

AWJ

PLANNING

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 25th November 2015 at 7.30pm at Grosvenor House, Grosvenor Road, Whittlesey

Present: Cllr Mrs Jolley, Mrs Laws, Mrs Mayor, Whitwell, Mrs Windle.

Officer in Attendance: Mrs Sue Evans – Town Clerk

Recording: DS250039.DS2

P95/15. To receive apologies from absent Members.

Cllr Bristow who has made the decision to step down from this committee.

P96/15. To confirm and sign the Minutes from the last meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday 28th October 2015.

Ratified: The Minutes were approved.

P97/15. Declaration of Members Interests

Councillors Mrs Laws as members of FDC Planning Committee advised that should Planning applications be discussed she may comment, but reserve the right to change their minds should more information become available at a later date. Cllr Mrs Laws advised that as there were speakers at the meeting she may open her option to ask questions.

F/YR15/0199/F – Cllr Butcher declared a personal interest, he reserved his right to speak but would not vote.

F/YR/1007/LB – Cllr Mrs Windle declared a personal interest and will not leave the room, but will not speak or vote on this application.

P98/15. Public Forum.

To allow any member of the public to address the council. Time allowed 15 minutes total.

3 Members of the public were present

Mr Woolaston presented as follows on Snowley Park and Glenfields, the report is below.

Dear Whittlesey Town councillors,

We are writing to you on behalf of the Flood Warden Group in Whittlesey.

Our groups concern in our letters dated 19/8/15 and 21/10/15 that we sent in to FDC planning department have not been alleviated by these new revised proposals, as such we object to this application.

There are THREE new documents that we wish to highlight that elude to clarify/confuse the extent of the 5.0 m AOD level onto the site, these are Contour plan drawing dated 17/11/15 (Appendix 1), Topographical survey drawing (Appendix 2) and the Engineering layout (Appendix 3), dated 18/11/15 on FDC associated documents for this reserve matters application.

The contour plan drawing appears to cherry pick certain 5.10m AOD levels to produce a dot to dot yellow line that gives the impression that the site is all within flood zone 1 (Appendix 1). Yet the topographical survey drawing dated 18/11/15 on FDC website associated documents for this reserve matters application paints a conflicting picture and is attached as Appendix 2 see below.

This shows an AOD measurement of 4.51m in the drainage ditch that connects to whittlesey flood reservoir, slightly north of the defining 5.0m line (flood zone 3b) and 4.98m that borders this drainage ditch, the 5.0m contour line for some reason stops at this point and does not give a full picture.

The Engineering layout (Appendix 3) actually shows the connection of the 5.0M AOD line that goes straight through the drainage ditch and therefore MUST connect to Whittlesey Flood reservoir.

It is our view that these latest conflicting documents and drawings are far from conclusive evidence that the site is not connected to whittlesey flood reservoir and as such this area of the site may be within flood zone 3(b).

We have previously stated we are concerned that the developer wants to build dwellings in flood zone 3(b). We are additionally concerned that by developing land that is attached to the Whittlesey flood reservoir, without like for like compensation for the loss of that flood storage area, will only exasperate the existing problem of dwellings that are already at risk of flooding, that are below the 5.0m AOD level on the north side of Whittlesey.

This goes against condition 8 of the planning decision notice dated 7th may 2014. Also This goes against the governments PPG and NPPG on flood risk and local plan policy 11 and 14.

I have emailed Rhiannon Swindale , Ben Thornley and Chris Swain asking for clarification that all previous and new information will be incorporated in the EA's response to Shanna Jackson .

End.

P99/15. Presentation from Lou Mason-Walsh Principal Transport Officer, Major Developments, Cambridgeshire County Council.

Lou Mason Walsh (referred to as LMW)- advised she was here to briefly explain what a transport assessment is and what she can / can't do, LMW advised members that a transport assessment is a statutory document.

Lou advised members what a transport assessment is:-

What is a Transport Assessment?

A Transport Assessment (TA) is statutory document which accompanies a planning application, and is used by planning authorities and highways authorities (and if necessary the Highways Agency) to determine whether the impact of a new development on the transport network is acceptable. It allows the local planning authority to decide whether to grant planning permission on the basis of transport issues. The Transport Assessment should identify what measures may be required to deal with the predicted transport impacts and to improve accessibility and safety, especially for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.

The main guidance is contained in Guidance on Transport Assessment published by the Department for Transport March 2007,.

When Is An Assessment Required?

The need for, scope and type of assessment required for new developments is determined primarily through discussion between the developer and the local highway authorities. However, if an assessment is required, there are two levels:

- Transport Statement - for developments which have a relatively small transport implication; and
- Transport Assessment - for developments which have significant transport implications.

Both documents should include:

Existing Transport Conditions:

- Walking and cycling routes and facilities

- Existing public transport services and infrastructure
- Operation of local road network
- Traffic surveys
- Accident history on local road network

Development Details:

- Type and size
- Parking (total, disabled, cycle/motorcycle)
- Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access
- Servicing arrangements and emergency vehicle access

Trip Generation and Distribution:

- Calculation of the likely number of trips to and from the development by each transport mode, throughout the day
- Determination of which routes will be used to access the site

Additionally, a Transport Assessment should include:

Public Transport, Walking and Cycling Assessments:

- Assessment of whether the current public transport services and walking and cycling infrastructure have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional trips created by the development
- If these are not sufficient, new facilities/services should be provided as part of the development proposals

Proposals (in the form of a Travel Plan) to reduce the number of trips to the development:

- Measures to reduce the need to travel (e.g. home working or internet shopping)
- Measures to encourage the use of more sustainable travel options rather than single occupier car journeys (e.g. walking, cycling, public transport, car sharing)

These types of measures are more important than highway improvements, in mitigating the impact of the development.

Traffic Impact Assessments:

- Assessment of whether the road network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the residual vehicular trips created by the development (following consideration of all feasible measures to reduce the number of trips to the development)

The above requirements are not exhaustive and there may be a need for additional information and assessments, depending on local circumstances. The key issue is that the scope of any Transport Statement or Transport Assessment should be agreed at the pre-application stage between the appropriate authorities and the developer.

What is the TA used for?

The Assessment will be used in the determination of the planning application and should inform the local highway authority's decision by answering the following;

- Is the proposed development contrary to any national, Regional or local policies?

- Does the development take account of any other schemes within the area around the proposed development?
- Are the transport impacts of the proposed development acceptable?
- Is the parking provision for all modes (cars, cycles, service vehicles etc.) acceptable?
- Are the sustainable transport modes promoted acceptable?
- Are improvements to the transport infrastructure and services required to mitigate the effects of the development included? If so are they adequate?
- Is the layout proposed operationally acceptable and safe?
- What levels of financial contributions will be required?

When is a transport assessment required?

The DfT guidance on Transport assessments states that a TA is required when a proposed development is of a scale that will have a significant impact on existing users of the transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the site.

The decision about whether an assessment is required and if it is what level of assessment is needed is based on a number of factors including;

- The existing transport conditions in the vicinity – parking traffic flows, congestion/ capacity, safety and accessibility by all modes of travel;
- The scale and nature of the proposed development;
- The number of trips likely to be generated by the proposed development by all modes of travel;
- Operational aspects of the development (hours of operation, uses etc.);
- Other development proposals in the area around the proposed development;
- Access, servicing, parking arrangements and provision for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users;
- Sensitivity of the adjoining land users/occupiers;
- Transport Strategies and programmes in the vicinity;
- Environmental considerations, severance, air quality management etc.

The elements that should be included in a TA

1. Development Proposals

- Site location;
- Land use;
- Size; and
- Proposed parking provision (all modes)

2. Existing Situation

- Current land use;
- Surrounding highway conditions;
- Pedestrian and cycle access;
- Public transport access;
- Observed traffic flows; and
- Other development in the area.

3. Relevant Planning Policy

- National;
- Regional; and
- Local.

4. Sustainable Transport Assessment

- Pedestrian accessibility;
- Cycle Accessibility;
- Public transport accessibility;
- Servicing arrangements; and
- Travel plan.

5. Traffic Impact Assessment

- Study network;
- Assessment years;
 - Base
 - Opening
 - Future
- Growth factors;
- Trip generation (all modes);
- Committed and development trip generation;
- Traffic distribution;
- Data Presentation;
- Junction Assessments; and
- Safety.

6. Internal Site Layout

7. Travel Plan

As part of the assessment process it is recommended that pre application advice is sought to confirm the scope of any assessment. These discussions are undertaken to ensure that key elements of the assessment are agreed prior to the commencement of work to speed up the process. These discussions should include the following.

The Scope of a TA

The key elements that should be agreed in the course of any pre application or scoping studies include the following;

- What is the nature of the proposed development?
- What type of assessment is required?
- Where is the development site located?
- What study area needs to be included in the assessment?
- What traffic data is to be used in the assessment?
- How are the trips generated by the proposed development to be assessed?
- What future year assessments are required?
- What methodology is required for calculating the growth rates to be used for development of the future year traffic flows?
- What methodology is to be used for the assignment of trips generated by the proposed development?
- What are and time period is required for the accident assessment.

Once a transport Assessment is received then as Local Highway Authority we have to check that the information contained is acceptable and that any mitigation will be adequate.

The key area that we look at are;

- Development mix,
- Trip Rates,

- Distribution of trips,
- Future growth assumptions,
- Junction assessment and resulting mitigation if required.

As part of the appraisal process we may make initial comments requesting additional information once we receive any additional information it is only at this point that we form a view on the application based on the evidence provided by the applicant. We do not make assumptions or go looking for information ourselves we rely totally on the information supplied by the applicant. If sufficient information is not provided or the results of the assessment prove that the development will have an unacceptable impact on the local road network then we retain a holding objection.

It is important to note that under Paragraph 32 of the NPPF and application can only be refused on highway grounds if it results in severe cumulative residual impact.

Ask Lou for the bit about when, how etc, trip rates, junctions, future year growth.
Professional judgement.

Cllr Butcher – Are these survey's carried out as desk top or physical, LMW advised they have to use observed traffic data that must be less than 3 years. Cllr Butcher how much is actually done by CCC and how much done by Desk top studies by other people, any application that is submitted, the applicant must obtain their own traffic data, the studies must be during term time. The data that is obtained by central government and is used by various organisation and is open to scrutiny

Cllr Laws cannot see consistency with the highways reports Stonald Road being one of the areas of concern. LMW advised that these were dealt with by different officers, so there may have been inconsistencies, LMW is now the only officer for Fenland and will be our officer. To put down the 'ATC' (Automatic Traffic Count) there is a fourteen day application period and it must be licenced. Cllr Mrs Laws asked if advice is given on where these ATC's are located LMW advised that she understood that these locations were agreed by the Network Manager. Cllr Mrs Laws asked that if she was aware of an ATC being completed but the location not being where it should be, who should she report it to, LMW advised he should be reported to her.

Cllr Mrs Laws and Cllr Butcher thanked Lou for attending the meeting.

P100/15. Representative from David Wilson Homes to discuss planning application F/YR0636/RM

Reserved matters application relating to the detailed matters of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping pursuant to outline permission F/YR14/0365/O (residential development (150 dwellings max) with associated infrastructure) comprising of 144 x 2 storey dwellings, 7 x 1 bed, 23 x 2 bed, 38 x 3 bed and 71 x 4 bed and 5 x 5 bed with garages and associated infrastructure) at Land North of Snowley Park and Glenfields, Whittlesey – **The revision is: amended documents received in relation to flood risk and drainage, highways, ecology and layout.**

Mr Ken Armstrong – Design Manager and Mr were in attendance from David Wilson Homes.

Members were advised that the flooding issues had been discussed in a meeting with Paul Sharman North Level IDB with concerns raised regarding the topographical work and agreement had been reached that more work had been undertaken

Works to the ecology system have been undertaken to clear the brambles and other bushes, this was done in accordance with their method statement and inspected by their ecologist, they will maintain the grasslands. The DW representatives were advised by Cllr Mrs Mayor that the area had been flattened before the ecologist went to site. DW representatives advised that as land owners they can undertake the maintenance. Cllr Whitwell advised that it was stated on the plan that the buffer zone would be retained, however all the Silver Birches were removed. Cllr Mrs Laws advise them that the ecological officer was definitely not present as she had had to call in the FDC Enforcement Officer. DW Homes will investigate this further.

The DW representatives had been advised that the IDB had concerns that they were encroaching on the drain, however this area is now 7M and North Level IDB are happy with this. Cllr Mrs Mayor has asked who will be looking after the lagoons on site, and what contract will be in place to ensure these are maintained at all times. DW Homes advised that they have a management company in place, Cllr Mrs Mayor asked for assurances are in place that would deal with any issues should this management company cease to exist DW Homes advised that they are paying funds to North Level IDB towards the upkeep of these lagoons, these will be a maximum of 1.5 metres deep with banks leading into the lagoons, Cllr Mrs Laws advised the

general consensus would be for stepped lagoons and not banks, the DW representatives will take this into consideration.

DW Homes have been in contact with CCC highways and all the concerns raised have now been addressed.

DW homes have split the affordable housing into ones and twos, the 16 single ones are right on the edge of the site and members felt that were not integrated very well and needed further work, DW representatives will look into this.

DW Homes will contribute and improve the existing play area, Cambs Police felt that this was not necessarily a good idea and they felt the play area would be better located near the road junction.

DW Homes confirmed they had undertaken pre application discussions with FDC who were happy with the revisions including the play area.

Cllr Whitwell advised there are no travel plan documents on FDC website, DW Homes advised the travel plan is still being looked at by CCC but would be back on the website very shortly. Cllr Whitwell expressed concern at the Junction of Crossway Hand and Stonald Road as this is used as a bit of a rat run.

Cllr Mrs Mayor advised that they were going to issue bus tickets to people, however what would happen now as one of the bus companies is no longer in use. DM Homes would have to withdraw these if there were no busses, DM homes may investigate what else they could offer.

P100A/15 – Proposed Pre Application Charging Scheme Consultation from Fenland District Council.

Cllr Butcher declared an interest as he has been involved in discussions as he is an FDC Cabinet Member. Cllr Mrs Mayor thinks there should be a charge, but it must be on a case by case basis, ie the size of the development would determine the cost. This would also hopefully improve the service that is delivered and developers would expect an answer at the end of these discussions. Cllr Whitwell proposed we support this scheme, seconded by Cllr Mrs Windle with a unanimous vote in favour Cllr Butcher and Laws abstained.

P101/15. To consider planning applications received from Fenland District Council for comment, including:-

Question for every planning application - Does it meet the criteria of Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service, Building Safe and Designing out Fire.

F/YR0636/RM – Reserved matters application relating to the detailed matters of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping pursuant to outline permission F/YR14/0365/O (residential development (150 dwellings max) with associated infrastructure) comprising of 144 x 2 storey dwellings, 7 x 1 bed, 23 x 2 bed, 38 x 3 bed and 71 x 4 bed and 5 x 5 bed with garages and associated infrastructure) at Land North of Snowley Park and Glenfields, Whittlesey – The revision is: amended documents received in relation to flood risk and drainage, highways, ecology and layout.

The Town Council unanimously recommends refusal on the following grounds:

Play Area:

The existing play area has suffered from vandalism and anti-social behavior. It is overlooked by only 1 streetlight. Extending this area would only make this situation worse, as stated by both Cambridgeshire Police and Fenland Parks Manager who have both raised objections to the play area in the position as indicated on the plan. The Police in particular has suggested that the new Play Area should be situated in the centre of the development where it can be seen from more properties.

Social Housing:

This should be distributed more throughout the site and not isolated into one corner, potentially creating a two-tier society. The Local Plan states and developers are advised that social housing should be pepper-corned, integrated, and building materials and designs should be of the same quality. The FDC Senior Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer has expressed concerns about the plans for affordable housing.

Drainage:

The proposed layout shows two water storage lagoons. These will form a valuable water protection for the proposed new dwellings. Strong consideration is needed concerning the size, type of structure, and ongoing maintenance of the lagoons. WTC believe that the lagoons should be of a stepped design, both on safety grounds and access for ongoing maintenance. We believe that the North Level IDB is the accepted

professional and recognised Authority that has substantial local knowledge of the Whittlesey Washes. North level IDB should approve and adopt the complete drainage structure. We have major concerns about the use of an outside Management Company. Whittlesey Town Council has experience on a different local development, where a Management Company was used. They subsequently went into liquidation, and there has been nothing but problems since, with no Authority looking to take on the responsibility. We need guarantees to ensure that something similar does not happen here.

Flood Risk:

FDC Head of Planning was quoted as saying that the EA hold the definitive map defining the flood risk zone. Yet the EA accepted a submission by Consultants BWB employed by the Developers, and has now removed its objection. We are concerned that the map used keeps changing, and would like an independent land survey carried out. We have a responsibility to the local residents to ensure the development does not increase the risk of flooding. We are not convinced that the current plans achieve this.

Travel Plan:

The 8 Travel Plan documents originally submitted have been withdrawn. The impact of this site with others already approved in Stonald Road will have a huge impact to traffic in the area, and especially the junction of Crossway Hands with the A605. We request that the Developer submit a new Travel Plan.

Site Clearance:

Clearance needs to be carried out in line with Conditions. We feel that clearance already carried out breached some conditions, and has, as a result, destroyed valuable landscape that is invaluable for local wildlife.

Management Plans:

There needs to be a Construction Environment Management Plan and a Construction Traffic Management Plan, which limits the allowed hours, to help protect existing residents. Several of these objections have been raised with previous RM applications, but appear to have been completely ignored.

F/YR15/0960/0 – Erection of 3no dwellings (Outline with all matters reserved), – Land East of 51 Coates Road, Eastrea.

The Town Council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

F/YR15/0972/F – Erection of a single-storey extension to front and conversion of garage to living accommodation of existing dwelling – 2 Ford Close, Whittlesey.

The Town Council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

F/YR15/0990/F – Erection of 2 x 3 storey 4 bed dwellings – Land West of 206 Coates Road, Coates.

The Town council recommend refusal of this application on over intensification of site and not in keeping with the street scene.

F/YR15/0995/TRCA – Fell 1no Mountain Ash within a Conservation Area – 125 South Green Coates,

The Town Council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

F/YR15/0997/0 – Hybrid application: Full Planning permission for the remediation and levelling of the land and Outline planning permission for erection of 23no industrial and commercial units (B1,B2 and B8) (outline with matters committed in respect of access and layout) – Lattersey Field, Benwick Road, Whittlesey.

The Town Council want more information before making a decision and request the following information:

What are the working hours?

How is the contaminated earth going to be removed? and where is it going to go?

The Clerk to request an extension to Full Council

F/YR15/1007/LB – Internal and external works to Listed Building comprising of replacement of existing windows with timber framed double glazed sash windows and metal framed casements within existing stone surrounds; removal of internal partition wall and formation of internal doorway.

The Town Council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

F/YR15/1021/LB – Demolition of ancillary building (no 12) to 10 Claygate – 10 Claygate, Whittlesey.

The Town council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

[Handwritten signature]

F/YR15/1020/F – Erection of 3 x 2-storey 3 bed dwellings with integral garages and detached car port with store over for use by 10 Claygate involving demolition of 12 Claygate – Land South of 2 Searles Court, Whittlesey.

The Town council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

Information for the Planning Committee.

Letter from Peterborough City Council Ref: 14/01136/ful – Construction of 5 (five) wind turbines to a maximum height of 130 metres (to vertical blade tip) with ancillary infrastructure including substation, access tracks and crane hardstanding's, temporary construction compound and improvements to access on to A47 – Willow Hall Farm, Willow Hall Lane, Thorney – **The application has formally been withdrawn.**

P102/15. Agenda items for update and discussion

- Neighbourhood Plan – Cllr Mrs Laws advised the first meeting had taken place on the 17th November, this was just a brain storming session, the next meeting is scheduled for the 14th January 2015.
- Taylor Wimpey Update – Cllr Mrs Jolley advised members the Clerk had chased this and received an email as follows:-
- Sainsbury Update – Cllr Mason concerned that residents had received correspondence from Sainsburys directly, however WTC has not received anything.

P103/15. Date of next meeting – 27th January 2016.

To: Councillors Mrs Jolley, Bristow, Butcher, Mrs Laws, Mrs Mayor, Whitwell, Mrs Windle

Meeting closed 21.25.

[Handwritten signature: Rita Jolley]

.....
Cllr Mrs Rita Jolley
Chairman
Planning Committee