

Public Document Pack



Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee
Held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 20 March 2012

Members Present:

Councillors – North (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Casey, Hiller, Simons, Stokes, Harrington, Lane and Martin

Officers Present:

Simon Machen, Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services
Nick Harding, Planning Delivery Manager
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 Todd.

Councillor Winslade was in attendance as substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest

All Members declared that they had received correspondence from both objectors and supporters in relation to item 4.1.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 February 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2012 were approved as a true and accurate record.

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

The Chairman addressed the Committee and sought clarification from Members as to whether any of them felt that they had been unduly influenced by any of the correspondence which had been circulated to them in relation to item 4.1. All Members confirmed that they had not been unduly influenced.

5. 11/01321/OUT - Vacant Land at Maskew Avenue, New England, Peterborough

The application site was located at Maskew Avenue to the north-west of Peterborough City Centre and was 'brownfield' in nature. The 3.5 hectare rectangular site was situated immediately to the south of a retail park comprising B & Q, Matalan Argos and eight other retail units and alongside the East Coast Mainline railway corridor which defined its south-west boundary. Maskew Avenue defined the opposite long boundary on the north-eastern side and provided access to the site. Along Maskew Avenue there were a number of relatively small commercial buildings and to the south of the site were a series of redundant rail tracks. The site previously contained the Royal Mail Parcel Force sorting and distribution centre. A cycle/pedestrian route running adjacent to Maskew Avenue linked the townships of Werrington, Walton and Bretton with Millfield and the city centre.

Within the existing Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005 and soon to be adopted Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) the site was allocated as a General Employment Area. In addition the site was adjacent to a proposed Minerals and Waste Transport Zone and it fell within a proposed Minerals and Waste Transport Safeguarding Area (the principles of Transport Zones and Transport Safeguarding Areas had been established through the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (CPMWCS) policy CS23, and were supported by Minerals Policy Statement 1 and the emerging National Planning Policy Framework). The site was in an 'out of centre' location based on the definition contained in Annex B of Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4).

Outline Planning permission was sought for a Class A1 foodstore of 6,912 square metres gross, 4806 square metres net (the net floor space would comprise 2884 square metres of convenience space and 1922 square metres of comparison floor space) served by 490 parking spaces (including provision for disabled and mother and child facilities) and with associated access and servicing. The scheme also included cycle parking, a wind turbine, solar panels and recycling facilities. The application was in outline, with only siting and means of access submitted for approval at the current stage. The proposals also included a 'park and cycle' facility, including a small ancillary retail unit of 275 square metres.

In order to mitigate the impacts of the additional vehicles generated by the proposals the applicant's consultants had proposed the following:

- Signalisation of the two Bourges Boulevard north and south approach arms at the Bourges Boulevard/Maskew Avenue roundabout (Junction 42);
- A new signalised junction on Maskew Avenue where the new site access was to be located; and
- Adjustments to the existing signals on the Bourges Boulevard/A47 roundabout (Junction 18).

The Local Highway Authority and also the Highways Agency (HA) had requested additions to those proposed above and these were:

- A queue loop (or 'hurry call') on the westbound slip road off the A47 at junction 18 (the purpose of these loops would be to ensure that queuing traffic would not tail back, when the loops were triggered by a queue they would instruct the traffic signals to give priority to the queuing traffic and 'flush' that traffic through the junction); and
- A queue loop (or 'hurry call') on Maskew Avenue on the exit from junction 42.

In addition to the above, the developer had proposed contributions to mitigate the impact of the development towards:

- Strategic Infrastructure, Public Realm improvements within the city centre;
- Sustainable Transport Infrastructure; and
- Community Infrastructure a) Open space and retail regeneration projects within the local vicinity, b) Job creation, skills and training for local community (primarily based within the Central Ward) and c) Sustainable Environmental Improvements.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal, highlighting the main issues for consideration, those being the principle of a foodstore on a site allocated for general employment, the retail implications of the development, the transportation impact, ecology issues, the S106 planning obligation and investment and job creation. The recommendation was one of approval subject to the completion

of a reptile survey and the referral of the application to the Secretary of State if Committee were minded to approve, due to its size and location outside of the centre.

An assessment of the planning issues had been undertaken and the findings were outlined, these included the outcome of sequential testing undertaken (which identified the sequence of appropriate locations before an out-of centre location could be considered for retail development), the focus on key policy issues, the transport issues and the negotiated S106 contributions. These were outlined in detail in the committee report and summarised verbally by the Planning Officer.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. There had been a number of late representations submitted from both objectors and supporters and these were outlined in detail in the report.

Mr Ben Wrighton, an objector, addressed the Committee. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The scheme would have a potential effect on existing shops;
- Alongside the recently approved station quarter scheme, this development would lead to a cumulative negative impact on city centre stores;
- Peterborough was already well accommodated for foodstores;
- The ING station quarter proposals would suffer if the application was approved;
- The ING station quarter proposal was located in a preferential sequential location and had potentially substantial regeneration benefits;
- ING had recently completed S106 discussions and was now in a position to hold meaningful discussions with potential operators. The market would be distracted by the outcome of the current application;
- The decision would have a significant impact, both by reducing possible operators for the ING proposals and also undermining the negotiating position of ING;
- It could not be assumed that any operator had signed up for either scheme;
- Both schemes were in outline form only;
- ING believed that the scheme should be refused or at very least, deferred, based upon the impact policies of PPS4 and also the Council's own Core Strategy Policies;
- The Council was due to consider adopting the Site Allocations DPD, which specifically re-allocated the site for business uses;
- The need for a foodstore in this area was not clear;
- Had the Council seriously thought about the future impact on stores along Millfield and the surrounding area?
- The inadequacies of the planning process and committee report needed to be stated for the record including the incomplete Environmental Impact Assessment and the incomplete Retail Impact Assessment. The Sequential Assessment was also incorrect.

Mr Huw Williams, a Partner at Chase and Partners Planning Consultants, Mr Rick Mai, Director of Maskew Avenue Projects for Ravenside Investments and Mr Andreas Markides Director of SKM Colin Buchanan, addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The project represented a fantastic opportunity for Peterborough to regenerate a vacant Brownfield site;
- The proposed development would deliver a sustainable new building and would provide employment opportunities for up to 360 local people, with additional employment during the construction phase;

- All planning considerations had been carefully addressed;
- With regards to the environmental impacts on the effects of the development, the scheme had been the subject of a screening opinion;
- The newt survey was the only environmental issue outstanding and steps had been put in place to deal with this matter;
- The site had remained vacant for nearly 10 years, and whilst allocated for employment, it was not seen as an attractive location for such a use, particularly given the array of sites available for employment in Peterborough;
- The proposed development represented the very best development option for the site and would still provide new employment;
- The impact of the proposal had been dealt with thoroughly in the application submission and had been considered in detail by Officers over the past several months;
- It had been concluded that the proposals would not cause an unacceptable impact either to the city centre or any of the established other centres in Peterborough;
- The impact on smaller specialist stores would be limited, and the store would predominately bring competition to the existing network of supermarkets that served the weekly food shop;
- The proposal would not have an impact on the city centre or the Council's proposed 'North Westgate' development;
- A thorough Transport Assessment had been undertaken by the Applicant in order to meet the standards of the Highways Authority;
- The proposal would be good for Peterborough and would provide opportunities for local people.

Mr Mohammed Sabeel, a listed speaker on the application, was not in attendance.

Members debated the application and queries were raised with regards to the impact the development would have upon the highways network. The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and advised Members of the work which had been undertaken in order to mitigate against any traffic issues. The traffic modelling had, in conclusion, highlighted that the proposed additions to the highways network would in fact have a positive impact on the network.

Members expressed further concern at the possible highways issues which the proposal could generate, particularly at the weekends. In response it was advised that Officers were confident that they had tested for all possible worst case scenarios and there had been numerous Highways Consultants engaged in the process from start to finish.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been extensive public consultation undertaken and the proposals had the broad support of all three Ward Councillors and local residents. There had also been no objections from any of the major retailers in the city.

After debate, concern was expressed with regards to the possibility of surrounding local shops losing their trade and also the proposals deviation away from the development plan documents and policies. In response to this query, the Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering advised that the application had been given due consideration over several months and the Government's National Policy Framework, due to be released, would recognise that the presumption would be in favour of sustainable development, and this presumption would be embedded into the document.

After further debate, Members positively commented on the presentation given by the Applicant. The site had been vacant for almost 10 years and the proposal would be

welcomed, creating 300 plus jobs for local people. It was a well thought out outline application which was supported by the Ward Councillors. Overall the application would be a positive development for the city.

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried by 8 votes for and 2 voting against.

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

1. Reference to Government Office as a Departure application under the Town and Country Planning (Departures Direction) 1999 and as a Retail proposal under the Town and Country Planning (Shopping Development) (England and Wales) (No. 2) Direction 1993;
2. The conclusion of a reptile presence/absence survey and mitigation proposed;
3. The completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation;
4. The conditions C1 to C35 as detailed in the committee report.

Reasons for the decision:

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

- Could not be reasonably accommodated within the city centre (more specifically within the central retail area) or district centres within the short to medium term;
- Would not result in a significant material impact on the City Centre or District centres as a consequence of trade draw either individually or in conjunction with other recent developments, planning approvals or schemes under construction;
- Any impact caused to the city centre would be offset via a S106 obligation, with monies towards Strategic Infrastructure and Public Realm Improvements in the city centre;
- Was located on the edge of an existing retail park so there was likely to be link trips to the other units within the retail park;
- Would not result in an unacceptable impact on the local road network or compromise highway safety;
- Provided an appropriate level of parking and gave opportunity for travel by public transport, walking and cycling particularly due to its good location;
- Could be controlled by condition in respect of design and layout, crime and disorder, environment capital/renewable energy, infrastructure / infrastructure provision, transport, biodiversity, flood risk and archaeology;
- Would not result in a detrimental loss of employment land;
- Would not result in a detrimental impact on protected species or related habitat; and
- Represented significant investment and employment creation in one of the most deprived parts of Peterborough.

The proposal was therefore considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS3, CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14, CS15, CS16, CS21, CS22, the Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation Strategy SPD, Local Plan Policies OIW1.01, OIW6, T6, T8, T9, T10, LNE9, IMP1.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

6. 12/00008/HHFUL - 100 Alexandra Road, Peterborough, PE1 3DH

The application site contained a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the south western flank of Alexandra Road and close to the junction with Northfield Road. The surrounding character was comprised of properties of similar style and age, some of which had been extended to the side. The property had a single storey element to the rear forming part of the kitchen and which extended approximately 1.5 metres forward of the rear building line. This design was consistent with that of neighbouring dwellings. Beyond this projection was a conservatory projecting 2.4 metres. Directly to the south eastern side was a shed and car port which abutted the shared boundary with no. 98 Alexandra Road. The property was set back from the highway by 5 metres.

The application sought planning permission for the demolition of a conservatory to the rear of the property and single storey shed to side and the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The two storey side extension would have a width of 2.5 metres, would be positioned 0.4 metres back from the property frontage and would align with the principle rear building line of the property; extending some 6.8 metres in length. The extension would provide one additional bedroom to the first floor and a dining room and kitchen at ground floor. The single storey rear extension would be comprised of a number of elements resulting in a staggered projection. The minimum projection at the north western boundary with the adjoining dwelling at 102 Alexandra Road, would project 2.5 metres along the shared boundary. The single storey element at the south eastern boundary would project 3.8 metres and there would be a central element with a projection of 5 metres from the rear building line of the original dwelling. This element would be offset from the boundaries with the neighbouring properties at nos. 98 and 102 Alexandra Road by 2.8 metres and 1.5 metres respectively. The single storey extension would provide a bathroom, lounge and kitchen.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and advised that a neighbour objection submitted against the proposal had subsequently been withdrawn. This change in circumstances had arisen on 12 March 2012, after the publication of the Committee agenda.

The main issues for consideration were the design and visual amenity, neighbouring amenity and highways issues. The recommendation was one of approval.

Following a question to the Planning Officer with regards to the lack of rear access at the property, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

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

1. The condition C1 as detailed in the committee report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the condition, the proposal was considered acceptable.

The proposed extensions were proportionate in scale and design to the existing dwelling and the development would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and those surrounding the site.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011.

CHAIRMAN
1.30pm - 2.56 pm

This page is intentionally left blank