

# Public Document Pack



Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee  
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 6 July 2010

## **Members Present:**

Chairman – Councillor North

Councillors – Hiller, Serluca, Thacker, Todd, Ash, Winslade and Harrington

## **Officers Present:**

Nick Harding, Planning Delivery Manager  
Simon Machen, Head of Planning Services  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Ruth Lea, Lawyer (Growth Team)  
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lowndes (Vice Chair) and Councillor Benton.

Councillor Winslade attended as substitute.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **3. Members' Declaration of Intention to make representations as Ward Councillor**

There were no declarations from Members of the Committee to make representation as Ward Councillor on any item within the agenda.

### **4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 June 2010**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2010 were approved as a true and accurate record.

### **5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

The Committee agreed to vary the speaking scheme for item 5.3, 80 Lincoln Road. There were numerous objectors in attendance who had registered to speak and in order to ensure a fair hearing the scheme was varied to allow up to 20 minutes for objectors and 20 minutes for applicants and supporters.

#### **5.1 10/00406/LBC – Moving of existing entrance and rebuilding of stone boundary wall at Granville House, 2 The Green, Glington, Peterborough**

The application sought permission to relocate the existing vehicular access approximately 1.5m to the south. The existing access would be closed off. Damage had been caused to a length of the existing wall due to the positioning of two false Acacia trees which had been removed and the wall needed to be taken down and

rebuilt. The existing hard asphalt surface which formed the existing access would be taken up, kerbs raised and the grass verge extended across the disused entrance.

The application site contained a Grade II Listed Building with formal gardens to the south and north and paddock area to the west (designated within the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) as an allocated housing site (H10.04). The site was located close to the historic centre of Glington and within the Conservation Area boundary and was enclosed by a 1.2m high stone wall which was protected under policy DA9 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement). The surrounding area was predominantly residential in character and contained a number of listed properties, the church and church yard lay to the south-east and many of the properties were bounded by continuous stone walls, trees and hedges, all of which contributed to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application site with its boundary wall with trees behind provided a positive 'end stop' when viewed from North Fen Road, west along The Green.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the application was for listed building consent. The Committee was only able to consider the impact the proposal would have on the historic wall, consideration could not be given to other matters such as highway visibility. There had been previous applications for proposals at the site which had made reference to a garage, Members were reminded that the application before the Committee was in relation to the wall only. The applicant also had aspirations to build an additional property, subsequent to any consent that was granted, this matter was also not to be taken into consideration by the Committee.

Members were informed that the view of the Conservation Officer was that the wall formed an important feature within the Conservation Area and if the entrance point was moved to the left it would reduce the impact of the long section of wall. A punctuation of the highway verge would also occur.

Mr David Briggs, the applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The applicant did not wish to do anything to the house which would detract its aesthetics from the village. A new driveway would improve the aesthetics and the existing driveway would be lawned, giving a better outlook to the front of the house
- The two false acacia trees which had been removed had cracked the wall and therefore the wall needed repair
- Along the footpath, which was the only footpath to the Glington surgery, the roots of the false acacia trees had raised the tarmac therefore creating a hazard. Part of the project would be to take up the tarmac and to remove these roots
- The same materials would be used to re-build the wall
- The project would also enable the applicant to build a new driveway, as the current gravel driveway was no longer suitable for his needs. A bungalow was proposed at the back of the existing property and the new driveway would provide access to this
- The applicant did not wish to spoil the commercial value of his property
- There was a yew tree on one side of the driveway access which consistently had to be cut back every year to prevent the scratching of cars driving past. The visibility coming out of the driveway due to the tree was also poor and there was a real concern for people's safety as the footpath was the only footpath to and from the Glington surgery

In response to issues raised by the applicant and questions raised by Members, the Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that in terms of visibility when

leaving the property, given that the property was in a conservation area, you could not expect the standard of visibility to be comparable to that of modern standards. If a modern standard visibility splay was to be provided it would look out of place. With regards to the yew tree having to be cut back every year to give sufficient headroom for passing vehicles in and out of the driveway, this would raise no objection by the Planning Department as it was simply a matter of day to day maintenance. Members were advised that the condition of the wall had not been a concern for officers. The key concern had been the principle of moving the entrance point.

After debate and questions to the Planning Officer regarding Human Rights issues in relation to planning, the yew tree and the materials which would be utilised when rebuilding the wall, a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application. The motion was carried by 5 votes, with 3 against and 1 not voting.

**RESOLVED:** (5 for, 3 against, 1 not voting) to refuse the application, as per officer recommendation.

#### **Reasons for the decision:**

The justification provided by the applicant for the relocation of the access did not outweigh the harm which would be caused to the setting of the Listed Building and the character and appearance to the Conservation Area and the proposal was therefore contrary to policies CBE3, CBE6, CBE7, DA2 and DA9 (d), of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

The boundary walls of the property and others in the vicinity of The Green made a positive contribution to the special character of the centre of the Glington Conservation Area. The boundary wall to be part demolished, like others in the vicinity of the Green was recognised under policy DA9 (d) of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) and the Adopted Glington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as essential features of village character. The view from Flag Fen Road, west along The Green terminated at the present continuous wall with landscape behind and this was a positive 'end stop'. The proposed opening would diminish the quality of this view and the sense of place and enclosure in the street scene part formed by the continuous boundary wall. The alteration would also sub-divide a sizeable area of grass verge and introduce a hard surface in the street scene and harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to the adopted Glington Conservation Area Appraisal, guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 5, and policies CBE3 and DA9 (d) of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

The meeting was adjourned for five minutes.

#### **5.2 10/00480/FUL – Construction of two storey side and front extension, 5 Wyndham Park, Orton Wistow, Peterborough, PE2 6YD**

Permission was sought for the construction of a two storey front and side extension in order to create a 1 bedroom granny annexe containing a lounge, dining room, bedroom and bathroom. The extension would also allow for the enlargement of an existing bedroom and the creation of an en suite. The agent proposed to create an L shaped dwelling with side gable.

Wyndham Park was a fairly modern estate of detached dwellings in modest plots. The appearance of the estate was uniform in terms of size and design of dwelling but was punctuated by some substantial extensions in a similar vein to that proposed under the proposed application. Numbers 22, 26, 33, 35 and 42 being the most notable

examples. The application site was bordered by a landscaping strip to the south; the neighbouring dwellings sat to the north and east.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that there would be no issues with overlooking as the two windows which faced the adjacent property were at first floor level and were obscured glazed. Revised drawings showing the windows as obscured glazed had been submitted therefore the submission element of condition number 3, as detailed in the committee report, could be removed.

Members were advised that Councillor Stokes had referred the item to the Committee and not Councillor Allen as stated in the committee report.

There were no speakers on the item and after a brief debate a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C4 as detailed in the committee report
2. The update to condition numbered C3 as detailed in the update report

**Reasons for the decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposal was similar in extent to other extensions within Wyndham Park and would not result in unacceptable levels of overshadowing or overbearing to the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and would not result in a significant adverse impact on the street scene; in accordance with policy DA2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Councillor Lane left the meeting.

Councillor Thacker declared that she knew Mr Jeremy Roberts, a speaker on the next item, but this would in no way affect her decision.

**5.3 10/00502/FUL – Construction of 34 dwellings, together with access, car parking and landscaping and;  
10/00510/CON – Demolition of all buildings on site including offices and garages**

Full planning permission was sought under planning reference 10/00502/FUL for six two bed houses, one four bed house, fifteen one bedroom flats and twelve two bedroom flats together with access, car parking and landscaping. Conservation Area consent was sought under reference 10/00510/CON for the demolition of all the existing buildings on site, including the main Thurston/Gayhurst Victorian villa.

Twenty seven flats were to be provided in two three storey buildings. Twelve two bed flats would be sited within Block A and fifteen one bed flats within Block B. Block A would front onto Lincoln Road and its design would reflect the large terrace of houses opposite. Block B was the second of the two three storey blocks and would be set eighteen metres to the rear of Block A. Each flat would have one car parking space. Twenty one of these spaces would be sited to the rear of block A, the remaining six spaces were to be sited to the front of block B.

Five dwellings were to be accommodated in Blocks D (a row of three terrace properties) and E (a pair of semi detached properties) and would all be two storey in height. Two dwellings would be located in block C, a two bed house being two storey in height attached to a four bed dwelling being two and half storey in height. Nine parking spaces would be set aside for these seven dwellings.

All of the residential units would be affordable. A total of twenty secure cycle parking spaces were to be provided for the flats and each of the dwellings would have cycle storage. The site would be accessed from Lincoln Road.

The site was located within the city centre boundary and Park Conservation Area as defined by the Local Plan. The site was located on the west side of Lincoln Road. It was positioned to the south of St Mark's Church and the Beeches Primary School site, and to the north of the Craig Street surface level public car park and NHS building. To the west of the site were the rear gardens of the two storey residential houses on Craig Street.

The site covered an area of 5,070 sq metres. It was occupied by a large substantial Victorian brick built villa, which was in commercial use at the time, located in the centre of the plot, along with various minor outbuildings at the western end of the site. The main building had many surviving original features and was a good example of the Victorian buildings that were characteristic of that part of Lincoln Road. The site was also characterised by its mature tree lined southern and eastern boundaries and the spacious nature of the plot.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the application was a resubmission, following refusal at a previous Planning Committee meeting of a scheme which had included forty dwellings and a recognition centre.

Members were advised that the key issues for determination of the application were whether the loss of the existing building on the site, which was within the conservation area, was justified, whether the appearance of the new development within the conservation area was acceptable and whether the proposal was acceptable in terms of access, parking and its relationship with adjacent developments etc.

The application highlighted a significant improvement on the previous scheme which had been refused. Block A was set back from the road enabling the preservation of existing vegetation and uninterrupted views of the church from Lincoln Road. There would be one parking space allocated to each property, this was considered acceptable to the local authority given the proximity of the development to the city centre, the major bus routes and the provision of cycle parking facilities. The appearance of the block which would front Lincoln Road, would be of a more traditional appearance and key aspects such as materials and key features of other buildings in the locality of the conservation area had been picked up and incorporated.

Members were further advised that as the existing building lay within the Park Conservation Area, conservation consent would be required to remove the building prior to any new developments on site. A viability assessment had been undertaken by the applicant to assess whether the existing building could be realistically used for modern office developments or converted into flats. The viability assessment was identified as having weak points, however the main points of the document alluded to the fact that the cost of developing the existing building into modern offices or a flat development would be far more than the return on the investment. Therefore, the redevelopment of the existing building was not a viable option.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. A late representation had been received from a local resident which highlighted

concerns regarding drugs and prostitution in the area. It was stated that new residents would be placed at an unacceptable risk of exploitation by the criminal gangs that operated locally. This would further increase the risk of poverty and crime in the area.

A further condition had also been proposed by Highways should Members be minded to approve the application.

Comments had also been received from the applicants in response to the comments received from English Heritage, which stated that “the demolition of Thurston House had not been substantiated in accordance with PPS5 guidance”. The applicant’s had stated in response that “PPS5 was clear, that where retention was not viable, then a well designed new building which recognizes the setting and enhances the area, should be granted planning permission”.

Councillor Mohammed Jamil, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee on behalf of all of the Central Ward Councillors. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The majority of local residents whom the Central Ward Councillors had spoken to were in objection to the application. This also included Beeches school
- The Beeches school had a conservation area which backed on to the proposal site. The demolition of Thurston House and the building of new houses went against everything the children were being taught with regards to conservation
- The loss of Thurston House would be detrimental to the area, it enhanced the local area and was in keeping with the surrounding buildings
- The congestion along Lincoln Road at peak times of the day would be exacerbated by the proposed development. The allocation of one car parking space was inadequate
- By demolishing Thurston House, a part of the heritage of Peterborough would be lost
- The surrounding area was already densely populated and the introduction of more flats would be of no benefit to the area

Mr Stewart Jackson MP, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The lack of proper public consultation with local residents, undertaken by the housing association
- The proposal was over intensive and was not in keeping with the quality of the surrounding properties
- The proposal was inappropriate for the site, not least because it was in a conservation area
- Once a building with architectural value had been destroyed, you could not get it back
- Several people with skills and knowledge appertaining to old buildings had opposed the demolition
- Sixteen letters from neighbours had been received against the application. English Heritage had also stated that there was a breach in guidance in the proposal, Peterborough Civic Society, the Design Review Panel and MANERP had also objected to the application
- The Planning Committee report was contradictory to the Planning Officers recommendation as were the comments which had been stated by the Planning Officer with regards to the viability assessment that had been undertaken. The applicants had not definitively proven that it was not financially viable to keep Thurston House

- The proposal was for 100% socially rented affordable housing, which would take people off the housing waiting list on choice based lettings who may have no connection with the area, this went against the housing principles of the authority
- The Committee could recommend that the applicants go away and look once again at the viability of keeping Thurston House and then come back with a more respectful scheme towards the conservation area, the opposition of local people and the expertise of people from organisations such as the Peterborough Civic Society
- The area was a conservation area next door to a historic church in an established residential area

Councillor Pam Kreling, a Park Ward Councillor addressed the Committee on behalf of Councillor John Peach, a Park Ward Councillor and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The scheme proposed was not much different to the previous scheme which had been refused
- The Park Conservation Area had been designated to preserve the character of the area, unique to Peterborough
- The approval of the Park Conservation Area Appraisal Report and Management Plan had enforced the conservation of the area. Councillors had committed themselves to manage change and new development, to avoid harming the key elements and appearance of the Park Conservation Area
- The proposal was poor and would take up the majority of the green space on the site
- The proposal was contrary to planning policy CBE3
- The Management Plan which had been adopted, included a number of points which supported the fact that the development did not fit in with the plan. These included,
  - The proposal for the demolition of the whole or part of any building, or to intensify the use of plots in any way would not be supported
  - Any new development must enhance the character of appearance of the conservation area and must respect the scale, massing and materials of the traditional buildings within the conservation area and vicinity
  - The city council would not support proposals for widening existing entrances or creating new accesses that require the removal of boundary walls or hedges
- The application did not accord with local plan policy or national planning guidance

Four objectors, Mr Jeremy Roberts, Mr Henry Duckett, Mrs Margaret Randall and Mr Daniel Deja, who was representing the residents of Craig Street, addressed the Committee individually and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns from the objectors which were highlighted to the Committee included:

- The building should be maintained and kept as it was. It was an important conservation area and there were so few buildings of this nature left in Peterborough
- New housing was important and was required, but it was also important to keep Thurston House
- It did not make sense to build so close to St Mark's Church, when the Corn Exchange had recently been demolished because of how it impacted on St John's Church
- It was important to keep an open aspect and the character of Lincoln Road
- The plans could be looked at again and to incorporate Thurston House

- There was no adequate case for the loss of Thurston House
- Representations against the application had been summarised within the committee report instead of being appended. Therefore, inevitably, portions of representations had been missed out
- Gayhurst had been proposed by the Civic Society for inclusion in the revised local list, which was, at that point, under consideration by the council
- The area was overrun with crime which had been going on for ten years
- Policy DA11 stated that the consideration had to be given to the vulnerability of crime
- There were drug gangs and prostitutes along Lincoln Road who preyed on vulnerable people in the area
- If Thurston House was not a viable option for the developer, then it could be advertised for sale
- The developer had run the place down for many years and now wished to develop the site
- The developer had not demonstrated convincingly that the existing house could not be kept in some form or another
- Policy HE9.1 stated that there should be a presumption in the favour of conservation for a designated heritage asset
- The proposal was contrary to PPS5

Mr John Walton, from Accent Nene, Mr David Shaw, the agent, Mr John Blair, the architect and Mr Simon Wicken, the cost consultant addressed the Committee jointly in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. The Committee was informed that:

- There had been considerable changes to the scheme since its refusal at a previous Planning Committee meeting
- Local Councillors and local residents had been invited to meet with the applicant and agent throughout the consultation process but no replies had been received
- The NHS facility had been removed, there was a considerably lower residential density, all trees worthy of retaining had been retained including all of the trees along the Lincoln Road frontage, the frontage had been set back so as not to obscure the views of the church, the height of the buildings had been reduced and a traditional appearance to the frontage of the building had been put in place
- The block had been discussed in detail with the Council's planning officers and conservation officers as well as the design panel. All had a significant input into the final design
- There had been no objections received from the adjoining church
- Policy PPS5 and CBE4 of the local plan gave two forms of justification for demolition in a conservation area. The first was when the loss was necessary to deliver public benefits and the second was where no viable use could be found in the medium term that would enable the retention of the building and any harm was outweighed by bringing the site back into use
- The public benefit would be much needed affordable housing, which would help with the long waiting list in Peterborough
- The avoidance of a further vacant site in the city centre, which would be at risk of attracting further anti social behaviour to the area
- The retention of the building had been looked into, however the building was in poor condition and was in a low value location
- Previous planning permissions had been granted for the site but had not been implemented due to viability of the proposals
- Plans had been drawn up which considered the retention of Thurston House alongside a new development, however there were a number of financial and practical issues these proposals generated



- The refurbishment of Thurston House would be very complex and very expensive
- The retention of Thurston House would cause problems with the road location to feed into the other proposed dwellings. It would not be practical for a road to run alongside Thurston House
- Independent advice had been sought from Savills regarding the possibility of Thurston House being sold as a residential property for the private market. The only likely purchasers would be those who would wish to rent the property, thus creating a likely issue of a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) on the site
- It was likely that the house would fall further into disrepair if it became a HMO
- To refurbish the building would cost in the region of £500,000, and the end value would be in the region of £395,000. A loss of over a £100,000
- Office demand and rents in central Peterborough were generally low
- The existing office space was only occupied on the ground floor and in short term lets, the space was described as being poor
- The availability of office space in Peterborough was high
- Accent Nene believed that they had an obligation to build good quality housing schemes in Peterborough, this scheme was considered to meet this objective
- Peterborough would benefit from new affordable housing in a sustainable location and the risk of a further vacant site in the city centre would be avoided
- The scheme was being targeted to achieve sustainable homes to support Peterborough's environmental capital status
- A range of housing was needed for the city centre to draw in more residents who would, in turn, help to self police the centre
- The scheme was supported by the Peterborough City Council Housing Strategy Group and was likely to be supported by the Homes and Communities Association in terms of grant
- Accent Nene's offices were directly opposite the site and they wished for the site to showcase their management skills
- The site would become a magnet for further anti social behaviour if left empty
- The space around the proposal was not public open space
- The buildings would not be taller than the surrounding trees
- The frontage of the building had been designed to complement the building on the opposite side of the road, at the request of the Conservation Officer
- Schemes had been provided which incorporated Thurston House and these had been fully costed
- A key consultee was the Architectural Liaison Officer and it was highlighted that the scheme would achieve full accreditation of secure by design, which being in a city centre location would be extremely important
- There would be an innovative solution for waste located on the site, these being underground bin stores
- A lot of thought, time and effort had been put into the scheme and it was hoped that all previous concerns had been addressed

Members questioned the speakers regarding the viability of the schemes which had incorporated Thurston House, the type of housing that the new proposal would offer, the special needs facilities incorporated into the proposal, the innovative solution for waste on the site and the security issues surrounding the new proposal.

Further concerns were highlighted by Members with regards to the viability issues and the Head of Planning Services addressed the Committee in response to these concerns. Members were advised that the scheme had been looked at in great detail. The scheme had a long and complicated history, but the ultimate benefits to the area and to the city had outweighed the importance associated with retaining Thurston House. The building was not listed but was situated in a conservation area. If new development took place around the existing building, it was at risk of looking out of

place and its main attribute of having open space all around it would no longer be present. The attempts to design a scheme incorporating Thurston House did not work practically or from a planning point of view and would ultimately not work from a financial viability point of view. The area was of low land value and low rental value and if the building was kept in isolation and not as part of regeneration scheme it could have a further negative effect on the area.

After debate, Members expressed further concern regarding viability and the issues surrounding the prospect of placing vulnerable families with social problems and special needs into an area already rife with drugs and anti social behaviour. Members were advised that the gap between money being put in to the scheme in order to keep Thurston House and the money that would be returned would be vast, and therefore not viable. With regards to the future residents, they would not all be vulnerable people and an increase in development would ultimately deter crime in the area.

After further debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application for the demolition of Thurston House. The motion was carried by 5 votes, with 3 voting against.

**10/00510/CON - RESOLVED:** (5 for, 3 against) to approve the application for demolition, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions C1 and C2 as detailed in the committee report

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application for 34 dwellings on the site. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 2 voting against.

**10/00502/FUL - RESOLVED:** (6 for, 2 against) to approve the application for 34 dwellings, as per officer recommendation. Subject to:

1. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. The conditions numbered C1 to C15 as detailed in the committee report
3. The additional Highways condition as detailed in the update report
4. If the S106 has not been completed within 3 months of the date of this resolution without good cause, the Head of Planning Services be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason R1 as detailed in the committee report

#### **Reasons for the decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan.

Councillor Serluca left the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

- 5.4 10/00719/FUL – Construction of a new two storey high academy school building, incorporating the library, young people’s centre and early years centre, and demolition of the existing academy, library and Sheridan Centre buildings. Provision of associated external areas, including sports fields, a floodlit all weather pitch, car parking and public plaza, with associated access, alterations to cycle way and boundary treatments. Extension to the existing Bushfield Sports Centre, the re-cladding of its front elevation and the construction of a new colonnade feature. The refurbishment and extension of the existing changing**

## **pavilion building at Bushfield Community College, Bushfield, Orton Goldhay, Peterborough**

Full planning permission was sought for:

- The construction of a new two storey high Academy school building(9713m<sup>2</sup>); which included the library (524m<sup>2</sup>), young people's (124m<sup>2</sup>), and early year centres (96m<sup>2</sup>)
- The demolition of the existing school, library and Sheridan buildings (8500m<sup>2</sup>)
- The provision of associated external areas, including playing fields, a floodlit all weather pitch, public plaza, car parking, with associated access, alterations to the cycle way and boundary treatments
- An extension to the existing Bushfield sports centre (93m<sup>2</sup>), the re-cladding of its front elevation, and the construction of a new colonnade feature around the frontage of the sports and main school buildings
- The refurbishment and extension (11m<sup>2</sup>) to the changing room pavilion building, with the addition of a new entrance canopy
- Relocation of the grounds maintenance depot from its exiting position on the east of the site to the west, adjacent to the car park

The site covered an area of 10.8 hectares and was comprised of the existing school buildings, library, sports centre, maintenance depot, car park and sports fields and pitches. The site was located on the edge of the Orton District centre as defined by the Local Plan.

The surrounding land uses were residential to the north and west, recreational playing fields to the east, and the Orton shopping centre (including the community centre, health centre, elderly persons housing, and car park) to the south.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. There were a number of additional conditions and informatives which had been requested by the Highways Department. Comments had also been received from Sport England and four additional conditions had been proposed. The Landscape Officer had also provided comments in relation to the proposal, no objections had been raised, and three additional conditions had been proposed. Three further ecology conditions had also been proposed.

Late representations had been received from Anglian Water, the Local Wildlife Trust and CBRE, the owners of the Orton Centre. No objections had been raised, but CBRE had commented that part of the application site involved their land, however, there was no objection to the proposal in principle and CBRE would welcome discussions with the Council in respect of the future of the Orton Centre.

After debate, queries were raised regarding the turning circles for vehicles on site and the point of entrance into the school. The Highways Officer addressed the Committee in response to these queries and stated that work had been undertaken on the turning circles and tracking plots had been done for the largest vehicles. With regards to accessing the school, at that time the Orton Centres' land had to be used. Going forward this was not desirable therefore other points of access were to be looked into.

After further debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a financial contribution to meet the travel choice needs of the area
2. The conditions numbered C1 to C9 as detailed in the committee report
3. If the Unilateral Undertaking (UU) had not been completed within 3 months of the date of the resolution without good cause, the Head of Planning Services be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason R1 as detailed in the committee report
4. The additional conditions requested by the Highways Authority, numbered 1 to 17, as detailed in the update report
5. The informatives requested by the Highways Authority, numbered 1 to 8, as detailed in the update report
6. The additional conditions requested by Sport England, numbered 1 to 4, as detailed in the update report
7. The additional conditions requested by the Landscape Officer, numbered 1 to 3, as detailed in the committee report
8. The additional conditions relating to ecology, numbered 1 to 3, as detailed in the update report

**Reasons for the decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The design and layout of the development proposed would be both visually compatible with and enhancing to the surrounding character or appearance of the area. It was not considered that the development would adversely impact on any surrounding sites. Subject to the final comments of the Highway Officers, the highway implications of the development were considered to be acceptable. The ecologically enhancements and impacts of the development could be addressed by conditions.

The development was therefore considered to be in accordance with the planning policies of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

**6. Revised Enforcement Strategy – For Information**

A report was submitted to the Committee which highlighted proposed revisions to the Enforcement Strategy.

Members were advised that an Enforcement Strategy was in place so that all those engaged in the service knew the approach of the service and the standards of service that could be expected to be delivered. The new Enforcement Strategy reflected the new performance targets and revised approach to planning enforcement that had come in to place since the beginning of 2010. The document clearly set out what customers could expect from the in terms of service standards and also gave an overview of the enforcement process.

A query was raised regarding confidentiality. If a member of the public reported an enforcement breach, would this remain confidential? Members were advised that if a member of the public reported a possible breach, the information would be held confidentially, however, there may be occasions when the member of the public would be required to give evidence at court in order to prove the breach.

After further discussion, Members positively commented on the revised strategy, in particular the prioritisation of enforcement cases, and stated that it was a good piece of work and the changes were welcomed.

**RESOLVED**: to note the revised Enforcement Strategy.

**7. Revisions to the Local Validation List – For Information**

A report was submitted to the Committee which highlighted proposed revisions to the Local Validation List.

Members were advised that several years ago, the Government had introduced a single planning application form (1App as it was commonly known) and a standard (validation) list of information which had to be submitted alongside an application. The introduction of the single list had been undertaken as each Council had been designing its own form with different requirements to be satisfied by applicants. This was making it difficult for applicants to submit applications in different parts of the country with the confidence that the Council would accept and start to process the application. In order to ensure that Councils were able to reflect local circumstances, the Government allowed Councils to amend the standard list (to make it a local validation list) with the recommendation that any such revisions be the subject of public consultation.

After discussion, Members commented that the suggested revisions were good and that the piece of work overall was commendable.

**RESOLVED**: to note the revised Validation List prior to its submission for public consultation.

1.30pm – 5.00pm  
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank