

- 1) The building will be within the development boundary;
 - 2) It will not be cramped;
 - 3) Members do not believe it will set a precedent;
 - 4) It will be subservient to the host dwelling;
 - 5) The Local Highways Authority has not raised objections,
- and that the conditions be delegated to the Planning Manager.

At this point, Councillor Bovingdon vacated the Chamber.

63. **15/01189/FUL – LAND ADJACENT 2B MOOR ROAD, FORDHAM, CB7 5LX**

Julie Barrow, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report (Q132, previously circulated) which sought consent for the construction of a single storey dwelling on land adjacent to 2B Moor Road, Fordham. The proposed dwelling was of a similar style and design to that of No. 2B and would be located in the north eastern corner of the site with access via a newly created entrance off Moor Road. The proposal incorporated landscaping into the scheme.

Members were reminded that the main considerations in the determination of this application were:

- Principle of development;
- Visual amenity;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway safety; and
- Biodiversity and ecology.

It was noted that the site was located outside of the established development framework of Fordham in an area of countryside but adjoined the settlement boundary in a number of places. The site was therefore considered to be well connected to the settlement, alongside a number of residential dwellings and within close proximity to the facilities and services on offer in the village.

The Senior Planning Officer reiterated that the Council could not currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing land and therefore all applications for new housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, this did not remove development envelopes, but it did restrict the application of Policy GROWTH 2 within the Local Plan. For the purposes of assessing the proposal in relation to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the proximity of the site to the settlement boundary was considered to be sufficient to consider the site as being in a sustainable location.

- She agreed with paragraph 7.1.4 as she did not see there being a special need for what was a speculative venture into open countryside;
- She did not agree with paragraph 7.1.5, as the dwelling would not be in sufficiently close proximity to the settlement boundary;
- With reference to paragraph 7.3.5, this was piecemeal development and it would set a precedent. It would give the applicants the green light for further development and would not protect the development edge;
- This was a greenfield site in open countryside and the dwelling would be a major intrusion;
- She disagreed that there was not a five year supply of land for housing. There were more suitable sites elsewhere eg. Mildenhall Road 10 houses, 4 detached houses on the Fordham Road, in designated areas;
- The development envelope had been set out in the Local Plan to prevent sprawl into the countryside, and she was therefore asking the Committee to refuse the application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Keith Hutchinson, agent for the applicants, addressed the Committee and made the following remarks:

- He wished to emphasise that the acceptability of the scheme was dependent on the Council's lack of a five year supply of land for housing. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF spoke of a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and as a consequence, the application should be judged on its sustainability;
- The application site was on the north side of land currently being used as paddocks;
- The proposal would not extend the development envelope any further and it would constitute a logical rounding off of the area;
- This would be a new single storey dwelling with energy efficiency features and it would not set a precedent;
- With reference to previous refusals of permission, only 2005 related to this site and it was based on housing policy rejection. This was no longer valid and the Parish Council accepted that;
- The proposal was a sustainable development and should be granted permission as per the recommendation.

Councillor Hunt said he believed the proposal was encroachment into the countryside and to grant permission would set a precedent. He did not think there was a strong enough case for approval, and weight should be given to the fact that the site was not in the Village Vision. He duly proposed

that the Officer's recommendation for approval be rejected and the application be refused.

The Chairman reminded Members that the NPPF's "*presumption in favour of sustainable development*" was often quoted but it did not override other considerations. He cautioned the Committee to be mindful of the NPPF and to be robust in their reasons for refusal if they went against the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Rouse declared his support for approval of the application, saying he thought the dwelling would sit nicely in its location.

Councillor Austen seconded Councillor Hunt's motion for refusal, and when put to the vote, the motion was declared carried, there being 5 votes for and 3 votes against. Whereupon,

It was resolved:

That planning application reference 15/01189/FUL be REFUSED, for the following reasons:

- 1) It is encroachment;
- 2) It would set a precedent;
- 3) It will harm the character of the countryside;
- 4) There is no strong reason to support the application;
- 5) It will be visually detrimental to an attractive scene; and
- 6) It is against the Village Vision.

Councillor Bovingdon re-entered the Chamber at 4.20pm

64. **PLANNING PERFORMANCE REPORT – OCTOBER 2015**

Rebecca Saunt, Planning Manager, presented a report (Q133, previously circulated) which summarised the planning performance figures for October 2015.

The figures included all types of planning applications and were broken down under the following headings: Validation; Determinations; Applications determined by type; Applications determined on time; Appeals; and Enforcement.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that they would receive a monthly report, but due to the information being collated at the end of each month, the figures would be two months in arrears.

Councillor Cox requested that the quality of the documents provided to Councillors on the Planning Committee be discussed, as sometimes they were not very clear and this made it difficult to read them.

Councillor Beckett repeated his request that the issue of open space by ditches be reviewed. He also asked that any changes made to