



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 2 SEPTEMBER 2014**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chairman), Casey, Hiller, North, Rush, Stokes, Shabbir, Martin, Ash and Harrington.

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Planning and Development Manager  
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Amanda McSherry, Principal Development Management Officer  
Emma Naylor, Senior Strategic Planning Officer  
Ruth Lea, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Governance Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Serluca. Councillor Rush was in attendance as substitute.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Harrington raised non-pecuniary interests in agenda item 5.2, as an objector to the original application, and agenda item 5.7, as his relatives had made an objection to the application. He would withdraw from the Committee for both of these items.

Councillor Hiller raised a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 5.2 as a member of the Northern Level Internal Drainage Board.

**3. Minutes of the Meetings held on:**

**3.1 8 July 2014**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2014 were approved as a correct record.

**3.2 22 July 2014**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2014 were approved as a correct record.

**4. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor**

There were no declarations of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

The Chair advised that agenda item 5.4 '14/00895/HHFUL – 80 Ledbury Road, Netherton, Peterborough, PE3 9PJ' had been withdrawn.

**5.1 14/01060/R3FUL – Thorpe Primary School, Atherstone Avenue, Netherton, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the partial infill of the existing courtyard, a single storey rear extension and erection of a detached single storey teaching block at Thorpe Primary

School. Also included in the application was associated alterations to the car park at the front of the site and an extension of the car park to the rear.

The main considerations were:

- The Principle of Development
- Highways Impacts and Car Parking
- Design and Layout
- Landscape Impacts
- Ecological Issues
- Construction Management
- Other Matters

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report and update report.

Principal Development Management Officer provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- It was considered that the trees populating the boundary of the site were worthy of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).
- The number of pupils was to increase to 680, with the number of teaching staff to increase to 92.
- During construction works for the car park, access would be gained by Atherstone Avenue. Construction access in relation to building works would be from Ledbury Road.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places weight on the need to expand schools.
- The main basis for objection was in relation to traffic. A transport assessment identified that a lot of journeys to the school were made by car.
- No objection had been raised by the Highways Authority. It was accepted that congestion would occur, but this did not result in any concerns for safety.
- Methods to improve traffic have been informally explored, with consideration given to a possible lay by included in the scheme. However, it was believed that this would ultimately result in more congestion and was not supported by the Highways Authority.
- The design was considered acceptable. Several alterations to conditions had been outlined in the update report, in response to comments from the Arboricultural Officer.

Councillors Arculus and Councillor Fitzgerald, Ward Councillors, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The principle of development was not objected to, however the Councillors had concerns regarding traffic access.
- The current amount out of traffic created by the school and residents was unsustainable and an increase of 540 journey would not be feasible.
- More thought needed to be put into coming up with a 'kiss and ride' solution.
- The policy of requesting travel plans was not workable and would not be enforced, as the travel plan currently in place had no great affect.
- More consideration should be given to alternative traffic management proposals.
- It appeared that protecting trees was of greater importance than people's safety.
- The Councillors felt that more traffic would result in a higher risk of accidents happening.
- A 'drop off' system would help to alleviate the congestion in the morning rush.

Mr Peter Flowers addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The school provided sufficient places for the families within walking distance. Expansion should be considered in areas where it is really necessary.
- The additional cars that would result from expanding the school would have a significant impact on the environment, which goes against the City's aim of becoming an environment capital.
- Additional traffic would worsen an already difficult situation and would increase risk of accidents. Mr Flowers considered the accident report was flawed, as more traffic would result in more accidents.
- It was requested that, if the Committee didn't feel they could refuse the application, it be deferred to enable them to observe the traffic problems in the area.

Mr Brian Howard, Head of Schools Infrastructure, and Emma Everitt, Project Support Officer, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Consultation was undertaken with all the relevant stakeholders at the beginning of the process.
- Guidance was received suggesting that highways matters did not need to be considered.
- 'Sketch' options for traffic mitigation were drawn up, however these were not developed on the advice of Planning and highways.
- A delay in a decision on the planning application would result in a delay in the entire programme of three to six months. Cost would also be incurred on any temporary accommodation for additional pupils from September 2015.
- Alteration to the submitted scheme were possible, but would have significant implications.
- The increase in pupils would be done incrementally and would take about six years.
- The school caters for infants and, as such, a drop of zone would not be appropriate for all situations, as parents parked and walked their children to the school buildings.

In response to questions raised by the Committee, the Senior Engineer raised the following key points:

- The accident report was considered reasonable. Most accidents were registered with the police and there is nothing to suggest that there was a risk to individual's safety in the area.
- There was a problem with congestion, which was more difficult to solve.
- A significant number of car parking spaces would be required. While 40 / 50 spaces could feasibly be provided at the front of the site, this would mean concreting over the front of the site and may attract more cars nearer the school.
- Similarly, with a drop off scheme, this may attract more cars to come closer to the school instead of spreading out over a larger area. This is why the drop off / pick up options were not supported.

The Committee discussed the application and whether more could be done to mitigate the additional traffic the school expansion would attract. Although several Members suggested that a drop off system would be unfeasible, it was considered that the problem of additional congestion should be considered in greater detail. It was believed that this site in particular presented a more significant problem than other school sites in the city.

The Planning and Highways Lawyer advised the Committee that the applicants were not required to mitigate pre-existing traffic problems, only that which was caused by the application.

A motion was proposed and seconded to defer the application to allow for more detailed exploration of traffic mitigating measures. The motion was carried eight in favour, two against.

**RESOLVED:** (eight voted in favour, two voted against) that the planning application be **DEFERRED**

### **Reasons for the decision**

In order for officers to explore possible traffic mitigation measures in greater detail.

## **5.2 14/00206/FUL – Land to the West of Williams Close, Newborough, Peterborough**

Councillor Harrington withdrew from the Committee.

The Planning and Highways Lawyer addressed the Committee and advised that the report contained an exempt appendix and if the Committee wished to discuss any information contained within this appendix, it should be considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting.

At its meeting on 22 July 2014, the Committee resolved to defer the consideration of the application on the grounds:

- To resolve concern about overlooking/loss of amenity from plots 14 and 20 to the neighbouring properties on Williams Close;
- To resolve highway concerns about the impact of the development of Soke Road;
- To enable a review of the viability appraisal.

The planning application was for a residential development on the land to the west of Williams Close, comprising of 42 dwellings, access, associated works and landscaping.

The main considerations were:

- Impact of Plots 14 and 20 on Williams Close
- Impact on Soke Road
- S106/ Viability

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Planning and Development Manager provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- Plots 14 and 20 had been relocated so that they were further away from the site boundary.
- The plans had been altered to provide a single access on to the eastern end of Soke Road, which was the wider section of road.
- The Section 106 Legal Agreement had been reduced to £15,000, however this was considered acceptable by the Section 106 Officers, following detailed viability appraisal

Mr Matthew Taylor, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Discussion had been undertaken with Planning Officers to address the Committees concerns.
- Plots 14 and 20 had been amended as well as the site access from Soke Road.

The Committee considered all their concerns to have been addressed.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

### **Reasons for the decision**

Subject to the imposition of 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 site was allocated for housing and its development would help meet housing need
- safe access into the site could be provided from Thorney Road and Soke Road and a new footpath link created.
- the development could be accommodated within the site without any unacceptable adverse impact upon the amenities of the neighbouring properties
- the development could be accommodated without any significant adverse impact upon existing landscaping
- the impact of the proposed development upon ecology of the site was considered to be acceptable
- the development would allow an acceptable level of amenity for the new residents including the provision of Public Open Space
- subject to further archaeological assessment the proposal not adversely affected any buried remains
- the site could be adequately drained

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policy CS1, CS2, CS8, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17, and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), policy SA6 of Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012), policies PP01, PP02, PP03, PP04, PP12, PP13, PP14, PP16, PP17 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Sections 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

### **5.3 14/00501/FUL – Land Adjacent to Haddon House, Brickburn Close, Hampton Centre, Peterborough**

Councillor Harrington re-joined the Committee.

At its meeting on 22 July 2014, the Committee resolved to defer the consideration of the application in order to establish whether satisfactory amendments could be agreed in respect of the access and to address the Local Highways Authority objection relating to junction design and access.

The planning application was for the erection of a foodstore on the land adjacent to Haddon House, Brickburn Close, Hampton Centre, with associated car parking and landscaping.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Planning and Development Manager provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- Access to the site had been addressed so that HGV's could now access without problem.
- The central traffic island had been extended to prevent vehicles from making a right turn onto the A15. Vehicles would be required to turn left and use the

roundabout.

- The officer recommendation was now one of approval, as all the Committee's concerns had been addressed.

Mr Alistair Close, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Section 106 Legal Agreement had been drafted at length and would be able to move forward if the application was approved.
- Mr Close wanted to thank all those residents that had supported the application and was happy to be able to offer 30 to 40 new jobs in the area.

The Committee were pleased to see that their concerns had been addressed and were content with the location of the site.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

The remaining concern that Members expressing at the July meeting could be adequately addressed.

#### **5.4 14/01025/HHFUL – 38 Audley Gate, Netherton, Peterborough, PE3 9PG**

The planning application was for a two storey side and single storey rear and side extension at 38 Audley Gate, Netherton.

The main considerations were:

- Design and impact on the streetscene
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Parking

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Principal Development Management Officer provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The neighbouring properties were staggered, in relation to the site. So number 36 was set back from number 38.
- Though the streetscene possessed an open quality, it was considered that this would not be detrimentally impacted, as a gap of 2.4 metres would remain between number 36 and 38.
- The proposal would not extend past the rear of number 36.
- Obscure glazing had been proposed on the first floor landing
- There was sufficient space at the front of the site to allow for three or four vehicles to park. As such, the loss of the garages was not problematic.

Councillor Arculus, Ward Councillor was unable to stay for this item but his representations were read out by the Legal Officer, which in summary were:

- The Councillor believed that the proposal was too large in scale and would reduce the light able to reach number 36, contrary to planning policy.
- The scale of the building would be inappropriate within the street scene, which was worth preserving. This was contrary to planning policy.

- The Councillor encouraged the Committee to reject the application.

Ms Joy Cowland, 36 Audley Gate, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There would be an impact on traffic. Four cars were currently on the site, this would only become more problematic when building work started.
- In responding to members questions Mrs Cowland said that the road was enjoyable to live on, with no overlooking and large amount of light. The proposal would result in a loss of light to her property, which would affect the wellbeing of her and her husband
- Ms Cowland was concerned about what would happen to their fence, which was attached to the building due to be demolished and expressed concern about any damage which may occur during construction.
- Concern was also expressed regarding the shared drainage system, if the proposal were to be approved.
- It was believed that the proposal was unnecessarily large.

The Committee discussed whether the proposal represented an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties or resulted in a significant loss of light. It was noted that officers believed the separation distances to be sufficient, however Committee would need to come to a decision on whether they considered this sufficient.

A motion was proposed and seconded that permission be refused, against officer recommendation. The motion was carried six voting in favour, four voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (six voted in favour, four voted against) that planning permission is **REFUSED.**

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

The proposal would result in a loss of light and would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, contrary to policy PP3 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

#### **5.5 14/01036/HHFUL – 14 Woodbyth Road, Peterborough, PE1 3PE**

The planning application was a revised application for one and two storey side and rear extensions at 14 Woodbyth Road, Peterborough.

The main considerations were:

- Character and Appearance
- Residential Amenity
- Highways

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused, for the reasons set out in the report.

The Principal Development Management Officer provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The garage on the property had already been demolished and approval for a different planning application had been granted in 2011. A further extension had been proposed and refused.
- The proposal was considered to be excessively large and not in keeping with the streetscene.
- It was believed that the proposal would be visually harmful and would have an overbearing impact on other residences.

Councillor Peach, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The property in question was the smallest property in the area, so it was believed objections regarding size and scale were unfounded.
- The residents of the neighbouring properties supported the application.
- The applicant was seeking planning permission in order to properly care for his elderly relatives.
- The proposal before Committee today was very similar to the application previously granted.
- The site was not in a conservation area, was not overbearing and would be in keeping with the streetscene. As such, it should be approved.

Mr Phil Branston, Agent, and Mr Shabbir Ahmed, Applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The permission previously granted, for a 4 metre ground floor extension and a 2.3 metre first floor extension, was abnormal.
- The current application would be squaring off the building and would not significantly alter the streetscene.
- Mr Ahmed would like to be able to look after his parents, as they looked after him. In order to do this, a larger extension was necessary.
- While a smaller room was feasible, it would not accommodate the mobility requirements of Mr Ahmed's parents.
- Parking was not considered to be a problem, as there was sufficient space at the front of the site.

The Committee suggested that the application was acceptable. It was not believed to be overbearing and, as there had been no objection from the surrounding residents, it was considered suitable. In addition, they did not consider that there would be any unacceptable impact on the streetscene, given the position of the dwelling.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, subject to condition requiring matching materials, contrary to officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED**.

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

The application proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the property, or surrounding streetscene. Nor would the proposal result in an overbearing impact on adjacent sites.

#### **5.6 14/01167/HHFUL – 204 Dogsthorpe Road, Peterborough, PE1 3PB**

Councillor Harrington withdrew from the Committee.

The planning application was for a proposed two storey rear extension, detached gymnasium / store, new front wall and new rear fence at 204 Dogsthorpe Road.

The main considerations were:

- Character and Appearance
- Area / Neighbour Amenity
- Highways
- Representations



It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused, for the reasons set out in the report.

Principal Development Management Officer provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- While it was not considered that the proposed outbuilding had an adverse impact on the surrounding area, it was officers opinion that the extension to the main property would adversely affect amenity.
- It was considered that the proposed boundary railings at the front of the property were too high and visually harmful.

Councillor Peach, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The application comprised of a small property on a large site. As such, an expansion should not be considered excessive.
- Those who have objection are a significant distance away and would not be effected.
- The Councillor urged the Committee to approve the application, as the family were in need of the space.

Mr Phil Branston, Agent, and Mr Mehmood, Applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The building at the bottom of the garden had been approved within a previous scheme.
- If the Committee were of a mind to approve the application, the applicant would be happy to lower the front boundary railing to 1 metre.
- The proposal included a flat roof to reduce impact on the neighbours. It was not believed a significant loss of light would be incurred.
- Mr Mehmood was seeking the extension to provide room for his daughters. It was not anticipated to be an issue, as the site was large.

The Committee discussed the overbearing nature of the proposal and suggested that the loss of light on adjacent properties could be quite significant.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given in the report.

## **6. Determination of Castor Parish Council's Application to Designate a Neighbourhood Area**

Councillor Harrington re-joined the Committee.

The Committee received a report which outlined the application to designate a neighbourhood area from Castor Parish Council, in accordance with the procedures contained in the adopted Peterborough City Council Statement of Community Involvement.

The Senior Strategic Planning Officer provided an overview of the report and raised the following key points:

- Neighbourhood planning enabled areas to have a greater say in the planning process.
- A Neighbourhood Order set automatic planning permission for a certain class of development in a particular area.
- Caster Parish Council were currently undertaking the first stage of the process with their application.
- The Committee could either approve, approve with minor amendments, or amend the application significantly, which would result in another round of consultation. They did not have the power to refuse the application outright.
- It was not considered that any amendments would result in a more appropriate area. As such Option A, approval, was recommended.

**RESOLVED** that:

1. The Castor Parish Council's application to designate a neighbourhood area is approved without amendment, and
2. That the neighbourhood area is not designated as a business area.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 4:47pm