

# Public Document Pack



Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee  
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 26 July 2011

## **Members Present:**

Councillors – North (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Hiller, Simons, Stokes, Todd, Harrington, Martin, Winslade and Ash

## **Officers Present:**

Nick Harding, Group Manager, Development Management  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Kim Sawyer, Head of Legal Services  
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

## **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Casey and Lane.

Councillors Winslade and Ash attended as substitutes.

## **2. Declarations of Interest**

- 4.1 Councillor North declared a personal interest in that his stepdaughter attended Arthur Mellows Village College, but this would in no way affect his decision.
- 4.3 Councillor Simons declared a prejudicial interest in that he knew a number of residents in the area and he would withdraw from the meeting for the duration of the item.
- 4.4 Councillor Harrington declared a personal interest in that he knew of Mr Arthur Chambers, an objector, as he used to employ Mr Chambers' brother, but this would in no way affect his decision.
- 4.4 Councillor Stokes declared that she was Ward Councillor for the item and would be making representation as Ward Councillor on behalf of residents, but that she did not have a personal or prejudicial interest.

## **3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representation as Ward Councillor**

Councillor Stokes declared that she would be making representation as Ward Councillor on item 4.4, R and P Meats, 55 Cherry Orton Road.

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

### **4.1 11/00720/FUL – Construction of all weather artificial pitch with floodlighting and accompanying external works at Arthur Mellows Village College, Glington, Peterborough**

The proposal sought permission to;

- Construct an all weather artificial pitch

- Erect 8 x 15 metre high columns with 28 floodlights, proposed to be conditioned so as not to be used after 21.30 Monday-Friday or after 20.30 Saturday, Sunday or Bank Holidays
- Erection of surrounding fences standing at 3.06 metres and 4.5 metres; and
- Accompanying external works

Use would be made of the existing temporary access off Lincoln Road to construct the development. The access had been used in conjunction with recently completed works on the site. Under a proposed condition, the access would be stopped up upon completion of the construction.

The application site formed part of the existing school playing field, which was an area in the region of 2.7ha, screened by mature hedgerows and trees to the North, East, South and West respectively.

The School itself was situated to the immediate East, separated by a dedicated car parking area. To the North were residential properties, and to the South and West circa 90 metres was the A15.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the policy context and the principle of development, light pollution and highway implications. The recommendation was one of approval. Whilst the development was located in open countryside, it was an existing playing field, it had also been demonstrated that the floodlighting would not be detrimental to residential amenity or highways safety and it would not be detrimental to protected species. The noise would also not be detrimental to residential amenity and the proposed planting of oak trees would help to soften the development into the landscape.

Members were advised that the objections received against the proposal related mainly to the impact that the floodlighting would have on the area in general terms. The area was outside of the village envelope and therefore the floodlighting would introduce a significant amount of lighting into an area that would otherwise be dark. Concerns had also been raised with regards to noise emanating from the proposal, traffic generation due to the pitch being available for public use outside of school hours, and the lack of a carbon reduction/offsetting proposal as part of the development.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Objectors had made reference to the non-application of planning officers of policy CS10 of the Core Strategy, this highlighted that new development should include measures to further the Environment Capital agenda. Members were informed that officers applied the policy by seeking a 10% improvement against current building regulation requirements. This could not be applied to this development for two reasons, namely the development was not subject to control under building regulations and due to the fact that the development was not a building, there was no 'target emission rate' that could be calculated for it, so there was no way of identifying a saving to be achieved.

Members were further advised that a response from Councillor Samantha Dalton had also been provided detailing non planning measures that the Council were undertaking in conjunction with schools in order to secure carbon reductions.

There had also been a noise survey submitted on behalf of the applicants by Acoustic Associates and this report highlighted that the development would lead to no further noise than was given off at the current time. However due to the pitches being floodlit, the noise would happen more frequently.

The Planning Officer further advised that it had been identified that Sport England had not received notification of the application therefore comments had not been received. The application had been re-sent to them and they had verbally confirmed that it would be unlikely that they would have any issues with the proposal but there was still time for them to respond. Members were therefore advised that if they were minded to approve the application, they grant the Head of Planning Services authority to approve planning permission subject to their being no objections from Sport England.

The Chairman addressed the Committee and stated that Ward Councillor Diane Lamb and Parish Councillor Bob Johnson were in attendance and had requested to speak. Their application to speak had been received after the deadline and it was therefore for Committee Members to agree the request. Following a vote, the Committee agreed to allow both Councillors to speak, however it was noted that

Councillor Bob Johnson, a Glington Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- Glington Parish Council opposed the application on five grounds, those being development outside the village envelope, noise and light pollution, hours of proposed use, loss of amenity and standard of life for the residents and the increased traffic flow
- A previous application for a golf driving range had been opposed and this was outside the village envelope
- The decision had been appealed and had been upheld by an Inspector sighting light pollution. How was this application any different?
- The height of the lighting columns would be almost twice the height of any buildings in the village apart from the church. The lights would therefore be able to be directly viewed from the vast majority of the village
- The development was in virtually open countryside, therefore the illuminated block of white light would have an adverse effect on the traffic travelling along the bypass
- If the scheme was to provide an all weather pitch for the use of school children during the hours of school, this would be acceptable
- With the imposition of floodlights, it was being turned into a business proposal
- The noise survey had stated that there would be no increase in noise, but the levels heard already could not currently go on in to the evening
- Hockey matches and football matches produced a lot of noise
- The proposed hours were considerably longer than those of the fitness suite on the site
- The proposal would be more acceptable if the hours were brought into line with the fitness suite
- The opening hours would have an overall detrimental impact on the local residents
- There would be increased traffic flow in the area
- The college gates were currently locked at the weekend, therefore where were people going to park? The parking spaces which could be accessed would not be sufficient, this would mean increased parking issues in the village
- The application would mainly be used by people outside of Glington and would therefore not be solely for community use
- There was only one football team in Glington, with no hockey team or cricket team
- The football team played during the daytime, therefore they would not need the floodlighting
- In the application there was no reference to toilet facilities or changing facilities

- If Members were minded to approve the application, conditions should be imposed to cover the concerns raised by the residents of Glinton
- The impact of the development, the height of the columns and the light generated, would override the benefits

Mr David Cowcill, an objector and local resident, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The applicant's had not proposed any mitigation against the carbon footprint effect of the light usage. This was disappointing
- Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy fully applied in this case
- The Planning Officers exclusion of Policy was based on interpretation of the wording and it was believed that this was a narrow interpretation and did not serve Peterborough City Council as home of environment capital
- In relation to informative number 1, detailed in the committee report, it was highlighted that the development was subject to building regulations. CS10 should therefore be made to apply
- The Officers should be questioned in order to verify their viewpoint
- The application, if approved, should be conditioned in a suitable manner to achieve mitigation of the carbon footprint
- Sufficient solar generation to mitigate the effective use should be implemented

Mr John Dadge, from Barker Storey Matthews speaking as a Governor, Mr Gilmore McLaren, Chair of Governors and Mr Jonathan Oakley, the Deputy Head, addressed the Committee jointly in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- Arthur Mellows Village College was an Ofsted outstanding school, growing in numbers. 1550 students were currently on the role
- The sporting facilities were not up to standard, with no access to Astro turf facilities
- The facilities were proposed with similar opening times to those facilities of other schools so an equality of opportunity would be present
- The facility would be available for the benefit and use of the wider community. It was important to stress it would not be a commercial venture
- Arthur Mellows took sustainability seriously. Photo voltaic panels had recently been ordered to improve education facilities and to reduce the energy costs within the college
- The college operated a travel plan
- The relevant technical information had been provided to aid Members in making an informed decision
- The lighting would be focussed on the play area and light leakage would be minimal
- The noise levels would not be constant and would be set against the ambient noise of the bypass
- The Planning Officers had produced an onerous set of conditions and the College would comply with all stated
- The hours of operation were specifically worded in the condition and did not necessarily correlate with opening hours
- The pitch was not envisaged to be used every day until the curfew time
- There would be a site manager on site who would turn the lights on and off and would also open the car park to the college site at weekends and the changing facilities
- The maximum amount of cars on site during a match would not be comparable to the amount of cars on site during a school day

- The Design and Access statement submitted with the application had stated that play would stop at 9.00pm, with lights to be switched off at 9.30pm

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the spread of light over the area outside the pitch was minimal due to the lights being focussed on the pitch area and. The Highways Officer advised that he had also yet to see a floodlit pitch that caused a detrimental impact to drivers. Floodlit pitches were becoming more common and therefore people were less likely to take notice of them whilst driving past.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee in response to points raised by the speakers and stated that contrary to what was stated in the Committee report, buildings regulations approval was not required for the development and with regards to car parking, it would be feasible to add a condition stating that car parking would be available for use by third parties whilst the pitch was in operation.

Following debate, Members expressed concerns with regards to a number of issues including the hours of operation and the apparent difference in interpretation of Policy CS10. However, Members further commented that the facility should be welcomed and would be of great benefit to the College and the residents of Peterborough at large.

Following further debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to no objections being raised by Sport England in the first instance, the hours of lighting to be reduced to 21.00 during the week and 19.30 at weekends and bank holidays. The investigation into a suitable timing cut off facility being implemented on site, and an additional condition being implemented stating that the car park and changing facilities would be available for use during operational hours. The motion was seconded and carried by 7 votes for and 3 voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (7 for, 3 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. No objections being raised to the application by Sport England in the first instance
2. The conditions numbered 1 to 8 as detailed in the committee report
3. The informatives numbered 1 to 5 as detailed in the committee report
4. The hours of lighting to be reduced to 21.00 during the week and 19.30 at the weekends and during bank holidays
5. An investigation being made into a suitable timing cut off device for the site
6. An additional condition stating that the car park and changing facilities would be available for use during operational hours

**Reasons for 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 and specifically:

- The design of the All Weather Pitch was considered of appropriate size, scale, juxtaposition and appearance which would not detract from the character or appearance of the area or landscape;
- The proposal was not considered to have significant impact on neighbour amenity, by virtue of light, privacy or noise;
- The proposal was considered to provide satisfactory parking and would not result in a highway safety hazard; and
- The proposal was considered not to detract protected species and introduced an improved planting scheme.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with Policies CS14, CS16 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies LNE1, LNE9, LT10, LT12 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005), Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005), Planning Policy Statement 7 (2004) and the Peterborough Sports Strategy (2009-2014).

Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) could not be reasonably applied to the development as it would not significantly contribute to the Environmental Capital Agenda.

**4.2 11/00730/FUL – Amendments to previous planning permission (Ref: 10/00060/FUL) for the construction of a two storey rear extension and two single storey side extensions and the insulation and re-facing of north elevation and change to a window size (no lead glazing); and 11/00731/LBC – Amendments to previous listed building consent (Ref: 10/00070/LBC) at 14 Church Street, Thorney**

The proposals sought to amend two aspects of a 2010 grant of planning permission and a listed building consent for the erection of a two storey rear extension and two single storey rear/side extensions. The proposal was to bring rearwards an existing recessed two storey rear element of the dwelling by 2.8 metres to be in line with the principle gable to the rear elevation of the dwelling.

Two single storey side extensions were proposed on either side of the existing rear flank walls to the dwelling. The eastern side ground floor extension was to have a depth of 4 metres and a width of 2.5 metres with a mono-pitched roof. The western side single storey ground floor extension was to be accessed off the kitchen and was to have depth of 5 metres with a width of 1.5 metres to form a WC and shower room.

Timber casement windows were proposed in the extensions to replace the originally approved leaded lights fenestration. A window in the rear elevation was to be made independent of a proposed door in that elevation. The rainwater goods were proposed to be of cast iron.

The rear gable wall of the existing dwelling was to have a single 'brick skin' added rearwards to provide a layer of insulation whilst also providing a uniform brick finish to the elevation.

There were no alterations in the current applications to the scale, general proportions and footprint of the previously approved extensions.

The application dwelling dated back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century and was of brick construction with a pantiled roof throughout. The dwelling previously had a thatched roof. The footprint of the dwelling was 'T' shaped and was part two storey to the rear with a prominent gable end, and part one and half storey to the front facing Church Street. The current appearance of the rear and west elevation was poor due to contrasting brick types and poorly maintained rendering.

The property lay at a prominent corner within Church Street at the eastern end of a row of terraced housing and Thorney Library. Immediately to the east of the dwelling was a Pharmacy business within a small building that was formerly a telephone exchange. The Pharmacy had a large forecourt area and was set slightly rearwards of the application dwelling. A curved style 1.8 metre high fence formed the eastern boundary with the Pharmacy. To the rear of the site was a car repair business and to the west a part attached dwelling with a substantial curtilage. To the south of the site lay the grounds of Thorney Abbey.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the main consideration that being the impact of the proposed works upon the appearance of the Grade II listed building and the character of the Thorney Conservation Area. The recommendation was one of approval.

Following debate, Members commented that the revisions were an improvement to what was already a very pleasant and attractive property. A motion was put forward and seconded to approve application 11/00730/FUL. 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

A further motion was put forward and seconded to approve application 11/00731/LBC. 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.

**Reasons for decisions:**

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 proposed works would positively improve upon the character and appearance of the listed building and hence the Conservation Area, in accordance with policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

**4.3 11/00836/FUL – Residential development comprising 34 no. dwellings, associated access, landscaping and ancillary works at allotments, 1 Itter Crescent, Walton, Peterborough**

The application sought permission for residential development comprising 1 x 3 bed, 15 x 4 bed and 18 x 5 bed properties. The dwellings would be two and two and a half storey set on relatively large plots. The site would be accessed off Itter Crescent.

The site area was approximately 1.38 ha and was part of a site allocated for residential development under policy H3 (ref 3.21) of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005). The site was former allotment land located to the southern end of Itter Crescent and overlooked Itter Park Recreation Ground to the east and was separated from it by a public footpath/right of way. The site was currently overgrown with scrub, grass and a number of trees. The site was bounded to the north (Itter Crescent) and west (Fane Road) by established residential properties and allotment land to the south. The character of Itter Crescent was comprised primarily of detached single storey and two storey properties circa 1950s with large rearward gardens. Each dwelling along the Crescent was of individual design. Properties located in Fane Road were primarily two storey terraced properties with rear gardens extending some 22 metres. The site lay adjacent to Itter Park which had been awarded the Green Flag Status; the national standard for the parks of England and Wales. It was divided into two sections by a hedge and included a playing field and a small formal garden.

There was no on site provision for open space due to the proposals proximity to Itter Park and in lieu of this, a £10k contribution would be made towards further improvements within Itter Park. The developer was also proposing to make a contribution in line with Peterborough City Council's Planning Obligation and Implementation Strategy (POIS) at both a strategic level and a local neighbourhood level.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the application. The main issues for consideration were outlined and these included the policy context and the principle of development, the design and amenity on site, the impact on neighbouring amenity, residential amenity in general, highways implications, meeting housing needs, open space provision and landscape implications. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members were advised that the proposal was for 34 dwellings and this number had followed feedback received from local residents during previous consultations, where it had been identified that if development was to take place, lower density housing would be preferred. The proposed density of the site was slightly higher than was identified in the Adopted Local Plan, but this did not make the proposal objectionable.

In further response to neighbour feedback, the scheme also excluded any onsite provision of affordable housing. Instead a contribution of £840k was proposed for offsite provision could be made.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. A further neighbour consultation had been undertaken due to minor revisions in the proposals which included the house at plot 16 being changed from a 'Beauchamp' house type to a 'Pickwell', minor amendments to the access road and the addition of a 0.5 metre verge between 'Road 1' and the footpath. Three further letters of representation had been received with a number of concerns highlighted.

Members were further advised that there had been an additional condition proposed by Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue in relation to the provision of fire hydrants.

Mr Keith Warren, a local resident, addressed the Committee. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- Residents had been down the road of development for many years and nothing had come to fruition. Why was development due to take place now?
- The concerns outlined in Mr Warren's original submission, and those submissions received from other local residents, were further endorsed specifically the points in relation to the poor state of Itter Crescent and road safety

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee in response to comments raised by the speaker. It was highlighted that the reasons around the development coming to the fore now could not be specifically outlined, however the time had clearly not been right previously in terms of asset disposal.

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee in response to concerns highlighted by Members in relation to the impact of traffic on Itter Crescent. Members were advised that Itter Crescent was an old concrete type road and would be for the maintenance team to rectify any defects going forward.

Councillor Simons left the meeting.



Following debate, Members raised concerns at the loss of the allotments to which the Planning Officer responded that Members were to be mindful that the land had previously been sited as development land in the Peterborough City Council's Site Allocations Document.

Following further debate, Members commented that the provision would promote prestigious housing and would enhance the area considerably. A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application with the additional condition submitted by the Fire Authority in relation to fire hydrants. 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 social and physical infrastructural needs of the area
2. The conditions numbered C1 to C18 as detailed in the committee report
3. The additional Fire Authority condition in relation to the provision of fire hydrants as detailed in the update report

**Reasons for 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:

- This was an allocated housing site and would provide efficient and effective use of land and was in accordance with the spatial strategy for the location of residential development
- The proposal would provide a high quality development and meet the requirement for a need for executive homes;
- The scale and design of the development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- The development made adequate provision for the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the properties
- The development would not result in any adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing neighbouring dwellings
- The proposal provided adequate parking provision for the occupiers of the dwellings and visitors and would not result in any adverse highway implications
- The proposal did not have an unsatisfactory impact on any ecological feature, trees of significant value or archaeological feature; and
- The proposal made satisfactory and justified off site provision for affordable housing, public transport, and open space by way of a financial contribution. The proposal also made a contribution towards the social and physical infrastructure demands that it would place on the city.

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policies H3, H15, H16, LNE9, LNE10 and T10 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement), policies CS8, CS10, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy and PS1, PPS3, PPS5.

Councillor Simons joined the meeting.

**4.4 11/00879/FUL – Change of use of existing residential store to store room for business use (part retrospective), removal of existing mono pitch roof, and replace with flat roof and covered access to store room, change of use of part of**

## **existing garage to upgraded toilets at 55 Cherry Orton Road, Orton Waterville, Peterborough**

Planning permission was retrospectively sought for the change of use of an existing store, formerly used by a nearby dwelling, to storage for R & P Meats. Also proposed was the removal of the existing mono pitch roof to the toilets and its replacement with a lat roof and creation of a covered access to the store room. Finally, there was a proposal to extend the existing single toilet, using part of an existing residential garage building.

The application site was located on the southern edge of the Orton Waterville Conservation Area. The site consisted of a dwelling to the front of the site that had been rendered and remodelled over the years and was no longer of historic character. Along the left hand side of the site and to the rear was the meat wholesale premises that had been in operation since the mid 1950's. Along the left hand side of the site these were relatively narrow, single storey brick built outbuildings that were in commercial use. To the rear of the site was a larger modern structure which was in mixed use of commercial, incorporating residential garaging. To the centre of the site there was a garden space and gravel driveway that was used for the parking and turning of the 4 commercial vehicles stored on site.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the application. The main issues for consideration were outlined and these included the policy context and the principle of development, the design and visual amenity on site, whether the proposal would impact on the Conservation Area and highways implications. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. A further two letters of objection had been received against the application, one of which had been signed by multiple households, and a number of photographs had also been submitted showing the problems local residents suffered in relation to parking and traffic congestion. The Planning Officer advised that given the very small area of floorspace involved in the application, it would be extremely difficult to prove that the application would further worsen the existing congestion and disturbance observed by neighbours.

Councillor June Stokes, Ward Councillor and Member of Orton Waterville Parish Council, addressed the Committee and prior to her own submission, read a letter which had been submitted by Councillor Sue Allen, Ward Councillor. Councillor Stokes responded to questions from Members and in summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The residents of Cherry Orton Road and adjoining roads, had had enough of the large lorries parking along the road
- The area was a Conservation Area and a beautiful village and it was being spoilt by having large lorries travelling up and down a narrow road
- Where the business was placed, it was causing a detrimental impact on the residents quality of life
- Residents had been blocked into their own driveways on occasions and had been told that they would have to wait whilst lorries unloaded
- There had been damage done to homes on several occasions and also to residents cars
- The business had originally started with five staff members there were now seventeen and if allowed to expand anymore, would cause even more of an impact on these people's lives
- The business should be placed in a more appropriate place i.e. an industrial site
- A number of planning applications had previously been refused for the site

- There had been many complaints from residents over the years with regards to this property
- When the lorries were unloading the road was completely blocked
- There was noise of vehicles returning late at night after returning from catering functions
- There were the sounds of crates and equipment being unloaded which could be heard by neighbours

Mr Singer, an objector and local resident, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The committee report had been produced prior to objections being received from residents
- The Council had resisted expansion of the site previously due to the detriment of residential amenity
- The premises was inadequate for the number of lorries loading and unloading
- A forklift truck loaded and unloaded on the road, this was surely a safety issue
- Houses had been damaged by the large lorries
- There was noise pollution, both in the early morning and late evenings
- Blocking of driveways and light into properties by the lorries
- Diesel fumes drifting into properties whilst the lorries left their refrigerators running whilst unloading
- The number of employees had trebled
- The delivery capacity had increased at least fivefold
- A catering aspect had been added to the business, this was not indicative of a business that was intending to stand still, therefore there would surely be further expansion
- An increase in business activity would bring about a further decrease in residential amenity

The Applicant and Agent had registered to speak, however they were not in attendance.

Members commented that they sympathised with the residents' predicament. However, the application before the Committee did not affect the design and visual amenity of the property and it did not impact on the Conservation Area in its proposal and the highway implications were not affected by the current proposal.

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that it could not be proved beyond reasonable doubt that the proposal would cause further detriment to highways safety.

Following debate, Members commented that the location of the business was not ideal for the area, however there were no reasons as to why the application could be justifiably refused. A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried by 8 votes, with 2 voting against.

The Chairman addressed the Committee and stated that it would be of benefit for residents to contact Environmental Health as it was apparent that there were a number of issues that needed to be addressed.

**RESOLVED:** (8 for, 2 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C3 as detailed in the committee report

### **Reasons for decision:**

The proposal would not impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation area and associated historic fabric. Also, because of the proposed uses and limited size, the proposal was unlikely to cause any significant intensification of business activity on the site and therefore was unlikely to be detrimental to residential amenity or highway safety.

The proposal was therefore in accordance with policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), IOW7 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005 and Planning Policy Statement 1 and 5.

#### **4.5 11/00911/FUL – Construction of first floor extension to rear of dwelling (retrospective) at 42 Berkeley Road, Peterborough**

Retrospective planning permission was sought for the construction of a first floor extension to the rear of the residential property. The extension had been built above an existing single storey rear extension and was of the following dimensions – 3300mm deep x 3500 mm wide. The proposal incorporated a gable roof with a ridge height of 5500 mm above ground level. The eaves were 500 mm above ground level.

The application dwelling was a detached two storey property situated to the north side of Berkeley Road. The property had a gable roof and was constructed from brick and tile with render to the front. The dwelling had an existing two storey rear extension. The property had a detached single garage located to the north side of the main house. A hard paved driveway was located to the front and side of the dwelling that provided on plot parking for two vehicles. The property had an existing dropped kerb. The front curtilage was flanked by a low rise brick wall.

The application site was located within a mature residential street scene characterised by two storey semi detached dwellings of a uniform character to the north side of the highway and bungalows to the south side.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. The main issues for consideration were the design and impact on the character of the area and the impact of the development on neighbour amenity. The recommendation was one of approval.

Following debate, Members commented that the extension was impressive and the match of brick was good. 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 condition numbered C1 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 and specifically:

- The extension by reason of its design, siting, scale and height will not result in a significantly detrimental impact on the character of the area or the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

## **5. Changes to the Local Validation List**

The Committee received a report for information which outlined the changes to the Local Validation List, which had to be submitted with planning applications. The provision of a 'One Stop Shop' web based application checklist and guidance was also presented to the Committee for information purposes.

Members were advised that planning applications had to be accompanied by "standard" information set out in a National List of requirements and by any further information set out in the Council's Local List of requirements. Peterborough City Council had a Local List of requirements published on its website. It had been noted that the presentation of what was required to be submitted could be improved upon and that further clarification on specific requirements for each application type was needed. These improvements were required both for applicants and agents submitting applications and for the Council's own technical support staff who were responsible for validation of applications. To this end a bespoke "One Stop Shop" web based checklist had been created which provided further detail and clarity on the requirements.

Many of the improvements made to the current Local List of requirements merely provided further clarification to items that appeared on the list. However, the review of the current list and preparation of the new lists to be provided in the "One Stop Shop" had highlighted a need in some areas to update the current Local List of Requirements. These updates were detailed in the committee report.

A demonstration of the 'One Stop Shop' was presented to the Committee and the benefits it could bring to the Council were highlighted. Members positively commented on the changes and stated that it would be of benefit to revisit the list in around six months in order to check on progress.

**RESOLVED:** to note the proposed changes to the Local Validation List (which was to be the subject of public consultation) and to note the provisions of the 'One Stop Shop'.

## **6. Six Monthly Appeal Performance**

The Committee received a report which outlined Planning Services' performance at appeals over the past six months.

Members were advised that it was useful for the Committee to have sight of these outcomes in order to identify whether there were any lessons to be learnt in terms of appeal outcomes. This would help to inform future decisions and to potentially reduce costs.

Members were further advised that during January to June 2011, the Council had won 60% of the appeals lodged which was in line with previous targets set by the Government, and there had been no awards of cost made against the Council.

**RESOLVED:** that the Committee note past performance and outcomes, as attached at Appendix A to the committee report.

13.30 – 17.25  
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank