



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held in St Mary's Church Hall, St Mary's Church, St Mary's Street, Ely on Wednesday, 4th December 2019 at 2:00pm.

PRESENT

Cllr Bill Hunt (Chairman)
Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith
Cllr David Ambrose Smith (substitute for Cllr Joshua Schumann)
Cllr Sue Austen
Cllr David Brown
Cllr Lavinia Edwards
Cllr Alec Jones
Cllr Lisa Stubbs (Vice Chair)
Cllr John Trapp
Cllr Gareth Wilson

OFFICERS

Angela Briggs – Planning Team Leader
Maggie Camp – Legal Services Manager
Richard Fitzjohn – Senior Planning Officer
Rachael Forbes – Planning Officer
Barbara Greengrass – Planning Team Leader
Catherine Looper – Senior Planning Officer
Andrew Phillips - Planning Team Leader
Janis Murfet – Democratic Services Officer
Dan Smith – Planning Consultant
Angela Tyrrell – Senior Legal Assistant
Russell Wignall – Legal Assistant

IN ATTENDANCE

Cllr Lis Every (Agenda Item No's 8 & 9)
Cllr Julia Huffer (Agenda Item No's 6 & 10)
25 members of the public

60. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Matt Downey and Joshua Schumann.

It was noted that Councillor David Ambrose Smith would substitute for Councillor Schumann for the duration of the meeting.

61. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

62. MINUTES

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 6th November 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

63. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made the following announcements:

- This meeting was being held in the Church Hall because the Council Chamber at The Grange was being used for postal votes. January's meeting would take place at The Grange as usual;
- Rebecca Saunt, Planning Manager, was on leave and therefore Andrew Phillips, Planning Team Leader was deputising for her at this meeting;
- This was the last Planning Committee meeting before Christmas and the Chairman wished all present a Happy Christmas. He also thanked Members and Officers, saying it was a pleasure to work with them
- Richard Fitzjohn, Senior Planning Officer, was leaving the Authority in January 2020. On behalf of Members, the Chairman thanked him for all his efforts, wished him good luck for the future and expressed the hope that he would have a Happy Christmas with his partner and baby son.

64. 19/00100/FUM – SITE SOUTH OF WINGS HOSTEL, STATION DROVE, SHIPPEA HILL

Richard Fitzjohn, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report (reference U132, previously circulated) which sought permission for the provision of additional temporary rural workers' accommodation and welfare facilities to extend the existing provision at Wings Hostel, Shippea Hill.

The proposal would increase the amount of accommodation on the site from 71 portacabins to 148 caravans/cabins, in addition to providing an on-site shop, recreational and welfare facilities and additional parking. It would increase the capacity from 408 to 592 people between 1st May and 31st October in any year.

It was noted that due to unforeseen circumstances, Members had been unable to make a site visit, but they had been provided with photographs of the application site.

The site was located within the countryside, to the south west of the A1101 and Shippea Hill Station. It was accessed via a long road from Station Drove, which was off the A1101. It was also located adjacent to a railway line and was well screened by established landscaping, comprising trees and hedging.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a site location map, an aerial photograph, a site plan of the proposal and indicative visuals of the accommodation, shop and main office.

The main considerations in the determination of this application were:

- Principle of development;
- Character and appearance of the area;
- Residential amenity;
- Highway safety and transport;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Ecology;
- Archaeology; and
- Trees.

The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that the main consideration was whether there was sufficient business justification for 184 additional workers to be accommodated on the site. The applicant had submitted a Heads of Terms document which agreed that as part of a Section 106 agreement, the increase in workers living at the Shippea Hill hostel would be offset somewhat by a reduction in workers living at the Barway hostel. There would be an increase of 184 people at the Shippea Hill hostel and a decrease of 148 people at the Barway hostel – an overall increase of 36 workers over the 2 sites.

The map on page 12 of the Officer's report showed that the majority of harvesting operations were located closer to Shippea Hill than they were to Barway. This demonstrated business and sustainability justifications for locating more accommodation at the Shippea Hill hostel.

It was noted that the Council's Housing department supported the application in principle, stating that it would help to meet Policy HOU5 of the Local Plan, as it was an extension to an established seasonal, agricultural workers accommodation.

The scale of the proposal was not considered to be larger than that required to meet the functional needs of the business, and the on-site shop was considered to be ancillary to the accommodation as it would only serve the rural workers occupying the site.

Subject to agreement of a S106 which was in general accordance with the agreed Heads of Terms, it was considered that the principle of development was acceptable for occupation between 1st May and 31st October in any year.

The Council's Trees Officer raised concerns that the proposal had a very dense layout which would have a negative effect upon the landscape character of the area. However, he acknowledged that there was existing habitation use which currently impacted views and he therefore did not object to the scheme.

With regard to the visual impact of the proposal, it was noted that the existing site comprised portacabins, offices and welfare facilities. The proposed extension to the site would significantly increase built form on, and adjacent to the site, but it was a significant distance from the public highway and would be well screened by mature landscaping. It was therefore considered that there would be a low visual impact from the public highway.

Speaking next of residential amenity, the Senior Planning Officer stated that the scheme would not result in any significant harm to the existing occupiers of nearby properties. In respect of the agricultural workers, the development would improve the existing accommodation, recreation and welfare facilities available, whilst reducing the numbers of people per cabin.

Although there was a railway line adjacent to the site, the Noise Impact Assessment stated that the part of the site predicted to have an exceedance of 2dB internally was the existing site and not the extension, and the relaxation of internal noise levels was acceptable when weighed against the benefits of the application. On that basis the noise impacts were considered acceptable.

It was noted that the applicant provided regular shuttle bus services for business and recreation purposes and the proposed 70 car parking spaces would meet predicted private car levels. The Local Highways Authority Transport Team had no objections to the proposed development, subject to a condition requiring a Bus Management Plan to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to manage the buses during the morning and evening shift changes.

The application site was located in Flood Zone 3, but the principle of development was considered acceptable as the application was to expand an existing temporary accommodation site. It was accepted that there was a business need for the additional accommodation at this location and it could not be reasonably placed elsewhere at a lower risk of flooding. On this basis the flood risk sequential test was passed.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy stated that the floor levels of the caravans/cabins would be a minimum of 0.5 metres above ground level. The flood risk exception test was therefore satisfied, subject to the recommended drainage conditions.

The Committee noted that the application was supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment. It identified that there would be no significant

impacts on protected species or habitats with the implementation of mitigation and compensation measures. The Assessment recommended biodiversity enhancement measures which would be likely to result in a biodiversity net gain, and these could be secured by condition.

Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology advised that the site lay within an area of high archaeological potential. They did not object to the development, but requested a planning condition requiring an archaeological investigation prior to development commencing.

The submitted arboricultural report identified five low quality trees to be removed and the Council's Trees Officer had raised no objection to this. A soft landscaping scheme requiring new trees to be planted would be secured by condition.

Turning to the planning balance, the Senior Planning Officer said that the proposal supported the viability and sustainability of the business and would make a positive contribution to local economy. While it would result in additional structures and development in the countryside, the visual impact from public highways or viewpoints would be very limited. Although there would be additional traffic movements within the vicinity of the site, on a wider scale traffic movements originating from the Barway Hostel should be significantly reduced. The LHA Transport team did not consider there would be a detrimental impact on the highway network.

On balance it was considered that the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal was therefore recommended for approval.

A Member, referring to paragraph 7.2.13 of the Officer's report, asked if the applicant had made a proper request to extend the period during which the proposed accommodation could be occupied. The Senior Planning Officer replied that the request had been received the day before his Committee report was due to be submitted. No justified essential need had been demonstrated and therefore it had not been demonstrated that the extended period of occupation complied with Policy HOU5 of the Local Plan. As the request would have required consultation, it was decided that the application should come to Committee with the information originally received. If the applicants wished to extend the period of occupation, they would have to submit a separate variation of condition application at a later date.

Another Member wished to know what would happen to the existing accommodation on the site and was advised that it would be replaced with the proposed new units.

A further Member asked about parking arrangements on site and whether people would need to use their cars much. The Senior Planner outlined the site plan and indicated where various facilities were located. He did not think they would as they would be working long hours and that car owners would only be approximately 10% of the occupiers.

A comment was also made that the number of people occupying one unit would be reduced and so they would be living in better conditions.

The Chairman said that the importance of this employer to the local economy should be recognised. 148 people would be moving from Barway to this site and the view from the public highway was fairly academic. He reiterated that Members would not be considering the late application information, but that which was before them today.

Councillor Jones wished it to be noted that his brother in law worked for Gees; the Legal Services Manager said that this was a personal interest and would not preclude him from participating in the vote.

Members were reminded that the importance of seasonal workers must not be underestimated.

It was proposed by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Jones that the Officer's recommendation for approval be supported, and when put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 19/00100/FUM be APPROVED subject to the signing of the S106 Agreement and the recommended conditions as set out in the Officer's report, with authority delegated to the Planning Manager and Legal Services Manager to complete the S106 and to issue the planning permission.

65. 19/00447/RMM – LAND ACCESSED BETWEEN 2 AND 4 FORDHAM ROAD, ISLEHAM

Andrew Phillips, Planning Team Leader, presented a report (reference U133, previously circulated) relating to the application that was considered at Committee on 6th November 2019 and was deferred to allow the developer time to alter the layout/design in providing single storey dwellings.

With the application coming back before Members within a month and the previous committee report attached as Appendix 2, this report only covered the substantial changes.

The Committee was asked to note the following additional consultation comments which were tabled at the meeting:

- Trees Officer – states previous comments still valid;
- Isleham Parish Council – no objections subject that the developer passes the 5 metre buffer zone to residents of Hall Barn Road;
- Local highways Authority – states the arrangement is acceptable, but has led to Plots 119 and 120 having to reverse 20 metres to allow easy turning;
- 4 additional neighbour comments raised the following:

- 39 properties for sale, more dwellings not required in village;
- Additional bungalows adjacent to properties of Hall Barn Road welcomed;
- Self builds will still cause loss of privacy and a restriction should be added to prevent loss of privacy.

The Planning Team Leader covered the additional consultation responses. The maintenance strip and its future ownership/management was covered in the S106 with the outline consent. The self builds would be considered when they came forward and the other issues would be covered in the following presentation.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a site location plan, aerial view, the indicative layout of the proposal and the current layout.

The main consideration in the determination of the application was the update from the November 2019 Planning Committee, this being primarily residential amenity. Plots 116 and 117 were the two storey dwellings that Members raised concerns about in relation to the impact on residential amenity, and this led to the application being deferred.

These two properties had been amended to single storey bungalows (now Plots 118 and 119) and a bungalow (Plot 111) had been added to the rear of No. 2 The Briars. The addition of the three bungalows along the western edge had led to the loss of a more even spread of bungalows across the site as the overall number proposed remained the same. However, the harm to the overall quality of the urban design was very minimal.

It was noted that the proposal would lead to the requested improvement to the residents of No. 29b Hall Barn Road and it would not create any new residential concerns elsewhere.

The comments raised by the Local Highways Authority would not justify a reason for refusal.

The Planning Team Leader concluded his presentation by saying that the proposal had been designed taking into account the constraints of the site, the requirements of the outline permission (including the S106), the requirements of the statutory bodies and the comments from District Councillors at the last Planning Committee meeting.

The proposal was considered to be acceptable, subject to the recommended conditions, and was therefore recommended for approval.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Robert Eburne, Planning Director for Bloor Homes Eastern, addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

- It was a credit to Officers that the application had been brought back to Committee so quickly;
- He had spoken to the neighbours and the Ward Councillor regarding the key issue and that part of the site had been reorganised;
- There were now 7 bungalows in total, with all being in a uniform area along the boundary;
- It had been possible to resolve the neighbour's concerns and there was now a good outlook with no overbearing;
- He commended the scheme to Members, saying that Bloor was a 5 star quality house builder.

In response to a Member's question regarding parking, Mr Eburne confirmed that it would be relevant to each property.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Julia Huffer addressed the Committee on behalf of Isleham Parish Council and made the following points:

- She had been following this application and had attended the meeting with Mr Eburne and the residents of Hall Barn Road;
- It had been agreed that ownership of the buffer zone was to be transferred to the residents of Hall Barn Road and The Briars;
- This had allayed some of their fears and would ensure some privacy. However, the impact on No's 3 and 5 The Briars could not be underestimated and the concerns of those most affected had only been partially addressed;
- The Parish Council had no objections to the scheme as long as the agreement was honoured.

A Member of the Committee asked Councillor Huffer what would happen if one of the residents decided to sell their property. She replied that there would be a resident's association to take over the buffer zone; this was the only compromise that could be reached. The Planning Team Leader interjected to say that the S106 Agreement permitted the buffer zone to be sold to individuals or a management company to be set up; this presented no problem in planning terms. The Member went on to commend the pace of work since the last meeting, saying that it looked like concerns had been addressed and he was content with this.

A Member made reference to the plot of land that might become the pre-school and raised a concern regarding parking around this area. The Planning Team Leader said the current application was deferred on the basis of the concern about the bungalows. No details of the pre-school had been submitted as part of this application and there were no updates in relation to this.

It was proposed by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Jones that the Officer's recommendation for approval be supported, and when put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 19/00447/RMM be APPROVED subject to the recommended conditions as set out in the Officer's report.

66. 19/00877/FUL – PLOT 2, SITE NORTH WEST OF 72 WEST STREET, ISLEHAM

Rachael Forbes, Planning Officer, presented a report (reference U134, previously circulated) which sought permission for a five bedroom dwelling and detached garage at Plot 2 at 72 West Street, Isleham. Plot 2 was also part of another application, 19/00366/FUL, which was for three detached dwellings on land at 72 West Street, which was split into three plots.

Members were asked to note the additional site plan which had been tabled at the meeting.

The site was located within the development envelope for Isleham, but outside of the Conservation Area. To the west of 72 West Street was a brick outbuilding which had planning consent to be converted under application 19/00366/FUL, and there was an access between the dwelling and the outbuilding. To the east of the site there was a private road serving approximately nine dwellings and there were TPO trees along the boundary of the site. To the west was a residential dwelling and its associate land, and to the north was 70 West Street, a two storey dwelling.

It was noted that the application had been called in to Planning Committee by Councillor Joshua Schumann as he believed the application was very finely balanced and the Parish Council had no objections to it, therefore it should be taken to Committee for consideration.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a site location map, aerial view, the layout of the proposal, proposed elevations and floor plans and photographs relating to visual impact.

The main considerations in the determination of this application were:

- Principle of Development;
- Visual Amenity;
- Residential Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Ecology and Trees;

- Flood Risk and Drainage; and
- Other Matters.

The Planning Officer showed Members a slide relating to the history of application 19/00366/FUL. The left hand section showed the original elevations and the right, the amended and approved design.

The site was located within the Isleham development envelope and therefore the principle of development was acceptable, subject to satisfying all other relevant material planning considerations.

In terms of visual impact, it was considered that the proposal resulted in a dwelling which was of a scale that was not in keeping with the built form in the area. It would give the appearance of a two storey dwelling in an area that was largely 1½ storey and single storey, and it would be visually prominent in the street scene. It was considered that the proposal did not provide a complementary relationship with the existing development and was therefore contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan 2015.

In connection with residential amenity, it was considered that there was sufficient distance between dwellings such that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact and would provide high standards of amenity to future occupiers.

Speaking next of highways, the Planning Officer said that the proposed dwelling would be accessed from West Street, through an existing access. There was sufficient space on site for turning and parking and there was a double garage proposed. There had been no objection from the Local Highway Authority.

The Committee noted that no ecological assessment had been submitted and the application form stated that there was not a reasonable likelihood of protected or priority species, designated sites or geological features being affected by the proposed development. No further ecological information was sought at this site under the previous application 19/00366/FUL due to the site being considered unsuitable for protected species.

The Trees Officer had raised concerns that the proposed dwelling was too close to the Root Protection Area of the trees for protective fencing alone and the hardstanding proposed would need to be installed via reduced dig operations; these details could be secured by condition. He had also raised concerns that the proximity of the trees would result in conflict with future occupiers due to shading to the dwelling and garden, leaf litter, lack of light, blocked gutters and lack of grass. The windows on the north east elevation served three shower rooms, a utility room and a secondary kitchen window. There was a large garden area to the north west of the proposed dwelling as well as that to the north east and therefore it was considered that there would not be a significant impact to residential amenity.

The site was located in Flood Zone 1 and therefore would not require the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment. Surface water would be

disposed of via soakaways, with foul water to be disposed of via the mains sewer.

The Planning Officer concluded her presentation by saying that it was considered that the proposal would result in a dwelling which was of a scale, mass and height not in keeping with the existing built form in the area. It did not reflect the surrounding residential development, it would be visually prominent within the street scene, and would present an unbroken mass of 15.3 metres at a height of 7 metres. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Andrew Fleet, agent, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- He drew Members' attention to the revised location plan, which was tabled at the meeting. It showed the proposal to be in an area of significant development;
- Plot 2 occupied an area of 245 square metres and was 26.6 metres within the root protection zone;
- The applicants were currently living in Fordham but wished to return to live in Isleham;
- The design of the proposal had changed considerably and an alternative had been agreed with Officers;
- The Parish Council had raised no concerns;
- While the Trees Officer had raised concerns about leaf litter and blocked gutters, any building could suffer this issue with leaves;
- The Officer was only concerned with scale and mass. The height of the dwelling was very much 1½ storeys and would be similar to Plot 1. It was well set back and the frontage would not be contiguous;
- The length of the dwelling had been reduced, it would have timber boarding and the materials would match those in the locale;
- The proposed dwelling would cause no harm and was peri-urban in character.

A Member asked the Case Officer if Permitted Development Rights had been removed, to which the Officer replied that the previous application did not remove those Rights. Another Member felt that the proposal was too hard to turn down and he was not convinced that it could be refused.

The Case Officer was asked to confirm the measurements, and having re-measured the building, she confirmed that it should be 14.3 metres in length, not 15.3 metres.

A number of opposing views were expressed during the ensuing debate. Some Members thought the application should be approved as there

was development all around the site, the design of the dwelling would not look out of place and it was in keeping with the area. Others were of the opinion that it would be visually prominent in the street scene and there was concern regarding the form of development on this side of West Street where dwellings were increasing in scale towards the rear.

It was duly proposed by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor Wilson that the Officer's recommendation for refusal be rejected and the application be granted permission. When put to the vote, the motion was declared lost, there being 4 votes for, 5 votes against and 1 abstention.

It was proposed by Councillor Trapp and seconded by Councillor Brown that the Officer's recommendation for refusal be supported. When put to the vote, the motion was declared carried, there being 5 votes for, 2 votes against and 2 abstentions. Whereupon,

It was resolved:

That planning application reference 19/00877/FUL be REFUSED for the reasons given in the Officer's report.

Members noted that there was a typographical error in paragraph 1.1 of the recommendation; the expanse of width was stated as being 15.3 metres and this would be corrected to 14.3 metres in the refusal notice.

67. 19/00939/FUL – AMANI, 43 PRICKWILLOW ROAD, QUEEN ADELAIDE, CB7 4SH

Dan Smith, Planning Consultant, presented a report (reference U135, previously circulated) which sought full planning permission for the erection of a replacement dwelling and one additional dwelling on site. A planning permission for a smaller replacement dwelling at the south western end of the site was granted under reference 16/00953/FUL but it had expired during the course of the determination of the current application.

The site was a shallow parcel of land running alongside Prickwillow Road. It was not located within any development envelope and was in the countryside, the nearest development envelope being Queen Adelaide 700 metres to the west and Prickwillow 1.8 kilometres to the east. It was bounded to the rear by the Ely to Norwich railway line, the embankment of which stood approximately 2.5 metres above the level of the site. The site also sat below the level of Prickwillow Road and the existing vehicle access sloped relatively steeply down to the site. The land to the north and south was open and flat and the neighbouring properties were low level bungalows, with the dwelling to the south west having a large outbuilding to the side and rear. There was neither a footpath nor street lighting along the road in either direction.

It was noted that the application had been called in to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Lis Every.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a map, aerial view, the layout of the proposal and elevations.

The main considerations in the determination of the application were:

- Principle and 5 Year Land Supply;
- Flood Risk and Drainage;
- Sustainability of site;
- Visual Amenity; and
- Noise.

Members were reminded that the Council was currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and therefore the presumption should be in favour of sustainable development unless NPPF policies (including Flood Risk) provided a clear reason for refusal or the adverse impacts would outweigh the benefits. The proposed development would not comply with Policy GROWTH 2 which sought to direct new dwellings to the most sustainable locations within the District.

The application site was located in Flood Zone 3, meaning that it was at a high probability of surface water flooding. National and local policy required new dwellings to be located in lowest risk areas unless the Sequential and Exceptions tests were met and the applicant had included Flood Risk Assessments relating to the proposed dwellings. However, it was concluded that there were other more sustainable sites within Ely which were in Flood Zone 1 and the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed additional dwellings were necessary in this location. The application therefore failed the Sequential Test for this reason. Had the Sequential Test been passed, the Exceptions Test required that the public benefits should outweigh the flood risk. It was considered that an additional dwelling would not provide a sufficient benefit to outweigh the risk of flooding. As both tests were failed, the application was contrary to specific policies within the NPPF regarding flood risk and the tilted balance was not engaged.

With regard to the sustainability of the site, it was noted that it was located at least 700 metres from the nearest development envelope, where Policy GROWTH 2 restricted new residential dwellings. There was no public transport so applicants would be heavily reliant on the use of private motor vehicles. The site was along a 60mph road with no street lighting; there would be harm to the social objective of sustainable development due to the lack of access to facilities and services and harm to the environmental objective due to the overreliance on unsustainable means of transport. On this basis the site was considered to be unsustainable.

Turning next to visual amenity, the proposed development was considered to be excessive in terms of its scale and design. The design was convoluted and out of character with the dwellings along this part of Prickwillow Road and an additional dwelling would overly urbanise the street scene, contrary to the current pattern of development.

Given the proximity of the railway line to the proposed dwellings, there was significant potential for noise disturbance to the occupiers of the

properties. This would require mitigation but it was considered that acceptable internal night time noise levels could not be achieved with windows open, thereby resulting in a poor level of amenity for occupants.

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment stated that the impact of the railway line on noise levels would be acceptable subject to the installation of a 2 metre high acoustic fence. However, given that the fence would be located at the bottom of the 2.5 metre high embankment, it was considered that screen fencing would be ineffective.

It was therefore considered that the proposed development was contrary to Policies ENV 2 and ENV 9 of the Local Plan 2019.

In connection with other matters, it was noted that safe access and adequate parking and turning would be provided on site to serve both dwellings and as the site was of low ecological value there would be limited opportunities for enhancement. There would be no significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties from the proposed dwellings and the development was not at significant risk from land contamination.

The Planning Consultant concluded his presentation by saying that the tilted balance within the NPPF was not engaged as the application was contrary to specific NPPF policies related to flood risk. In any case, the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme and the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Andrew Fleet, agent, addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

- The site was in a defended flood zone and the Flood Risk Assessment had been accepted by the Environment Agency;
- There were not more acceptable sites available, and besides which, developments had been permitted in Great Fen Road, Soham
- There were three elements to sustainability and this proposal supported the social aspect. Not everyone wanted to live in an urban area, some people worked from home and this property would receive postal and other deliveries;
- The Council could not currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of land for housing;
- Planning permission was granted for a replacement dwelling on the site under reference 16/00953/FUL;
- Each dwelling had a lesser footprint;
- There was an eclectic mix of dwellings in the locale;
- The context of the design was a safe route but with a contemporary twist;

- All plots had amenity space on all sides and the occupants of the dwellings would have an alternative source of ventilation;
- His clients would be happy to install acoustic fencing.

In response to a question from a Member, Mr Fleet confirmed that the floor level would be increased to 300mm above that required by the Environment Agency. Another Member, citing the issue of a sustainable location, said that Mr Fleet should accept that this Committee was looking at the location stated in the Officer's report, not elsewhere. Mr Fleet replied that the application should be judged on its own merits.

A Member expressed concerns about the noise levels and said they would be the same no matter how close the building was to the railway line. Mr Fleet had no comments in relation to this statement.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Lis Every addressed the Committee in her capacity as a County Councillor and made the following remarks:

- She had called in this and the following application in her capacity as a County Councillor;
- She had a huge regard for the Planning department and she was aware that Officers had to follow policies, but this could lead to differences of opinion;
- She had been following the applications as at one point they fell within her Ward boundary;
- Queen Adelaide had a strong community. She knew it very well and the additional two houses would be well received;
- The charm of the area was its wide mix of dwellings, so she found it difficult to understand why it would be refused on the grounds of scale and character;
- The new dwelling was acceptable in visual terms, scale, mass, design and impact on flooding;
- There had been no adverse responses from consultees, the City of Ely had no objections and the application should be considered on its own merits. In addition the risk could be mitigated against.

The Planning Consultant reminded Members that the Environment Agency did not apply the Sequential Test, as this was for the Local Planning Authority to do. A lack of comment was not a tacit implication that the Test had been passed. Raising the levels would not deal with the issue of wider sustainability to the community and with regard to amenity, Officers did not believe that the garden would be free of noise disturbance. The provisions of the NPPF applied.

Andrew Phillips, Planning Team Leader, highlighted a typographical error in paragraphs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 of the recommendation. Each referred to the 'NPPF 2018', and should instead read 'NPPF **2019**'.

In response to a Member's question regarding the height of the new dwelling and whether it would be higher, the Planning Consultant confirmed that the dwelling would be 0.5 metres higher than previously approved. Mr Fleet reconfirmed that the dwelling would be 200 – 300mm higher. The Planning Consultant also stated that the floor levels would be raised by 1 metre plus an additional 300mm (internal floor level).

A Member asked to see the slide of the site plan again and asked if the Permitted Development Rights would be retained as part of the previous permission. The Planning Consultant replied that the permission did not withhold them, so the applicant could extend if he wished; however, he could not extend the ridge heights.

The Vice Chairman commented that there had recently been much in the news about flooding and the effect it had on peoples' lives. She reiterated the importance of Members going on site visits and said that she would be very concerned about the risk to the community as this site was located in Flood Zone 3. Community spirit would not be encouraged by using cars, there would be a huge impact on visual amenity and noise disturbance would also have an impact. In the light of this she was minded to support the Officer's recommendation.

One Member stated he agreed with Councillor Stubbs' comments. Another raised concerns over noise saying that this proposal was not suitable for a family. A third Member concurred with Councillor Stubbs and added that a better quality of housing should be supported.

The Chairman stated he believed the proposal should be refused and this application highlighted the importance of site visits.

It was proposed by Councillor Stubbs and seconded by Councillor Jones that the Officer's recommendation for refusal be supported, and when put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 19/00939/FUL be REFUSED for the reasons given in the Officer's report with the corrections to the date of the NPPF.

68. 19/00940/FUL – 43 PRICKWILLOW ROAD, QUEEN ADELAIDE, CB7 4SH

Dan Smith, Planning Consultant, presented a report (reference U136, previously circulated) which sought full permission for the erection of a replacement dwelling on site. A planning permission for a smaller replacement dwelling was granted on the site under reference 16/00953/FUL, but this had expired during the course of the determination of the current application.

The site was a shallow parcel of land running alongside Prickwillow Road bounded to the rear by the Ely to Norwich railway line, the embankment of which stood over 2 metres above the level of the site. The site also sat below the level of Prickwillow Road and the existing vehicle access sloped relatively steeply down to the site. The land to the north and south was open and flat and the neighbouring properties were low level bungalows, with the dwelling to the south west having a large outbuilding to the side and rear. There was neither a footpath nor street lighting along the road in either direction and the site was located entirely within Flood Zone 3.

The site was not located within any development envelope and was in the countryside, being 700 metres from Queen Adelaide to the west and 1.8 kilometres from Prickwillow to the east.

It was noted that the application had been called in to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Lis Every.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a map, aerial view, the layout of the proposal and elevations.

The main considerations in the determination of the application were:

- Previous permission and Principle;
- Visual amenity; and
- Other matters.

The Planning Consultant stated that there had previously been a small bungalow on the site which had now been removed. While there was general policy support for a replacement dwelling, the scale of the replacement was considered to be excessive given the low level of the neighbouring bungalows and the limited scale of the replacement. The design of the proposal was convoluted and not in keeping with the modest and simple dwellings which characterized the development along this part of Prickwillow Road. It would cause significant harm to the visual amenity and character of area and this would be exacerbated by the need to raise the land levels and finished floor levels significantly above those current established on site as the visual impact of the development would be increased.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment proposed that the finished floor levels of the dwelling would be 1 metre above the existing ground level and that flood resilient construction would be up to 300mm above the finished floor level. There would also be a first floor refuge if flooding was to occur, and this was something not offered by the bungalow which previously occupied the site. Arrangements for adequate foul and surface water drainage on site could be secured by condition. It was therefore considered that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage.

The Planning Consultant concluded his presentation by saying that in weighing the benefits and adverse impacts on the tilted balance, as required by the NPPF, it was considered that the benefits of the scheme were relatively limited although some weight was given due to the Council's inability to

demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. The harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal and would conflict with the environmental objective of sustainable development. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

It was noted that the typographical error referring to 'NPPF 2018' in the reason for refusal would be corrected to read 'NPPF **2019**'.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Andrew Fleet, agent, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Application 16/00953/FUL for a chalet bungalow had been granted approval on 22nd September 2016. A Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted with the application;
- The previous application had started on time;
- There would be a traditional gable to gable clad in facing brick;
- The eaves height was less, the overall height was three bricks higher (0.2 metres), and the main bulk would run parallel to the road;
- Prickwillow Road was an eclectic mix of dwellings ranging from traditional to contemporary, and this scheme would have a more contemporary twist;
- The mass would be reduced by a hipped end and the materials would reflect the fenland setting. The floor level would be exactly the same as the previous 2016 application.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Lis Every addressed the Committee in her capacity as a County Councillor and made the following remarks:

- She urged Members to consider that this was a replacement dwelling and this was why she called in the application;
- It would provide a family home and the design was acceptable;
- There had been no adverse response from consultees and the City of Ely Council had no objections to the scheme and no objections had been raised by neighbours.

A Member noted that while planning permission had been granted three years ago, piling had only just commenced. He thought that given this length of time, it surely negated the need for another dwelling on the site. Councillor Every replied that it would be a larger house and would be well received. The Planning Consultant interjected to say that the previous approval was given under the policy which allowed dwellings in the countryside and allowed for some enlargement to bring homes up to a modern standard of living. The additional height had been accepted on that occasion

but the additional scale now proposed and design were out of keeping, with the design being overly complicated. The increases might seem relatively small but a decision had to be made relative to the original bungalow, not the previous replacement permission.

Members were advised that flood risk and noise disturbance fell away as reasons for objection as it was the view of Officers that residential use would be appropriate on the site given the historic use and previous replacement permission. Weight should be given to the fact that there had previously been a dwelling on the site. A landscaping condition would be applied and the hedging to the front of the site would not be removed to allow development of the site.

Following discussion over the length of time a hedge could be protected, Andrew Phillips, Planning Team Leader, commented that landscape was usually only protected for five years and longer periods of time should be clearly justified.

One Member considered the design to be convoluted and felt that the proposal would be overbearing if permission was granted. The Planning Consultant replied that on paper there was nothing wrong with the design of the dwelling but it was just not in keeping with the location.

Other Members believed that there was no reason to refuse the application as there was already a wide variety of house designs in the area and this would complement the variance; one made the point that a smaller dwelling had been approved and this was more suburban and he was therefore minded to support the Officer.

Councillors Wilson and Stubbs considered that the Officer's recommendation should be supported.

It was duly proposed by Councillor David Ambrose Smith and seconded by Councillor Edwards that the Officer's recommendation for refusal be rejected and the application be granted approval.

The Planning Team Leader provided advice on when Members were seeking to overturn an Officer's recommendation. He also reiterated that Policy HOU8 related to the original dwelling, not the previous approval.

There was comfort break between 4.20pm and 4.30pm.

Members then returned to the motion for approval which was declared carried, there being 6 votes for and 4 votes against.

It was resolved:

That planning application reference 19/00940/FUL be APPROVED for the following reasons:

- 1) The dwelling does not constitute a significant and demonstrable harm; and

- 2) The benefits of the size and scale are in accordance with Policies HOU8, ENV1 and ENV2 and the adverse impacts do not outweigh the benefits.

At this point the Planning Consultant asked the Committee to specify whether or not Permitted Development Rights should be removed from the permission.

It was proposed by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Christine Ambrose Smith that they be retained, and when put to the vote, the motion was declared carried with 8 votes for and 2 votes against. Whereupon,

It was further resolved:

- a) That the Planning Manager be given delegated authority to impose suitable conditions; and
- b) That Permitted Development Rights be retained.

69. 19/01115/OUT – SITE NORTH OF 55 POUND LANE, ISLEHAM

Catherine Looper, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report (reference U137, previously circulated) which sought outline consent for the construction of two dwellings adjacent to the site of a recently permitted dwelling. The matters to be considered were access, appearance, layout and scale. The two dwellings would share a vehicular access.

Members were reminded that this application had been submitted following the refusal of an earlier application for two dwellings on the site.

The site was located toward the north of Isleham and was in close proximity to the development envelope. It was currently vacant and enclosed by a well-established hedge. Isleham had a mixture of dwelling types and designs near this location, which were generally set back a short distance from the public highway.

It was noted that the application had been brought back before Members as it had previously been determined at Committee.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a site location map, aerial photograph, the layout of the proposal, elevations and photographs of the street scene.

The main considerations in the determination of the application were:

- Principle of Development;
- Residential Amenity;
- Visual Amenity; and
- Highway matters.

The Council was currently unable to demonstrate an adequate five year housing supply and therefore applications were being assessed on the basis of presumption in favour of development unless there were any adverse impacts in doing so.

As the site was located in close proximity to the settlement boundary and the services and facilities on offer in Isleham, the principle of development was considered acceptable subject to compliance with other local and material planning policies and all other material considerations that formed part of the planning balance for the application.

With regard to residential amenity, the drawings submitted showed that a suitable relationship between the dwellings could be achieved in order to prevent detrimental impacts on neighbouring properties. The dwellings were modest in scale and were positioned to ensure that habitable rooms did not overlook neighbouring amenity areas. The application proposed suitable plot sizes and amenity spaces.

In connection with visual amenity, the application site was located in close proximity to the settlement boundary, and in turn had access to the services and facilities in Isleham. The proposal would contribute to the local housing supply and would also be beneficial in the short term to the local economy through the construction stage.

Turning next to visual impact, the drawings submitted show a limited level of glazing to the road-facing elevations of the proposed dwellings, to retain a more rural appearance within the street scene. The scale of the proposed dwellings was considered to be appropriate and the retention of the established boundary hedging would help to assimilate the built-form into its surroundings. The retention of this hedge could be secured by condition to prevent removal. Although the introduction of built-form would create a change to the appearance of the settlement edge, the single storey scale of the plots indicated a stopping point of built-form and provided a step down from the adjacent two storey dwellings.

It was noted that the Local Highways Authority had been consulted and had raised no objections in principal to the application. Conditions are recommended to ensure that the proposal did not create impacts on highway safety. The proposal provided sufficient parking spaces for the proposed dwellings, and therefore highways matters were considered to be acceptable.

The Senior Planning Officer concluded her presentation by saying that the principle of development at the site was considered to be acceptable. The proposal was not considered to create significantly harmful impacts on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers or on the visual character of the area. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the recommended conditions as set out in her report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Julia Huffer, a Ward Member for Fordham & Isleham, addressed the Committee and read out the following prepared statement:

'The Parish Council has consistently objected to proposals for development on this site because of its detrimental impact on our village.

The reason given for refusal of the previous application was that 'The proposal would create a visual intrusion of built form into the open countryside which would be significantly harmful and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the settlement edge, which is also exacerbated by the overdevelopment of the site.

This proposal remains of the same scale as the previous application. Therefore the reason for that refusal remain valid.

The report accepts that it will create a change to the settlement edge but is deemed acceptable because of the more rural design and the substantial boundary hedging around the site. However the advice from the Council's Trees Team in the report clearly states that further development of this site will not assimilate into the landscape. There is no reference to its visual impact from any point other than that of neighbouring properties.

This site is next to the main entrance to our village from Ely and Soham and those travelling benefit from wide ranging views along Prickwillow Road and Knaves Acre Drove. Additionally the visual impact from Coates Drove and Little London Drove is clear. These Drovers are heavily used for walking. They offer wide ranging views uncluttered by development and are part of the 'open space' of the village for the benefit of all.

The Local Plan Policy ENV1 relates to landscape and settlement character. It states within it that proposals for development should be informed by, be sympathetic to, and respect the capacity of the distinctive character areas including the following:

- The settlement edge and their wider landscape setting;*
- Key views into and out of settlements.*

There is no reference to this policy within the report and Members who have had the opportunity to visit the area looking over the site from these Drovers and driving to the village will recognise that the proposal would create a visual intrusion of built form into the open countryside which would be significantly harmful and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the settlement edge.

I would therefore ask Members to take this fully into account and recognise, as set out in the National Planning Policy framework, that the adverse impacts of granting permission will significantly and demonstrably outweigh the perceived benefits and refuse this application.'

Councillor Huffer stated that as a Ward Member, she supported the Parish Council one hundred percent. The Parish Council were careful when they objected and the site would no longer be countryside.

The Senior Planning Officer did not agree that the application site was in open countryside as the land had been used as garden land and was

hedged in. The Trees Officer had commented that the Laurel hedging was not in keeping with the rural nature of the site, but it was very mature and its removal would be resisted.

A Member wondered whether trees could be added to the condition relating to landscaping and the Senior Planning Officer said that this would be flagged up with the agent; the retention of the hedge would be also conditioned.

Referring to the two previous refusals of permission, the Chairman remarked that the applications were for full sized houses. The Senior Planning Officer responded saying that the previous scheme in 2018 was for 3 dwellings. However, this recommendation was for approval of two dwellings and they were now single storey.

The Vice Chairman said that the Committee listened when Parish Councils made statements, but if Members wished to refuse an application they needed good reasons for doing so. In this instance, she could not support the Parish Council and was minded to support approval of the scheme.

Another Member, having noted that this was an outline application, suggested that changes could be made to appearance when the full application came back to Committee. The Senior Planning Officer reiterated that appearance was being considered today; the design before Members today was the one they would be approving. The elevations would be fixed and landscaping would be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage; the recommended Condition 2 would be updated and Condition 6 to state that the landscaping scheme was to be submitted as part of any Reserved Matters application.

In proposing that the Officer's recommendation for approval be supported, Councillor Brown said he had huge sympathy for the Parish Council, but he did not feel there were reasons enough to go against the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Jones seconded the motion saying that he sympathised with Councillor Huffer but he felt the screened aspect would not affect key views.

When put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 19/01115/OUT be APPROVED subject to the recommended conditions as set out in the Officer's report and as updated by the Case Officer during the meeting to amend the wording of Condition 2 which related to the matters to be submitted as part of a reserved matters application, and Condition 6 which was to be amended to read that as part of any reserved matters application a soft landscaping scheme should be submitted.

70. 19/01395/FUL – 3 HALL LANE, BURWELL, CB25 0HE

Rachael Forbes, Planning Officer, presented a report (reference U138, previously circulated) which sought permission for a change of use of the existing annexe to an independent residential dwelling.

A single storey annexe was granted permission under application 14/00628/FUL in 2014 and a two storey annexe (reference 16/01407/FUL) was approved in 2016.

The site was situated within the development envelope of Burwell and outside of the Conservation Area. The annexe was at the bottom of the rear garden of 3 Hall Lane and had its own access from Dark Lane along a Public Right of Way.

Dark Lane was an unadopted public byway, characterised by the rear of residential dwellings and the associated outbuildings, boundary treatments and vegetation. There were single garages and another annexe building, which was a garage with annexe above.

The application was called in to Planning Committee by Councillor David Brown as he believed there were matters of principle associated with this application that deserved to be considered by the Committee.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting including a map of the location, aerial view, the layout, and the elevations.

The main considerations in the determination of the application were:

- Principle of Development;
- Visual Amenity;
- Residential Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Public Right of Way;
- Ecology; and
- Flood Risk and Drainage.

Speaking of the planning history, the Planning Officer said that the annexe/outbuilding of application reference 14/00628/FUL had been designed in such a way that it could be converted to a garage in the future. However, application reference 16/01407/FUL was submitted as the annexe had not been built in accordance with the approved plans and sought retrospective permission. Permission for a change from single storey annexe to a two storey annexe to provide habitable accommodation for a full time care worker was approved.

The site was located within the Burwell development envelope and therefore the principle of development was acceptable subject to satisfying all other relevant material planning considerations.

Members were shown a number of photographs relating to visual amenity. The Planning Officer said that the annexe was accessed from Dark Lane, a public byway for all traffic from Spring Close to High Street. Vehicular traffic could not access the High Street from Dark Lane as there were bollards in place to prevent this. The dwellings situated on Hall Lane and The Paddocks back onto Dark Lane. Dark Lane was characterised by vegetation/trees and boundary treatments such as close board fencing. There were single garages present at other properties that are accessed from Dark Lane and a 1.5 storey detached garage and annexe at number 7 Hall Lane, approved under application reference 16/00664/FUL. While the building was already present and there were no changes proposed to the building itself, it was considered that its use as an independent dwelling would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The character of Dark Lane was a narrow public byway which very clearly consisted of the rear of residential dwellings and their associated outbuildings/boundary treatments. It was considered that the use of the annexe as an independent dwelling would result in the introduction of a type of backland development which was not characteristic of Hall Lane. It was also considered that while the design of the proposal was appropriate for an outbuilding/annexe with the potential to return to a garage, it was not considered to reflect the form of any of the adjacent dwellings in character and appearance and does not provide a complimentary relationship with its surroundings. It therefore failed to comply with policy ENV 2 of the Local Plan.

With regard to residential amenity, the proposal was not considered to result in a significant impact to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. However, it was considered that it provided a poor standard of amenity to future occupiers by virtue of a small plot and garden space and a poor outlook from the first floor bedroom.

Concerns had been raised about the suitability of Dark Lane as an access as it became churned up when wet and this would make access difficult. The Lane was an unadopted path and bridleway, which provided access to the rear of the properties at Hall Lane. The Local Highway Authority had been consulted as part of the application and commented that while they did have reservations regarding the suitability of Dark Lane as a residential access, it appeared to have established use by this and other properties.

They commented that the approval granted under reference 14/00628/FUL appeared to recognise independent access and parking for the two buildings and no significant increase in use was likely to result from the proposal. While the turning length was not ideal, the additional width available should make it workable. Visibility accessing Dark Lane was not ideal although this application was not changing the existing situation and on this basis, they had no objections.

Two parking spaces had been provided on site in accordance with the Council's parking standards.

It was noted that the County Council Definitive Map team had no objections to the proposal.

The site was in Flood Zone 1 and as the building was existing, it was considered highly unlikely that it would adversely affect protected species.

The Planning Officer concluded her presentation by saying that while there were no changes proposed to the existing building, it was considered that the use of the annexe as an independent dwelling would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. The annexe was not intended to be a separate dwelling and was granted approval on the basis that it complied with policies as an annexe, in connection with the host dwelling.

The proposed development would not reflect the dwellings in the street scene due to its design and location and it was read as an outbuilding subservient to the main dwelling. It failed to offer a high standard of amenity for future occupiers and was contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan 2015; it was therefore recommended for refusal.

The Chairman adjourned the Committee and left the room at 5.07pm and returned at 5.09pm.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Michael Hendry, agent, addressed the Committee and made the following comments:

- He wished to contest a number of points that had been made;
- The issue was simply who could occupy the annexe. The building existed, it had its own facilities and no changes were proposed, save an increase in the garden;
- There would be no adverse impact on the area;
- The proposal complied with building regulations;
- Highways and the Rights of Way teams had no objections;
- There would be no significant impact on the traffic on Dark Lane;
- The proposed scheme fronted an existing byway so saying it was backland development was misleading;
- The Council could not demonstrate a 5 year supply of land for housing;
- The proposal had been considered acceptable in principle.

Mr Hendry gave the following responses to a number of comments and questions from the Committee:

- The fence had been moved back to extend the garden, which would be 300 square metres;
- The Design Guide said that a dwelling should occupy $\frac{1}{3}$ of the plot;
- Residents would bring their refuse bins to the nearest accessible highway. This could be either Spring Lane or the High Street;
- Parking was already available on site for contractors and space would be made available for them to leave their supplies;
- The annexe was currently vacant as the occupant had died;
- Waste and recycling would be collected on the High Street.

A Member asked the Planning Officer if she thought a precedent would be set for the rest of the Drove if the application was to be approved. She thought it would, but advised that the application had to be judged on its own merits. She also responded to a question from another Member, saying that although the Lane became churned up in wet weather, the Local Highways Authority had raised no objection to the scheme.

The Chairman asked, and the Planning Officer confirmed that the owner could not rent out or sell the annexe as a separate property; its use was ancillary to the main dwelling.

During the course of debate a number of differing views were put forward.

A Member supported the recommendation for refusal saying that the Parish Council objected to the scheme and neighbours had expressed concerns. The byway was used by a number of people and it was felt that approving the application would set a precedent for the rest of Dark Lane. Other Members concurred, adding that the annexe had been built in good faith to be used as an annexe, but it never seemed to have been used for what it was intended.

One Member said that in his opinion, the annexe should never have been approved in the first place, but he did not agree with the recommendation for refusal. Another agreed, saying that it would be a perfectly good house for a couple; it should be brought back into use and there should be more of them.

The point was made that the annexe should be closer to the host dwelling and that granting approval would set a precedent. The Chairman commented that this was a good example of why call-ins to Committee were important.

It was duly proposed by Councillor Edwards and seconded by Councillor Austen that the Officer's recommendation for refusal be supported,

with the addition of a further reason: *It would set a precedent for the rest of the street.*

When put to the vote, an equality of votes was declared, there being 5 votes for and 5 votes against the motion.

The Chairman used his casting vote to support the Officer's recommendation, whereupon,

It was resolved:

That planning application reference 19/01395/FUL be REFUSED for the reasons given in the Officer's report, and the following additional reason:

- It would set a precedent for the rest of the street.

71. PLANNING PERFORMANCE REPORT – OCTOBER 2019

The Planning Team leader presented a report (reference U139, previously circulated) which summarised the planning performance figures for October 2019.

It was noted that the Department had received a total of 226 applications during October 2019, which was a 3% decrease on October 2018 (233) and an 11% increase from September 2019 (203).

An Enforcement Notice, effective from 7th November 2019, had been issued in respect of a shop front in Coronation Parade, Ely.

The appeal hearing for applications 17/02217/OUM and 18/01611/OUM (Site south of 85 – 97 Main Street, Witchford) had been arranged for 15th January 2020 and would be held in the Council Chamber at the Council Offices, starting at 10.00am.

It was resolved:

That the Planning Performance Report for September 2019 be noted.

The meeting closed at 5.30pm.