

---

**MAIN CASE**

**Reference No:** 19/00897/FUL

**Proposal:** Temporary erection of a single storey marquee for functions, outside bar and store forming an annexe to existing hotel (retrospective)

**Site Address:** The Three Pickerels 19 Bridge Road Mepal Ely  
Cambridgeshire CB6 2AR

**Applicant:** Mr Paul Kenyon

**Case Officer:** Molly Hood, Planning Officer

**Parish:** Mepal

**Ward:** Sutton  
Ward Councillor/s: Lorna Dupre  
Mark Inskip

**Date Received:** 20 August 2019      **Expiry Date:** 13 January 2020

[U148]

---

**1.0 RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 Members are recommended to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposal, due to its light weight marquee material and proximity to the surrounding neighbouring properties would cause significant and demonstrable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, due to the excessive noise and disturbance. This is contrary to policy ENV2 and EMP2 of the Local Plan 2015 which seeks to ensure that there are no significantly detrimental impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring and future occupiers as a result of the new development.
- 2 The proposal fails to provide adequate parking facilities to sufficiently accommodate the volume of guests which the venue could hold. The proposal does not incorporate adequate on-site vehicular parking and manoeuvring facilities to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal, if permitted would therefore be likely to result in an undesirable increase in on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is contrary to policies COM7, COM8 and EMP2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.
- 3 The marquee and shipping container would have a significant visual prominence from the streetscene of Bridge Road and from Footpath No.7. The proposed development, by virtue of its design, scale and siting, is considered to

be out of character with the existing traditional built form in the area and would result in a dominant form of incongruous development. The proposal would cause significant harm to visual amenity and is contrary to Policies ENV1, ENV2 and EMP2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 and chapter 12 of the NPPF.

- 4 The proposal fails to provide an adequate Flood Risk Assessment and insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would be safe from flooding and the proposal is therefore contrary to policy ENV8 of the Local Plan 2015 and Chapter 14 of the NPPF.

## **2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

- 2.1 The application seeks permission for the temporary erection of a single storey marquee between the months of April to October. Additionally the application seeks permission for an outside bar and store which are situated within a converted shipping container. The container measures 6.2m, with a width of 2.3m and a maximum height of 2.5m. The marquee and outside bar are proposed to be used for functions as part of The Three Pickerels, in particular birthday parties, weddings and receptions. The shipping container would form a permanent structure on the site. The structure has already been in use throughout 2019 and was present at the time of the Officer site visit.
- 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.eastcambbs.gov.uk/online-applications/>. **Alternatively a paper copy is available to view at the East Cambridgeshire District Council offices, in the application file.**
- 2.3 The application has been called into Planning Committee by Councillor Dupre. The Councillor believes that the marquee is a temporary structure with no permanent detrimental impact on the Grade II Listed property and the applicants have worked hard to make close neighbours aware of the events. Additionally, the holding of events is already permitted inside the Three Pickerels and there is nothing to stop people congregating in the gardens. The site is low risk for flooding and people already park on the road which is for short periods of time, with very limited impacts.

## **3.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

|              |   |          |            |
|--------------|---|----------|------------|
| 03/00388/FUL | Conservatory extension to Public House  | Approved | 19.06.2003 |
| 17/00623/FUL | Proposed extensions, loft conversions & alterations plus change of use from public house to hotel | Refused  | 11.07.2017 |

|              |  |          |            |
|--------------|--|----------|------------|
| 17/01738/FUL | Extensions, loft conversion and alterations plus change of use from public house to hotel  | Approved | 07.12.2017 |
| 08/00329/FUL | Proposed external dining deck, fire escape staircase, internal alterations to form bed and breakfast accommodation and change existing window to rear entrance door, and redesign of approved conservatory | Approved | 20.05.2008 |

#### **4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT**

4.1 The application site is a detached building with the permitted use as a hotel, known as The Three Pickerels. The site is setback from the highway, accessed of a further road off Bridge Road. Parking for the site is to the front of the building and adjacent to the north-west is the New Bedford River, which forms part of the SSSI and Ramsar site of the Ouse Washes. As a result the site is located within Flood Zone 3. Although the site is located outside of the defined development envelope, there a number of residential properties in close proximity.

#### **5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

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

##### **Conservation Officer – 5 December 2019**

The application site has little or no inter-visibility with any heritage assets in the vicinity and is unlikely to have any demonstrable impact on their significance.

Recommendation: no objection

##### **Asset Information Definitive Map Team - 11 September 2019**

Public Footpath 7 Mepal must remain open and unobstructed at all times. Building materials must not be stored on Public Rights of Way and contractors' vehicles must not be parked on it (it is an offence under s137 of the Highways Act 1980 to obstruct a public Highway).

Public Footpath 7 Mepal must not be used to access the development site unless the applicant is sure they have lawful authority to do so (it is an offence under s34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to drive on a Public Footpath without lawful authority)

No alteration to the Public Footpath 7 Mepal`s surface is permitted without our consent (it is an offence to damage the surface of a public right of way under s1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971).

The granting of planning permission does not entitle a developer to obstruct a Public Right of Way

**Cambridge Ramblers Association -**  
No Comments Received

**Environmental Health - 10 September 2019**

Environmental Health have raised some concerns regarding this application.

The department has received several complaints regarding functions in the marquee. There are residential properties in close proximity to the site and whilst I have no objections to the structure itself (as entertainment could still take place externally without this application being granted) it would be sensible to incorporate as much noise mitigation as practicable to prevent a negative impact on the residential amenity of nearby residents.

Effectively soundproofing a marquee is difficult due to the lightweight material they are comprised from but there are options available to fit solid sides which will help control some of the frequency spectrum and I would advise the applicant to look in to this so as to demonstrate best practicable means of preventing a nuisance. The most important element of noise control will be a robust noise management plan. I would request that if permission is granted there be a condition which stipulates a noise management plan must be submitted and approved by the LPA. I believe that the LPA have a frequently used condition for NMPs but let me know if you need any guidance wording this.

If permission is granted it may also be necessary to limit the number of events held in the marquees as well as the timings. I can discuss this with you at a later time if required.

Finally, the applicants should be advised that planning permission does not confer immunity from action under statutory nuisance. Either by local authority or a private individual.

**15 October 2019**

The Environmental Health Technical Officer would like to make some additional comments to the previous response

‘You have shown me images of the marquee and explained the scale of the development which I had not fully appreciated before I made my previous comments. As it is now apparent that wedding functions of up to 150 people would not be able to take place without this application being granted I need to reiterate my concerns with regard to noise. I am struggling to think of other examples of wedding venues in such close proximity to residential dwellings within our district. It may be possible to put some stringent planning conditions on the application to prevent amplified music within the marquee or restrict the number of events to be held but with up to 150 people attending I can still see the potential for noise nuisance on neighbouring properties.’

For these reasons, with the information provided I find myself unable to support the application at this time.

**Technical Officer Access - 4 September 2019**

Route to facilities/WC, path from the hotel should be firm, level and slip resistant. Consider provision of a temporary accessible toilet close to the marquee.

Path from the parking should be firm, level and slip resistant and well sign posted.

Accessible parking should be at least 6%, and as close to the building as possible.

Good general directions internally and externally.

Good lighting required.

### **Historic England - 2 September 2019**

On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest you seeks the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers.

### **Ward Councillors -**

No Comments Received

### **ECDC Trees Team -**

No Comments Received

### **Parish - 2 September 2019**

Mepal Parish Council have no concerns about the application.

### **Environment Agency - 16 September 2019**

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) we object to the grant of planning permission and recommend refusal on this basis for the following reasons:

The FRA submitted with this application does not comply with the requirements for the site specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks associated with the proposed development. In particular, the FRA fails to:

- Include all the available information on the flood risk at the site.
- Demonstrate that the residual risk of flooding on the event of a breach of the Hundred Foot Drain flood defences can be safely managed.

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) does not consider the residual risk of flooding in the event of a breach of the Hundred Foot Drain. Our Fenland breach mapping and Tidal Hazard mapping both indicate that the site could flood to a depth of over 2m in the event of a breach of the Hundred Foot Drain flood defences.

Given the expected depth of the flooding in the event of a breach, the FRA will need to demonstrate that the marquee will be designed to allow flood waters to pass through them and to be able to withstand the expected hydrostatic pressure of water in such an event.

The FRA needs to assess the means of access and egress to and from the development in the event of extreme flooding and should include a flood warning and evacuation plan.

Under the terms of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR), a permit may be required from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures within the floodplain or in, under, over or within 8 metres from the top of the bank of the Hundred Foot Drain, which is designated a 'main river'.

The EPR are a risk-based framework that enables us to focus regulatory effort towards activities with highest flood or environmental risk. Lower risk activities will be excluded or exempt and only higher risk activities will require a permit.

### **Local Highway Authority – 22 October 2019**

The Highway Authority objects to the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposal does not incorporate adequate on-site vehicular parking and manoeuvring facilities to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority. The proposal, if permitted would therefore be likely to result in an undesirable increase in on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety.

Footpath No.7 runs past this development site and as such I would recommend that the CCC RoW team are consulted.

### **Natural England – 20 December 2019**

The main issue is likely to be noise disturbance to qualifying breeding bird species of the Ouse Washes SSSI, SPA and Ramsar site, given the April – October operational period. However, I think this is likely to be low risk given the distance between the development and main bird breeding habitat within the Washes, and the buffering effect of the Hundred Foot and other built infrastructure.

- 5.2 A site notice was displayed near the site on 9 September 2019 and a press advert was published in the Cambridge Evening News on 5 September 2019. In addition seven neighbouring properties have been directly notified by letter. Five responses have been received which either raise concern or offer support, these are summarised below:

- The events hosted have an impact on surrounding residential properties.
- The lights and noise affect our ability to enjoy our property.
- Concerns of littering of the surrounding green areas and wildlife effects.
- The marquee has been in use for the past year for wedding receptions, quiz nights, day events.
- There is nothing substantial in the marquee to reduce the noise.
- Music is sometimes played from early afternoon to midnight when there is an event on.
- The venue creates an intrusion to our home due to the not being able to escape the noise.
- The landlords were advertising it to cater for up to 150 people and there are concerns over parking.

- The use of the two industrial containers is out of keeping with the area and there is a Grade II listed building nearby.
- When there is an event there is a portaloo and there has since been the introduction of additional lighting.
- The lighting is intrusive and shines into our conservatory.
- The footpath is at times blocked with vehicles and the surface has been damaged.
- The structure has been there for some while and has never looked out of place.
- It is in a secluded part of the hotels rear aspect and does not impact the environment.
- It brings visitors to the community, generate employment and put Mepal on the map.
- There is minimal impact to the pub users or local residents when the marque is in use.
- It is used in frequently.
- If this was to be rejected another Cambridge village amenity would be lost.
- It brings positive attributes to the village.
- The owners work to rectify any problems that arise.
- The structure does not impact the surrounding area in face it enhances it.
- It brings more visitors and employment to the village

## **6.0 The Planning Policy Context**

### 6.1 East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| ENV 1    | Landscape and settlement character                   |
| ENV 2    | Design   |
| ENV 8    | Flood risk   |
| ENV 12   | Listed Buildings                                     |
| COM 7    | Transport impact                                     |
| COM 8    | Parking provision                                    |
| GROWTH 2 | Locational strategy                                  |
| GROWTH 3 | Infrastructure requirements                          |
| GROWTH 5 | Presumption in favour of sustainable development     |
| EMP 2    | Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside |

### 6.2 Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Guide  
Flood and Water

### 6.3 National Planning Policy Framework 2019

- 6 Building a strong competitive economy
- 9 Promoting sustainable transport
- 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 considerations of this application are: principle of development, impact on the conservation area and heritage assets, highways safety, impact on residential amenity, flood risk and impact on visual appearance and character of the wider area. In 2017 Planning Committee permitted the change of use of The Three Pickerels from a public house to a hotel, which included external alterations and additions to the building. From the officers site visit it was noted that no building work has commenced on the site.

### **7.2 Principle of Development**

7.2.1 Policy EMP2 of the Local Plan allows for proposals to expand existing businesses in the countryside but only where certain criteria are complied with. In particular, development must not harm the character and appearance of any existing buildings, remain in scale with the location and not have a significant adverse impact in terms of the amount or nature of traffic generated. This report will demonstrate that the proposal fails to meet the criteria as set out within Policy EMP2 of the 2015 Local Plan.

### **7.3 Residential Amenity**

7.3.1 Policy ENV2 and EMP2 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 marquee is situated to the south of the public house and would sit adjacent to the eastern outbuildings which are associated with the public house. It is considered that the location of the marquee and shipping containers would not result in overshadowing and overbearing as the structure itself does not sit directly adjacent to the neighbouring residential properties. However, the site is surrounded by residential dwellings and on the same side of the bank as the venue there is one residential property to the north. On the opposite side of the bank there are five residential properties and some of these project towards The Three Pickerels.

7.3.2 A number of comments have been received that have raised concerns over the disturbance caused by the events held in the marquee and site. In particular it is the noise and light disturbance that have caused issues with the surrounding residents. Additionally Environmental Health have received complaints and advised at present with the information provided they would be unable to support the application. The comments add that it may be necessary to include planning conditions to prevent amplified music within the marquee or restricted the number of events in order to reduce the impacts on the residents nearby. However, with up to 150 people attending, the Officer advised there still is the potential for noise nuisance to the neighbouring properties even if the restrictions were imposed. The structure has been present throughout the summer months and a number of events have already taken place, thus the impacts can be assessed. Whilst there has been comments of support for the application and the benefits it brings to the village, it is considered due to the close proximity of the site to residential dwellings there would be significant harm to residential amenity.



7.3.4 The location of the marquee means the west of the site is open and noise would therefore be able to travel across the river towards the residential dwellings. It is considered that the introduction of a marquee within this location for seven months of the year is inappropriate as the site is not isolated and is surrounded by a number of residential properties where the events could cause noise and disruption into unsociable hours. The application form indicates that events would be limited to Friday, Saturday and Sundays, within the time frames of 12:00 – 00:00. The application also advises that at a maximum of two events would occur per month. However, the possibility of events not finishing until midnight and the potential for a total of 14 events across the period, it is considered the location, times and numbers are not appropriate for the site and would result in substantial harm to residential amenity. Therefore the proposal conflicts with policies ENV2 and EMP2 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.

#### **7.4 Visual Impact & Heritage Assets**

- 7.4.1 Policy ENV1 requires proposals to demonstrate that their location, scale, form, design, materials and colour will create positive complementary relationships with existing development to ensure that it will protect, conserve and where possible enhance. The proposed marquee is visible from numerous points and although the existing hotel obscures views of the part of the proposal from Bridge Road, there are still sufficient views of the marquee for it to have a presence within this streetscene. The greatest view of the marquee is from the public footpath which runs along the site to the east, where the full scale of the structure is at its most visible from this point. Additionally the marquee can be viewed from the river and there are limited views from the bridge and the other side of the bank. Concerns have been raised by the surrounding properties that the containers are out of keeping with the area.
- 7.4.2 The location, scale and form of the marquee are not sympathetic to the existing character of the area and the proposal is not considered to result in any enhancement to the visual appearance of the area. Furthermore, due to the footprint of the structures, including the marquee and shipping containers, the majority of the outdoor garden space of the venue is consumed by these features. The proposal is considered to create a dominant feature to the rear of the venue and whilst it is understood that this area is outdoor space of The Three Pickerels and could be used in conjunction with the pub, it doesn't mean that a structures that have such visual prominence and detriment to the area should be permitted.
- 7.4.3 The proposed structures would not create a positive and a complementary relationship, nor does it respect the existing development as the design, materials and colour are not complementary to the existing local context of the traditional buildings which surround the site. The Three Pickerels, the adjacent building and neighbouring property are very traditional in design. The colour and scale of the marquee adds to the presence of the structure and the white is very prominent against the traditional materials of the surrounding buildings. It is considered that the location, colour and materials of the proposal are not sympathetic to the surroundings and create prominence within the streetscene. The proposal is contrary to policies ENV1, ENV2 and EMP2 of the 2015 Local Plan, as well as the

NPPF as it fails to be sympathetic to the local character, which includes the built environment and the landscape.

- 7.4.4 To the north of The Three Pickerels is the residential dwelling No.15 which is a Grade II Listed Building. 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.”
- 7.4.5 The Three Pickerels does form part of the setting of the Listed Building and the marquee is visible from the property as well as within the setting. Policy ENV12 relates to developments which are situated within the setting of Listed Buildings and proposals have to comply with the requirements of the policy. In particular ENV12 requires proposals to preserve and enhance those elements which make a positive contribution to better reveal the significance of the heritage asset. As well as not materially harming the immediate or wider setting of the Listed Building. The setting may extend beyond the immediate building curtilage and may include an extensive street scene or a wider urban design context.
- 7.4.6 Whilst the proposal does not make a positive contribution or enhance the setting of the Listed Building, it is considered that due to the distance which the proposal sits away from the Listed Building there would not be substantial harm to the heritage asset. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the buildings significance as a result of the distance and only a section of the marquee being visible within the setting. It is acknowledged there would be some public benefits of the scheme. The Conservation Officer advised that the application has little or no inter-visibility and is unlikely to have demonstrable impact on their significance.

## **7.5 Highways & Parking Provision**

- 7.5.1 The site contains an existing bed and breakfast and the application form states that there are a total of 13 car parking spaces for the use. However, no indication of the layout or location of the existing spaces has been provided and the area to the front of the hotel has limited parking and in some areas restricted access. Policy COM8 requires proposals to supply appropriate car parking. The policy states that in appropriate circumstances the parking standard may be relaxed, however the site is separate from the centre of the village with limited access to public transport facilities. Therefore the hotel and any potential functions would be heavily reliant on car use, in turn requiring a significant number of spaces.
- 7.5.2 It is considered that any function for a birthday party, wedding or reception would require greater parking provision than just 13 spaces. Additionally staff parking would have to be taken into account and again this would require a percentage of the existing 13 spaces on site. Whilst the application does not specify the average volume of people who are likely to attend for any function, the venue can cater for between 50 and 150 guests. The proposal would conflict with policy COM8 as an adequate volume of parking cannot be provided on the site for even 50 intended guests for the venue,

let alone 150 guests. Furthermore, neighbouring properties raised concerns over the parking provision for the number of guests which could attend an event.

- 7.5.3 The site does benefit from an existing access to the highway, however the internal road is not adopted. The Local Highway Authority have objected to the application on the grounds that the proposal does not incorporate adequate on site vehicular parking and manoeuvring facilities. There is insufficient off street vehicular parking provided as part of the application and the increase in on-street parking would be at the detriment of highway safety.
- 7.5.4 As there is a limited area to the front of the hotel for parking, it is considered that function guests would have to park along the highway, which could result in a safety issue. Policy COM7 requires proposals to provide a safe and convenient access to the highway. With a high number of guests attending a venue with limiting parking facilities and the potential for parking along the highway, this could result in an unsafe access to the highway for guests or surrounding residents. It is considered with the restricted information on the capacity of the function space, insufficient detail on the existing parking layout and minimal detail on the proposed parking or transport procedures; the application fails to meet policy. In particular the application would be contrary to policy COM8 and EMP2 as the proposal would have adverse impact in terms of the amount or nature of traffic generated, resulting in potential highway safety impacts.

## **7.6 Flood Risk**

- 7.6.1 The site is located within Flood Zone 3, therefore the impact the proposal has on the flood risk must be taken into consideration. Additionally the site is situated within an area designated as flood storage and benefits from no flood defences. The agent has submitted some information surrounding the potential flood risk of the site, however it contains inaccuracies as it advises the site is not within Flood Zone 3. This has been checked against the Environment Agency's mapping, which confirms the site is situated within Flood Zone 3. The information submitted by the agent is not sufficient to appropriately assess the flood risk. The Environment Agency were consulted on the application and objected to the proposal on the basis that:
- 7.6.2 The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted does not comply with the requirements for the site specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance. The FRA does not therefore adequately assess the flood risks associated with the proposed development and fails:
- Include all the available information on the flood risk at the site.
  - Demonstrate that the residual risk of flooding on the event of a breach of the Hundred Foot Drain flood defences can be safely managed.
- 7.6.3 Furthermore it was considered by the Environment Agency that the FRA failed to consider the residual risk of flooding. It is considered that the application has failed to provide sufficient detail to consider the risks involved with the development or submit an appropriate flood risk assessment for the scale and nature of the development, contrary to policy ENV8.

## **7.7 Other Matters**

7.7.1 Paragraph 170(d) of the NPPF advises that development proposals should minimise impacts on biodiversity and given the sites location within the SSSI and Ramsar site of the Ouse Washes, it has a high importance. Natural England have provided initial comments on the proposal advising that the main issue from the proposal is likely to be noise disturbance to qualifying breeding bird species of the Ouse Washes SSSI, SPA and Ramsar site, given the April – October operational period. However, Natural England considered the impacts of the proposal to be low risk given the distance between the development and main bird breeding habitat within the Washes, and the buffering effect of the Hundred Foot and other built infrastructure. It is considered due to the site having an existing use as a bed and breakfast/hotel with associated outdoor space, the proposal would not result in detrimental harm to the Ouse washes.

## **8.0 Planning Balance**

8.1 The proposal results in significant harm to the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers occurs and is considered to have significant impact on highway safety due to the lack of parking facilities on site. Furthermore adverse impacts are considered to occur to the character and visual appearance of the area, as a result of the scale, materials and design of the proposal. The proposal is contrary to policies ENV1, ENV2, EMP2, COM7 and COM8 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, as well as the NPPF. The harm caused by the proposal is considered to outweigh any benefits and therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

## **9.0 Costs**

9.1 An appeal can be lodged against a refusal of planning permission or a condition imposed upon a planning permission. If a local planning authority is found to have acted unreasonably and this has incurred costs for the applicant (referred to as appellant through the appeal process) then a cost award can be made against the council.

9.2 Unreasonable behaviour can be either procedural ie relating to the way a matter has been dealt with or substantive ie relating to the issues at appeal and whether a local planning authority has been able to provide evidence to justify a refusal reason or a condition.

9.3 Members do not have to follow an officer recommendation indeed they can legitimately decide to give a different weight to a material consideration than officers. However, it is often these cases where an appellant submits a claim for costs. The Committee therefore needs to consider and document its reasons for going against an officer recommendation very carefully.

9.4 In this case Members' attention is particularly drawn to the following point:

The site is closely situated to a number of residential dwellings and is visually prominent.

| <u>Background Documents</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Contact Officer(s)</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| 19/00897/FUL                | Molly Hood      | Molly Hood                |
| 03/00388/FUL                | Room No. 011    | Planning Officer          |
| 17/00623/FUL                | The Grange      | 01353 665555              |
| 17/01738/FUL                | Ely             | molly.hood@eastca         |
| 08/00329/FUL                |                 | mbs.gov.uk                |

National Planning Policy Framework -

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 -

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