the existing addition on the property, leading to overpowering modern additions which will distort the form of the original building and sandwich the C17 range between two wings further diminishing its status as the principal element of the building. The proposal is detrimental to the character and significance of the building contrary to local and national heritage protection objectives. Although not highly visible due to existing vegetation the extension will dominate views of the dwelling from the entrance to the property thereby detracting from the significance of the heritage asset. As such the proposed development would not comply with policies ENV2 and ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015, or the guidance set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF APPLICATION****2.1** Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey side extension protruding off the south-west elevation. The proposal consists of a glazed link between the existing gable of the dwelling and the main bulk of the extension. The glazed link projects 1m (3.28ft), spans a width of 3.3m (10.82ft) and proposes a ridge height of 4.45m (14.59ft). The remainder of

the extension measures 4.09m (13.41ft) in width and 4m (13.12ft) in depth, with a ridge height of 5.2m (17.06ft). In total built form will protrude 5m (16.4ft) from the side elevation of the existing property.

- 2.2 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>.
- 2.3 The application has been called into Planning Committee by Councillor Bovingdon as it was considered the set-up is detrimental to their living with the poor health of Mr Walsh and the proposed alterations will benefit the building. I feel that the case should be heard by committee and be transparent in a decision.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1

| | | | |
|--------------|--|--------------------------|------------|
| 20/01244/FUL | Extension forming kitchen | Refused | 13.11.2020 |
| 21/00209/LBC | Single storey side extension forming kitchen | Elsewhere on this agenda | |
| 19/01118/FUL | Proposed two storey extension to the southwest elevation | Refused | 04.10.2019 |
| 19/01119/LBC | Proposed two storey extension to the southwest elevation | Refused | 04.10.2019 |
| 20/01245/LBC | Extension forming kitchen | Refused | 13.11.2020 |
| 06/00496/FUL | Erection of fence and gate surrounding property (1.2m at front and drive & 1.8m elsewhere) | Approved | 13.06.2006 |
| 06/01087/LBC | Re-roof dormer windows, replacement windows, renovations and removal of toilet/bathroom and replace with lodge | Approved | 08.02.2007 |
| 06/01365/FUL | Dormer windows to existing roof and rear extension. | Approved | 08.02.2007 |

| | | |
|---------------|---|------------|
| 06/01365/NMAA | Non-material amendment to previously approved dormer windows to existing roof and rear extension. | 18.10.2010 |
| 06/01365/NMAB | Non material amendment to previously approved dormer windows to existing roof and rear extension. | 03.03.2011 |
| 06/01365/DISA | To discharge condition 2 (materials) and 3 (drawing) of Decision dated 08/02/07 for Dormer windows to existing roof and rear extension. | 03.03.2011 |

4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1 The application site is a detached dwelling located in Soham, outside of the development envelope. The property has a few residential dwellings located close by, however these are sporadically located along The Cotes. The linear position of the dwelling within the site results in the side elevation fronting the highway and this being the main aspect visible within the streetscene. A number of outbuildings are located to the south-west of the main dwelling and limit views of the dwelling. Along the south-east boundary are a number of well-established trees and greenery, which only offers glimpsing views from this aspect of The Cotes. The streetscene is comprised of a combination of a few detached dwellings which vary in design, open fields and a few outbuildings. The dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building, known as Broomstick Cottage.

5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

- 5.1 Responses were received from the following consultees [LIST] and these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

Cambridgeshire Archaeology - No Comments Received

Historic England - 23 February 2021

Thank you for your letter of 19 February 2021 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Parish - 8 March 2021

The extension will not enhance the old style cottage listed building. Outside the development envelope.

Ward Councillors –

This case is just being submitted but I have been asked to look at it by the owners and call it in as they feel that they have not been heard fairly by officers to date. I would like to call it in to planning committee as I feel the set-up is detrimental to their living with the poor health of Mr Walsh and the proposed alterations will benefit the building. As I live in a similar listed building and have experienced similar issues in the past but which were sensibly overcome, I do feel that the case should be heard by committee and be transparent in a decision.

Conservation Officer - 8 March 2021

NHLE ref 1391426 Broomstick Cottage is a Grade II listed dwelling which was spot-listed in 2005 to protect its historic interest, described thus at that time:

'Timber-framed building. Late 17th century with additions and alterations from the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. Wall to south-west gable replaced in brick; southeast elevation encased in brick; and northeast gable and north-west elevation rendered in concrete over lime and pebbledash respectively. Gable roof is covered in corrugated metal, which was possibly laid over thatch. The original central door opening on the south east entrance remains, but the door is not original and a modern entrance porch has been added. Modern side entrance porch added to south-west end, along with a lean-to extension to north-east gable. The two gable windows are 19th century, the south-east elevation has vertical sliding sash windows and those to the north-east are modern replacements. Internally, with the exception of the rebuilt south-west gable, timber framing is exposed throughout most of the building. It has a lobby entrance plan, with two large, central, back to back fireplaces; both with bressumer and one with the remains of a bread oven. There is a small service wing to the south-west end, but it is not clear if the partitioning wall is original or a later addition. The ground floor has floor bricks laid in a herringbone pattern. The first floor may be a later addition. The roof structure is common rafters with collars to the gables, thin ridge piece and thin rafters of hedgerow timbers with some evidence of lath and plaster between.'

The thatched roof was restored in 2006-7 (supported by a £11,500 loan from ECDC) and a substantial extension was accepted at the same time to assist the building's viability as a dwelling.

Historic England's 2008 document 'Conservation Principles, Policies & Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' delineates a range of heritage values which contribute to the significance of a heritage asset. In the case of traditional buildings, historic and aesthetic values tend to predominate, with the latter defined thus:

'Some aesthetic values are not substantially the product of formal design, but develop more or less fortuitously over time, as the result of a succession of responses within a particular cultural framework. They include, for example, the seemingly organic form of an urban or rural landscape; the relationship of vernacular buildings and structures and their materials to their setting; or a harmonious, expressive or dramatic quality in the juxtaposition of vernacular or industrial buildings and spaces. Sustaining design value tends to depend on appropriate stewardship to maintain the integrity of a designed concept, be it landscape, architecture, or structure' (paras 49-51).

'Evidential value, historical values and some aesthetic values, especially artistic ones, are dependent upon a place retaining (to varying degrees) the actual fabric that has been handed down from the past; but authenticity lies in whatever most truthfully reflects and embodies the values attached to the place. It can therefore relate to, for example, design or function, as well as fabric. Design values, particularly those associated with landscapes or buildings, may be harmed by losses resulting from disaster or physical decay, or through ill-considered alteration or accretion' (para 91).

'The greater the significance of a place to society, the greater the weight that should be attached to sustaining its heritage values... Since statutory designation, at local as well as national level, is a clear indicator of the significance of a place, the fact of designation can itself play a vital role in guiding options for strategic change' (paras 151-2).

'The greater the range and strength of heritage values attached to a place, the less opportunity there may be for change... Places whose significance stems essentially from the coherent expression of their particular cultural heritage values can be harmed by interventions of a radically different nature' (para 140).

'Changes which would harm the heritage values of a significant place should be unacceptable unless:

- a) the changes are demonstrably necessary either to make the place sustainable, or to meet an overriding public policy objective or need;
- b) there is no reasonably practicable alternative means of doing so without harm;
- c) that harm has been reduced to the minimum consistent with achieving the objective;
- d) it has been demonstrated that the predicted public benefit decisively outweighs the harm to the values of the place, considering
 - o its comparative significance,
 - o the impact on that significance, and
 - o the benefits to the place itself and/or the wider community or society as a whole'(para 149).

On a policy level, the NPPF states that:

'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'

'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. (paras 193-6).

Broomstick Cottage was listed in 2005 because it was judged to be in the public interest to preserve the building for its architectural and historic merit. Its restoration was supported by a public subsidy as a concrete expression of that interest and at the same time a significant addition (equating to 50% of its net original size) was permitted in order to ensure its ongoing viability as a dwelling. These were, by any measure, substantial impacts for any building, let alone a modest vernacular cottage, to absorb but were justified on the basis that they would secure the building's future.

The present application is the third scheme proposed for an extension from the south west gable and differs this time only in the introduction of a glazed caesura. Whilst this device will permit 'clear daylight' between the two elements, it is too narrow to alter the perception of the two parts as one building so the architectural impact, in particular the effect of 'sandwiching' the C17 range between two competing wings, would be the same. It is in any case a very mannered conceit, out-of-character in a building defined, as are all vernacular buildings, by its functionalism and logic.

No exploration of alternative options to provide a kitchen have been provided: the exclusion of the 2006 extension due to its potential as an accessible bedroom is difficult to reconcile

with its present use as a bar and games room. The point has been made throughout that occupants must be realistic about the size and range of accommodation such a modest building can provide, and may need to adjust their priorities accordingly. That position still stands.

It is considered that taken together with the earlier addition, the cumulative impact of extending from the south-west gable would further reduce the primacy of the original C17 range, and no 'clear and convincing justification' in NPPF terms has been advanced for this harm.

Recommendation: objection

Cadent Gas Ltd - 19 February 2021

Searches based on your enquiry have identified that there is apparatus in the vicinity of your enquiry which may be affected by the activities specified. Please inform Plant Protection, as soon as possible, the decision your authority is likely to make regarding this application.

Asset Information Definitive Map Team - No Comments Received

Consultee For Other Wards In Parish - No Comments Received

ECDC Trees Team – 10 March 2021

Having searched back through the previous applications I have found a photo that show the true scale of the tree to be removed and that there are no significant trees in the vicinity of the proposed extension so an AIA will not be required, but if the application is allowed a condition to provide details of tree protection measures for the site should be considered to ensure the boundary trees are retained undamaged for example:

No operations shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved (including demolition works, tree works, fires, soil moving, temporary access construction and / or widening or any operations involving the use of motorized vehicles or construction machinery) until a scheme for the protection during construction of the trees relevant to the site, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 - Trees in relation to construction - Recommendations, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall show the extent of root protection areas and details of ground protection measures and fencing to be erected around the trees, including the type and position of these. The protective measures contained within the scheme once approved shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any development, site works or clearance in accordance with the approved details, and shall be maintained and retained until the development is completed. Within the root protection areas the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25mm or more shall be left unsevered.

The Ely Group Of Internal Drainage Board - 22 February 2021

This application for development is within the Middle Fen and Mere Internal Drainage Board. The Board has no objections to this application from a drainage point of view.

Cambridge Ramblers Association - No Comments Received

- 5.2 A site notice was displayed near the site on 24 February 2021 and a press advert was published in the Cambridge Evening News on 25 February 2021.

5.3 Neighbours – two neighbouring properties were notified and no responses have been received.

6.0 The Planning Policy Context

6.1 *East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015*

ENV 1 Landscape and settlement character

ENV 2 Design

ENV 4 Energy and water efficiency and renewable energy in construction

ENV 12 Listed Buildings

6.2 *Supplementary Planning Documents*

Design Guide

Climate Change

6.3 *National Planning Policy Framework 2019*

12 Achieving well-designed places

14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

16 Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

6.4 Planning Practice Guidance

7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

7.1 The main issues to consider in the determination of this application are the impacts on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers, the visual appearance and character of the wider area as well as the impact on the heritage asset.

7.2 Residential Amenity

7.2.1 Policy ENV2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 requires proposals to ensure that there are no significantly detrimental effects on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers. The proposal will be situated forward of the south-west elevation, projecting towards the highway. The dwelling is not closely related to any neighbouring properties and location of the extension is not considered to create any harmful impacts on residential amenity.

7.3 Visual Impact

7.3.1 The dwelling is very visible from the site entrance and the proposed extension would dominate views of the existing dwelling. The property has already been extended to the side on the north-east elevation and the proposed extension would create a significant level of built form to the south-west of the dwelling, which would have a presence within the street scene of The Cotes. The Design Guide SPD requires proposals to ensure that once extended, the original dwelling is clearly legible and predominant. As mentioned previously the dwelling already has an addition off the north-east elevation and the application proposes to add a significant single storey extension to the opposite undeveloped elevation. It is considered with the scale of the extensions at either end of the property, the original dwelling will not remain clearly legible and will become overpowered by the additions.

7.3.2 Furthermore, the Design Guide SPD also states that the form and proportions of the original dwelling will determine the extent to which it can be extended. The dwelling is a small characterful property, which already has a large modern addition which provides further

accommodation. It is considered that a further extension will not be sympathetic to the form and proportions of the original dwelling as the cumulative impact of the additions will overpower the original form of the existing dwelling, compromising its primacy and being contrary to the Design Guide SPD.

7.3.3 The south-west elevation is the most visible aspect of the dwelling from the street scene of The Cotes due to the existing vegetation to the south-east and buildings to the south-west. The Heritage Statement also addresses its positioning in the streetscene and factors which obscure the principal elevation, leaving only the south-west elevation in view from The Coates. It is considered that the extension would become the prominent feature within the street scene, forming the principal view of the dwelling when entering the site. It is considered that the proposal would dominate the views of the dwelling within the streetscene, as a result of the scale and location. Whilst it is noted that the proposal has a lower ridge height to the original dwelling and efforts for separation have been made with the introduction of the glazed link, the cumulative impact remains and the further addition tilts the balance and becomes overpowering rather than subservient.

7.3.4 Additionally, it is considered the proposal is out of keeping with the design and characteristics of the original dwelling, which would be noticeable within the streetscene. This would be contrary to policy ENV1 of the Local Plan as it requires proposals to ensure that location, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and colour relate sympathetically to the surrounding area and each other, which the extension fails to do.

7.4 Heritage Asset

7.4.1 When assessing the impact of a proposed development on a heritage asset, the more important the asset, the greater weight should be. For example, a Grade I, Grade II*, or a Grade II listed building should be afforded greater weight than a conservation area. The NPPF states that "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use".

7.4.2 The application includes a Heritage Statement which has been resubmitted from the previous application 20/01244/FUL and 20/01245/LBC, which appraises the heritage significance of the built structures. Local Plan policy ENV12 requires Listed Building proposals that seek to extend or alter to preserve or enhance the significance of the building and not involve substantial loss of historic fabric. Furthermore, they are only supported where they facilitate the long term preservation of the building. There are three principles which the application would be expected to comply with, these being to preserve and enhance the building and to facilitate its long-term use.

7.5 Preserve and Enhance

7.5.1 The heritage statement doesn't refer to the current revisions under this application to include the glazed link, but the statement does reference the previous refusal from applications 19/01118/FUL and 19/01119/LBC. In response to the 2019 refusals, applications 20/01244/FUL and 20/01245/LBC were accompanied by a revised design which altered the eaves, lowered the ridge height and removed the first floor. However, it was still considered that those alterations to the design still did not overcome the previous concerns raised. It was highlighted that it is the principle of any development on this elevation which would lead to the harm through the dominance and sandwiching impacts from the structure. This current application has proposed a further amendment to include a glazed link between the gable end of the dwelling and the main bulk of the extension.

7.5.2 The further alteration to the design is not considered to overcome the concerns or issue with the principle of development off this gable end of the existing dwelling. Whilst the glazed link has aspired to achieve a very literal impression of separation between the extension and existing dwelling, it essentially still produces a sandwiching effect. The Conservation Officer advises that whilst the glazed caesura will permit 'clear daylight' between the two elements, it is too narrow to alter the perception of the two parts as one building. Therefore, the architectural impact, in particular the effect of 'sandwiching' the C17 range between two competing wings, would be the same. It is in any case a very mannered conceit, out-of-character in a building defined, as are all vernacular buildings, by its functionalism and logic. It is considered that the addition to the south-west elevation would be a contrived, uncharacteristic design which fails to enhance the significance of the heritage asset, contrary to policy ENV12 and the Design Guide SPD

7.5.3 It is considered that taken together with the earlier addition, the cumulative impact of extending from the south-west gable would further reduce the primacy of the original C17 range, and no 'clear and convincing justification' in NPPF terms has been advanced for this harm. The proposal would result in significant harm to the heritage asset, as the cumulative effect of the existing extension and the proposal would lead to the heritage asset becoming overpowered and dominated by the later additions. Whilst only the south-west elevation is predominately visible from the highway, the site and wider setting of the Listed Building still allows for views of the north-west and south-east elevations. In accordance with paragraph 196 of the framework this development is considered to result in substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, with no public benefits.

7.6 Loss of Historic Fabric

7.6.1 Any proposal to a heritage asset should minimise the loss of historic fabric. The Heritage Statement refers to the volume of alterations which have happened to the building prior to the 2006 additions and the extent of historic fabric which actually is retained in the building, particularly the fire places and early timber framing. The Heritage Statement addresses the reference to the south-west gable in the listing and its noted replacement in brick. The Heritage Statement considers this elevation to then have minimal historic or architectural interest. The Conservation Officer has previously accepted that no historic fabric would be lost in breaking through the south-west gable but did maintain that there is an architectural impact from the proposal. The architectural impacts of the current application remain centered around its design and the sandwiching effect the extension would create to the original form of the building.

7.7 Facilitate Long Term Use

7.7.1 Policy ENV12 supports extensions or alterations to listed buildings to support the long-term use and preservation of these important buildings. The Heritage statement also addresses the importance of securing long term preservation of these buildings. With Broomstick Cottage it is considered that the two storey extension permitted in 2006 provided the additional accommodation necessary to ensure the viability of the building as a residential dwelling. In its existing form today Broomstick Cottage is a well sized three-bedroom dwelling. The single storey extension to increase the size of the kitchen is not considered to be a necessary addition required to facilitate the long term use of the building, given the accommodation already provided within the building.

7.7.2 Furthermore, the Conservation Officer advised that Broomstick Cottage was listed in 2005 because it was judged to be in the public interest to preserve the building for its architectural and historic merit. Its restoration was supported by a public subsidy as a concrete expression of that interest and at the same time a significant addition (equating to 50% of its original size) was permitted in order to ensure its ongoing viability as a dwelling. These were, by any

measure, substantial impacts for any building, let alone a modest vernacular cottage, to absorb but were justified on the basis that they would secure the building's future.

- 7.7.3 The Heritage Statement questions the Conservation Officer's previous use of 50% when describing the previous addition. Under application 20/01244/FUL and 20/01245/LBC the Conservation Officer addressed the this point by advising the following:

The 2006 extension replaced a series of ad hoc C20 single storey additions to the north-east gable, which were of no significance as reflected in the fact that they were sacrificed. The north-eastern extension is not uncomplimentary but it is clearly a large modern addition and it is indisputable that its ground floor footprint (*not* volume) equates to 50% of the original two bay C17 cottage.

- 7.7.4 It is considered the comments made by the Conservation Officer under the 20/01244/FUL and 20/01245/LBC applications remain applicable and provide context as to why the principle of development off the south-west elevation remains unacceptable.

- 7.7.5 The application has been called into Planning Committee as the Councillor consider the existing set-up is detrimental to their living with the poor health of the applicant. Whilst is understood that a change to the current living accommodation within the dwelling is required by the applicants to support a health condition, no exploration of alternative options to provide a kitchen elsewhere in the building have been provided. The Conservation Officer has noted that the exclusion of the 2006 extension due to its potential as an accessible bedroom is difficult to reconcile with its present use as a bar and games room. The point has been made throughout that the occupants must be realistic about the size and range of accommodation such a modest building can provide, and may need to adjust their priorities accordingly. That position still stands.

7.8 Trees

- 7.8.1 The proposal will result in the removal of one from the site in order to accommodate the extension. The tree indicated for removal is separate to the boundary vegetation along the south-east boundary. The Trees Officer has noted the Officers site photos from an early visit which shows the true scale of the tree to be removed. The Officer advised that there are no significant trees in the vicinity of the proposed extension so an AIA will not be required, but if the application is allowed a condition to provide details of tree protection measures for the site should be considered to ensure the boundary trees are retained undamaged. It is considered that this request is reasonable and due to the visually importance of these trees within the streetscene protection measures should be conditioned.

7.9 Climate Change SPD

- 7.9.1 The recently adopted Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document predominantly focusses on providing additional guidance to the implementation of Local Plan Policy ENV 4 – Energy and water efficiency and renewable energy in construction. Policy ENV 4 states all proposals for new development should aim for reduced or zero carbon development in accordance with the zero-carbon hierarchy: first maximising energy efficiency and then incorporating renewable or low carbon energy sources on-site as far as practicable. It goes on to state that applicants will be required to demonstrate how they have considered maximising all aspects of sustainable design and construction, as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes (or its successor)". The opportunity was provided to the agent and comments (below) were received to identify how the proposal will deliver an energy efficient and achieve a minimised or zero carbon development.

'We have considered the elements of [the] Climate Change SPD and are satisfied with the approach as detailed on the plans. All of our projects take a fabric first approach to sustainability and we are committed to delivering robust projects that exceed the minimum requirements of the building regulations.'

7.9.2 From the agents comments it is accepted that suitable consideration has been made to deliver an energy efficient development. Therefore, the proposal is considered to address policy ENV4 and the Climate Change SPD.

7.10 Conclusion

7.10.1 The proposal is not considered to be an appropriate design approach, as it fails to respect the existing built form and character of Broomstick Cottage. The extension is not sympathetic to the existing building and fails to preserve or enhance the heritage asset. Whilst it is accepted that no historic fabric would be lost, the architectural integrity of the building would be compromised. The proposal would cause substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset and there no public benefits, as such the proposal is contrary to policies ENV2, ENV12 as well as the Design Guide SPD and NPPF.

| <u>Background Documents</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Contact Officer(s)</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| 21/00208/FUL | Molly Hood | Molly Hood |
| 21/00209/LBC | Room No. 011 | Planning Officer |
| 20/01244/FUL | The Grange | 01353 665555 |
| 20/01245/LBC | Ely | molly.hood@eastca |
| 19/01118/FUL | | mbs.gov.uk |
| 19/01119/LBC | | |

National Planning Policy Framework -

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 -

<http://www.eastcambs.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Local%20Plan%20April%202015%20-%20front%20cover%20and%20inside%20front%20cover.pdf>