



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee
held in the Council Chamber, The Grange, Nutholt Lane,
Ely on Wednesday, 5th October 2016 at 2.00pm.

P R E S E N T

Councillor Joshua Schumann (Chairman)
Councillor Sue Austen
Councillor Derrick Beckett
Councillor Ian Bovingdon
Councillor David Chaplin
Councillor Lavinia Edwards
Councillor Neil Hitchin

OFFICERS

Julie Barrow – Senior Planning Officer
Barbara Greengrass – Senior Planning Officer
Ruth Gunton – Planning Officer
Ruth Lea – Senior Lawyer
Janis Murfet – Democratic Services Officer
Gareth Pritchard – Planning Officer
Rebecca Saunt – Planning Manager

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

8 members of the public attended the meeting.

47. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Cox, Tom Hunt, Mike Rouse and Lisa Stubbs.

No Substitute Members were present.

48. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item No 7 (16/00937/FUL – 15 Holmes Lane, Soham), his parents being the applicants.

He said he would leave the Chamber before consideration of the application.

49. MINUTES

It was resolved:

That the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 7th September 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

50. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman proposed and the Committee agreed that the order of agenda be changed to take planning application reference 16/00937/FUL as the first item. The two remaining applications would be taken in the order in which they were listed.

The Chairman reminded Members that once he had left the Chamber, and in the absence of the Vice Chairman, they would need to elect another Chairman for the duration of the item.

At this point, Councillor Schumann vacated the Chamber.

It was duly proposed by Councillor Austen, seconded by Councillor Bovingdon and, in the absence of any other nominations,

It was resolved:

That Councillor Beckett should assume the Chair during the consideration of planning application reference 16/00937/FUL.

Councillor Beckett assumed the Chair.

51. 15 HOLMES LANE, SOHAM, CB7 5JP

Ruth Gunton, Planning Officer, presented a report (R96, previously circulated) which sought planning permission for a single storey extension to the rear of a single storey residential dwelling.

It was noted that the application had been brought to Planning Committee, as it was the home of family members of Councillors Daniel and Joshua Schumann.

The site was located on a residential road within the development envelope of Soham. It contained a single storey dwelling with a small garden to the front, a larger garden to the rear containing some small trees, and a driveway to the side containing a car port. There was also a hedge along the north eastern boundary with No. 17 Holmes Lane.

The immediate neighbours to the sides and rear (Nos. 11 and 17 Holmes Lane, and 2a Northfield Road) were single storey dwellings.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting. These included a map of the application site, an aerial photograph, visuals of the proposed elevations and site plan, the existing elevations, photographs relating to residential and visual amenity, and parking provision.

The Planning Officer said the key issues for consideration in the determination of this application were:

- Residential amenity;
- Visual amenity;
- Parking provision; and
- Trees and hedges.

It was considered that by virtue of the height and that no windows to habitable rooms were being proposed in the north east elevation, the development would not cause significant overshadowing, overbearing or loss of privacy to the neighbour at No. 17.

There were already windows in very similar locations to those proposed on the south west elevation. By virtue of this and the distance to the dwellings at 11 Holmes Lane and 2 Northfield Road, there were no concerns regarding overshadowing or loss of privacy to these neighbours. Similarly, it was considered that the proposal would not have any impact on the neighbours to the rear at Nos. 2a, 5 and 6 Northfield Road. It was therefore considered that the proposal complied with Policy ENV2.

Members noted that the development would be partially visible from Holmes Lane. The proposed facing brickwork would differ from the render finish on the existing house, but a mix of these materials was common in the immediate streetscene. If granted permission, it was suggested that a condition be imposed requiring the brick type to be approved by the Local Planning Authority before construction commenced. The roof slates and windows and doors would match those on the existing dwelling. It was considered that the proposed materials would preserve the streetscene and comply with Policy ENV2.

It was presumed that the carport would likely be removed to facilitate access to the rear of the property. Parking provision would remain unchanged with two spaces on the driveway and this was in compliance with Policy COM8.

The Planning Officer said the Trees Officer had been consulted on the application and had raised no concerns as it was not proposed to remove or prune the small trees in the rear garden or the hedge along the north eastern boundary. It was considered that with the recommended informative regarding the British Standard, the proposal complied with Policy ENV1 in respect of landscape character.

Councillor Bovingdon thought the application to be straightforward and said he could see no reasons for it not to be approved. He duly proposed that the Officer's recommendation for approval be accepted and the motion was seconded by Councillor Edwards. When put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 16/00937/FUL be APPROVED subject to the recommended conditions as set out in the Officer's report.

At this point, Councillor Schumann returned to the Chamber and reassumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

52. 16/00665/OUT – 3 CHAPEL LANE, SOHAM, CB7 5UL

Barbara Greengrass, Senior Planning Officer, presented a report (R94, previously circulated) on behalf of the Case Officer, which sought outline planning permission, with some matters reserved, for the replacement of an existing dwelling and the erection of an additional dwelling. Matters of access, layout and scale were to be considered as part of the application, however matters relating to appearance and landscaping were reserved.

It was noted that Councillor James Palmer had called the application in to Planning Committee.

The site was located in the open countryside to the north east of Soham towards the west end of Chapel Lane. It comprised an existing two storey dwelling, two outbuildings of a rural appearance and some trees. The site was predominantly surrounded by open agricultural fields, with the Internal Drainage Board's Town Drain and Fodder Fen Drove running adjacent to the west of the site. A neighbouring dwelling was also located within close vicinity to the site to the north west.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting. These included a map of the application site, an aerial photograph, and a visual of the proposed layout. There were photographs showing the existing dwelling and its access and the outbuilding. There were also photographs relating to the character and appearance of the area, ecology, and highway safety, and residential amenity.

The Senior Planning Officer said the key issues for consideration in the determination of this application were:

- The principle of development;
- Flood risk;
- Impact upon character and appearance of the area;
- Ecology;
- Highway safety;
- Trees; and
- Residential amenity.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

With regard to the principle of development, the Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that as the Council was currently unable to demonstrate an adequate five year supply of land for housing, the policies within the Local Plan relating to the supply of housing should be considered out of date. In view of this, all applications for new housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), unless any adverse impact would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

However, the application site was located along a single track road in a very rural location, a significant distance from the defined settlement boundary of Soham. The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members that Paragraph 55 of the NPPF stated that isolated new homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there were special circumstances.

It was therefore considered to be an unsustainable location for the erection of a new dwelling, in keeping with the conclusions of an Inspector in a recent appeal decision regarding 14 The Cotes, Soham (APP/V0510/W/16/3143840); this formed a material planning consideration to be given significant weight in determining this application. Members noted that the appeal decision for 14 The Cotes, Soham cited the location as unsustainable due to the reliance on cars to gain access to services and facilities, being 1.8 miles from the centre of Soham.

The application site was 3 miles from the edge of Soham and 4 miles from the centre of the town. As such, the Local Planning Authority viewed it as unsustainable, as there were a number of sites within Soham which were in a more sustainable location and were either allocated for development or could be windfall sites.

The Committee noted that the application site was located within Flood Zone 3, defined within the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance as having a 'high probability' of flooding, and the development type proposed was classified as 'more vulnerable'. The Guidance made it clear that this type of development was not compatible with this Flood Zone and therefore should not be permitted unless the development was necessary.

Paragraph 101 of the NPPF stated that development should not be permitted if there were other reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development, located in areas with a lower probability of flooding.

It was considered that as there were a number of reasonably available sites for the erection of a single dwelling within Soham that were at a lower risk of flooding, the proposed additional dwelling was not necessary in this location and the application failed the Sequential Test for this reason.

The Environment Agency had sent comments to the meeting to say that it would only find the proposal acceptable if a planning condition was imposed to control the finished floor level. They also advised that the LPA must be satisfied that the proposal had passed the Sequential Test and with regard to the ability of occupiers to reach places of safety and for access by emergency services. In their Fenland model this site is surrounded by flood water during an overtopping/breach event.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

In terms of character and appearance, the site location was predominantly rural in nature, mainly comprising agricultural fields. It was considered that the erection of an additional dwelling would create an urbanising impact and be visually intrusive upon the surrounding landscape.

Policy ENV7 of the Local Plan required an Ecological Report to be submitted where it was suspected that there could be an impact on protected species that needed to be adequately protected. However, a Phase 1 report was not submitted with the application nor requested by the Local Planning Authority, as the application was recommended for refusal. Insufficient information had been provided to enable assessment of any potential harm to protected species and the proposal therefore failed to meet the requirements of Policy ENV7 or Natural England's standing advice.

The Local Highways Authority had raised no objections to the proposal and considered that a passing bay on Chapel Lane would be acceptable. A Grampian Condition could be attached to any grant of planning permission to ensure that the bay was constructed prior to first occupation of the dwellings.

It was considered that the proposal accorded with Policy ENV2 of the Local Plan in respect of residential amenity, as there would be sufficient amenity space for each dwelling and there would be no loss of amenity to the adjoining resident.

Although the proposal would bring an additional residential dwelling to the Authority's housing stock and a positive contribution to the local and wider economy in the short term through construction work, it was considered that the benefits would be outweighed by the siting of an additional dwelling in an unsustainable location and increasing reliance on the car to gain access to services and facilities. Further harm would be caused by the increased risks of an additional dwelling within Flood Zone 3, with the potential for risks to protected species and the detrimental urbanising impact upon the surrounding rural landscape. The proposal was therefore recommended for refusal.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Andrew Fleet, agent for the applicant, read out the following statement which had been prepared by his client's drainage consultant:

'The National Planning Policy Framework requires a Sequential Test to be carried out for all development located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The sequential test should be based on either the Local Authority Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Maps, or when a Level 1 SFRA is not available, the Environment Agency Flood Zone Maps should be used.

The East Cambridgeshire SFRA was finalised in February 2011 but the areas benefitting from flood defences (as defined by the Environment Agency) were not used in its production. The information at the time did not include the benefit afforded by all the defences and subject to funding, further catchment modelling of the River Great Ouse was to be undertaken to update the information layer, as detailed on page 35 of the document.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

As a result of the additional modelling carried out since 2011, the site specific Flood Risk Assessment accompanying the planning application includes all the latest updated mapping available from the Environment Agency. Therefore the Sequential Test should be based on the latest updated Environment Agency Flood Zone Maps and not the original maps of 2011 which unfortunately did not take account of existing defences.

The application site is in a defended Flood Zone benefitting from Environment Agency defences of the River Ely Ouse, the River Lark and the Middle Fen & Mere IDB main drain system. Further hydraulic modelling by the Environment Agency as part of its Eastern Rivers Model indicates that the majority of the site along with most of the land immediately adjacent to the IDB Town drain would lie just within the 1 in 200 year flood plain, which is equivalent to a defended Flood Zone 2. The eastern part of the site and further land to the east would however lie outside the 1 in 200 year flood plain but within the 1 in 1,000 year flood plain, whilst Chapel Lane from the eastern part of the site's northern boundary lies outside the 1 in 1,000 year flood plain.

It may be concluded that the latest updated hydraulic modelling identifies the site as being located on the boundary of defended Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 1. The site specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted also identifies all other risks of flooding and concludes that the residual risk to the site over the lifetime of the development is low. Conclusions from the foregoing are:

- The latest EA modelling identifies the site on the boundary of defended Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 1 and the Sequential Test may be considered to be met;*
- Flood mitigation measures are included in the development proposals as betterment against the existing and also enable the Exception Test to be met;*
- Soham Town Council are in support of the planning application;*
- This development proposal will make a small contribution to the District Council's current lack of a 5 year land supply;*
- There are no flood risk related grounds of the National Planning Policy and its Planning Practice Guidance for the development proposals not to be approved.*

Turning to the site location, locally Great Fen Road and Hasse Road have always been known as Soham Fen, which has always been considered as a hamlet of Soham, similar to Barway, where there has been recent development.

Over many years a large percentage of the smaller housing stock in the vicinity has been demolished and replaced with larger properties, reducing the possibility for younger persons brought up in the vicinity to remain, or allowing others to purchase a smaller dwelling in an area not heavily populated. This application proposes two modest three bedroom properties and in a small way gives a chance to redress the balance.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

The NPPF confirms that there are three dimensions to sustainable development one of which is a social role and it supports the creation of strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations. The school bus, as it has done since my school days, collects and returns children from central Soham to this hamlet.

During the current problems with the 5 year land supply this Authority has granted consents in similar hamlet locations, generally to the north of Ely in places such as the Little Downham Drove, outer fringes of Pymoor, Wardy Hill etc, which in terms of location to services are no different to Soham Fen.

It is worth noting an Inspector's comments in an Allowed Appeal earlier this year in neighbouring West Suffolk:

'It is worthwhile noting that specifically reducing travel by car is no longer one of the expressed main concerns of Government policy as it was in 2007. Those living in rural areas will not have the same travel choices as those in a town. In practice the occupants would be likely to rely on the private car rather than more sustainable modes. Even for a rural location the accessibility credentials of the site would not be high to the extent that this would be a negative aspect of the proposal.'

We trust the foregoing further explains aspects of our proposal and allows the Committee to determine in a positive way. Thank you.'

Councillor Bovingdon asked Mr Fleet if he was stating that the site location was currently in Flood Zones 1 or 2. Mr Fleet replied that the drainage consultant considered it to be on the edge of the defended Zone 2 and 1.

Councillor Chaplin joined the meeting at 2.22pm.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor James Palmer addressed the Committee in his capacity as a Ward Member for Soham North, and made the following points:

- This was part of an area known as Soham Fen, and there had always been people residing there, outside of the town;
- It was not open countryside, because it used to have a school and a chapel as well as dwellings;
- It had been a sustainable place for hundreds of years and was now more sustainable than it had ever been;
- Similar roads etc could be found across East Cambridgeshire;
- To suggest that development could not take place here was wrong;
- The Appeal on The Cotes was dismissed on the grounds of sustainability, and he disagreed with that decision.

Councillor Palmer concluded by asking Members to consider the District and their knowledge of its semi-rural locations; he urged them not to reject the application on the grounds of sustainability.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

Councillor Bovingdon said he was inclined to agree with Councillor Palmer, and he asked the Senior Planning Officer if sustainability would still be an issue if the application had been for a single dwelling. She replied that this would have been acceptable as Policy HOU8 of the Local Plan allowed for replacement of dwellings in the countryside.

The Chairman asked for clarification regarding Natural England's position in relation to insufficient ecological information having been provided. The Planning Manager said that Natural England's Standing Advice stated that surveys must be submitted upfront accompanying an application and if they require any further surveys these must also be carried out prior to the determination of an application. This is also in accordance with Local Plan policy.

At Councillor Beckett's request, and with the agreement of the Chairman, the meeting was adjourned between 2.30pm and 2.35pm to allow Members time to read a copy of a letter from the Environment Agency, which had been tabled.

Councillor Bovingdon remarked that it showed how difficult Flood Risk Assessments were and he believed there were some contradictions in the Environment Agency's report. However, he was struggling because significant weight had been given to the Appeal decision on The Cotes, and planning permission could not be granted because no Ecology Report had been submitted. The Planning Manager said that to grant consent would be going against the Authority's policy and Natural England's Standing Advice, and the Chairman concurred, adding that there was an important precedent to be maintained.

Councillor Palmer interjected to say that the applicant would be prepared to submit an Ecology Report.

The Chairman said that if Members were so minded, they could defer determination of the application, but the applicant would have to agree; even so, the application could not be determined today.

Councillor Beckett commented that he had known the Great Fen Road area all his life, and he would have no problem with a replacement dwelling. However, two houses would not fit in with the fenland aspect of the area; the site location was off Great Fen Road and this proposal was going too far. An extra dwelling was one too much, and he preferred the Officer's recommendation for refusal.

The Chairman reiterated that there were a number of reasons for refusal, and deferral was an option. He also informed Councillor Chaplin that the Senior Lawyer had advised that as he had not been present for the whole of this application, he should not vote on it.

The Senior Lawyer advised that if Members were minded to defer the application, their reasons for doing so should be very clear. Following their discussions and Councillor Beckett's comments, she did not think that deferral should be on the basis of one issue, namely the Ecological Report, but that they needed to be clear about whether they were deferring for a full consideration of the application.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

At this point, Councillor Bovingdon proposed that consideration of the application be deferred. Councillor Beckett responded by saying that he supported the reasons for refusal as put forward by the Case Officer and would propose refusal if he could get someone to second the motion.

Councillor Hitchin recalled that a similar application had been granted approval some months ago, and also that flood zones were due to be reviewed in the near future. He believed the economy across the rural countryside would slow down if people did not use their cars, and he did not feel that reliance on a car was grounds for refusal.

The Chairman confirmed with Councillor Bovingdon that the matter was proposed to be deferred for full consideration and that no conclusions had been drawn on the application. The deferral would allow time for the Ecological Report to come forward and allow Members to have a full discussion on all aspects of the application when it comes back for consideration

Councillor Bovingdon again proposed that the application be deferred for full consideration, this time adding that an Ecological Report should be allowed to come forward. The motion was seconded by Councillor Hitchin, and when put to the vote, was declared carried, there being 4 votes for and 2 votes against. Whereupon,

It was resolved:

That determination of planning application reference 16/00665/OUT be DEFERRED to allow for the submission of an Ecology Report to come forward and for full consideration.

53. 16/00825/FUL – LAND NORTH EAST OF 70 ST JOHN'S AVENUE, NEWMARKET

Gareth Pritchard, Planning Officer, presented a report (R95, previously circulated) which sought permission for a single storey detached dwelling on a vacant piece of land within an existing residential area.

It was noted that the application had been called in to Planning Committee by Councillor Peter Cresswell; his reasons were listed in paragraph 5.1 of the Officer's report.

Mr Pritchard asked the Committee to note a number of housekeeping issues related to the application:

- Further comments were circulated to Members prior to Committee;
- Section 1.1 of the report detailed 14 recommended conditions. However, Appendix 1 only detailed 13 conditions. This was because number 11 – Parking under 1.1 was included within another condition and should have been removed from this list;

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

- Three separate decision notices relating to the original applications for St John's Avenue were tabled at this meeting following a request from a Member.

A number of illustrations were displayed at the meeting, including a map, an aerial photograph showing the sub-station, a visual giving the context of the proposal, the layout, an aerial photograph giving an overlay of how the scheme would sit within St John's Road, the elevations, and photographs of the street scene from various directions.

The Planning Officer said the main considerations in the determination of this application were:

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

The site was located within the established development framework for Newmarket. The majority of the site was surrounded by a 1.8 metre close boarded fence which was stepped away from the footpath to the north and from the back edge of the footpath for St John's Avenue to the east. There was a mature Maple tree in the north west of the site, and an electricity substation to the west.

It was noted that the site had been the subject of three previous applications, all of which were refused. The reasons given were the impact on residential amenity and scale and massing in close proximity to the pavement creating a cramped form of development out of keeping with the built form of the area. The third refusal went to Appeal in 2005, but was dismissed; a copy of the Decision Notice was attached to the report at Appendix 2.

Members were reminded that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) was currently unable to demonstrate an adequate five year supply of land for housing and therefore the policies within the Local Plan relating to the supply of housing should be considered out of date. In view of this, all applications for new housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), unless any adverse impact would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The benefits of the application were considered to be the provision of an additional dwelling to the District's housing stock, and a positive contribution to the local and wider economy through construction work. Being located within the established development framework for Newmarket, the site was considered to be in a sustainable location, close to goods and services.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

In terms of visual amenity, Members noted that St John's Avenue was characterised by open frontages facing the highway and the two storey detached dwellings were stepped back within the site. The proposed single storey dwelling would be contrary to the general pattern of development in the surrounding area, but it would not harm the character and appearance and would result in a less dominating form of development than that previously proposed and refused on the site.

With regard to residential amenity, the Planning Officer said that due to the siting of the proposed dwelling in relation to neighbouring dwellings, the proposal was not considered to cause a detrimental impact through loss of light or by being overbearing. It was also considered that there would be no loss of privacy due to the single storey nature of the proposal and the separation distances from the neighbouring properties.

Consideration had been given to the impact of the substation in close proximity to the residential unit and Environmental Health had raised no concerns. There was often electro field at the perimeter wall or fence of a substation, but it was considered that it would be no greater than that generally present in a typical home. The substation did make a low humming noise, however, this was not considered to be significantly detrimental.

Speaking of highway safety and parking provision, the Planning Officer said that St John's Avenue was an adopted road and the addition of a single dwelling would not compromise the safety and usability of the road. The occupier would be able to enter and leave the site in forward gear and the site could also accommodate appropriate visibility splays for safe access to the highway network. There was sufficient turning and manoeuvring space within the plot and the Local Highways Authority had raised no objections. The proposal was considered to comply with Policies COM7 and COM8 of the Local Plan.

The Committee was reminded that the proposal included the removal of some trees to the front of the site and the enclosure of a Maple tree to the north west within the driveway. The Trees Officer had raised no objections as the Maple tree was to be retained and adequate protection secured by condition.

It was understood that a number of legal covenants were in place across the development, controlling the use of land and structures to the front of dwellings. However, the Planning Officer reiterated that they were a civil law matter and did not form a material planning consideration.

Concerns had also been raised in relation to access to the substation and the cables under the site. Members were reminded that UK Power Network maintained a legal access to the site and had raised no objections to the application. The access to the substation was not a material planning consideration and if any cables had to be moved, the costs would be borne by the applicant.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Paul Drayton, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

- The applicant used to live at 70 St John's Avenue. He sold the property in 2003 but retained the application plot and now wished to build a bungalow for his own occupation;
- The application site was the subject of three previous applications for 3 and 4 bed dwellings;
- The last application had been dismissed at Appeal in 2005, one of the reasons being that the scale of the proposed dwellings was considered to be disproportionate;
- The proposed bungalow was appropriate for the size of the plot and the Officer supported the application;
- The applicant had looked at the Inspector's decision and designed the proposal accordingly;
- With regard to the perceived concerns, the applicant owned the entire site, but UK Power Network had the right of access;
- The access width had been increased to a minimum of 3.9 metres;
- The applicant had consulted UK Power Network prior to submitting his application and they had no objections;
- The existing fence line had been relocated to the north of the site by Eastern Electricity in 2005;
- The proposal would not encroach and there would be no parking on the access route;
- Electric cables would be removed before works commenced, but this would be a cost to the applicant;
- Appendix 2 of the Officer's report and the tabled documents showed that there were no restricted covenants.

At this point, the Chairman informed Members that Councillor Peter Cresswell, a Ward Member for Cheveley, had wished to address the Committee but was now unable to attend the meeting. He had asked that his comments be read out in his absence, but the Chairman felt that as they were included at paragraph 5.1 of the Officer's report, this was not necessary, because Members would have already noted them.

The Case Officer advised Members that since the report had been written the Parish Council had now objected to the proposal in relation to the design.

Councillor Beckett said he struggled to see any reason to refuse the application, because having visited the site he believed a single storey dwelling would fit in. His main concern was that, if granted approval, consideration should be given to the materials, so that the bungalow enhanced rather than detracted from the area.

AGENDA ITEM NO 3

The Chairman concurred with Councillor Beckett, suggesting that the applicant could be required to replicate the materials used on existing dwellings. He believed the application ticked all the boxes and reminded Members that the covenants were not a material planning consideration.

It was duly proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Councillor Bovingdon that the Officer's recommendation for approval be supported. When put to the vote,

It was resolved unanimously:

That planning application reference 16/00825/FUL be APPROVED subject to the recommended conditions as set out in the Officer's report.

54. PLANNING PERFORMANCE REPORT – AUGUST 2016

Rebecca Saunt, Planning Manager, presented a report (R97, previously circulated) which summarised the planning performance figures for August 2016.

Members noted that the majority of targets were being hit, apart from 'Other' applications, but these were still within the Government's targets.

Three Appeals had been received; one had since been withdrawn and decisions were awaited for the other two.

The agency worker would remain until the end of November 2016, but a new full time Planning Officer was to be recruited and the post would be advertised very shortly.

A 6 month review of the Service Plan showed improvements on last year's figures. Validations were now up to 72% within 5 working days and Enforcement was contacting 99% of complainants within 10 days.

The Chairman congratulated the Planning Manager and her team on their continued success and he asked that the Committee's thanks be passed on to all the Officers involved.

It was resolved:

That the Planning Performance Report for August 2016 be noted.

The meeting closed at 3.13pm.