



**RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 4 JULY 2017**

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**5.1 16/00080/MMFUL – Land Adjacent to Horsey Toll Farm, Whittlesey Road, Stanground, Peterborough**

**RESOLVED:** (unanimously) that planning permission is **REFUSED** subject to the conditions set out in the report and update report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The proposal is 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 below.

The proposal is considered as a waste management proposal outside an allocated area (CS18). Whilst satisfying one of the criteria for this policy, in making a positive contribution towards sustainable waste management, the lack of additional information prevents a definitive conclusion being drawn regarding its consistency with the spatial strategy for waste management. As such, it is correct for a precautionary approach to be adopted. The merits of the proposal, including compliance with aspects of national policies regarding the economy and rural diversification, the provision of renewable energy and moving waste up the waste hierarchy, cannot be satisfactorily weighed against the potentially negative impacts as they are not fully known. Such potentially negative impacts include:

- Alternatives. The consideration of alternative sites as required by the EIA regulations may demonstrate a more appropriate location.
- Ecology. The potential impact of lighting at the site, which is likely to be required, on protected species. The cumulative impacts with the restoration scenario for the approved Must Farm quarry. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policies CS15, CS27, CS34 and CS35.
- Landscape and visual impact. Residential visual receptors with views of the proposal. The cumulative effects of the proposal, specifically with the approved mineral workings at Must Farm. The potential impact of lighting at the site. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policies CS33 and CS34.
- Traffic, transport and highway safety. The ability of the highway network to accommodate increase in traffic. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policies CS15 and CS32.
- Noise. The residential use or otherwise of the caravan at Horsey Toll Farm needs to be established. The noise impact whereby the baseline has not been adequately established. The cumulative effects of the proposal with the operational scenario for the approved Must Farm quarry. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policies CS15 and CS34.
- Odour. The residential use or otherwise of the caravan at Horsey Toll Farm needs to be established. Also weighed into the balance is the information provided by the Environment Agency, which, whilst not objecting, notes that a large residential area may

be affected should odour be an issue. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policies CS15 and CS34.

- Floodrisk and drainage. There may be a sequentially more preferable site. Pollution potential during a flooding incident. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with paragraphs 100-104 of the NPPF and policy CS39.

- Heritage and Archaeology. The impact on known (designated and un-designated) heritage assets, including those subject to any requisite off site connection works. The degree of harm to Peterborough Cathedral. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policy CS36.

- Minerals Consultation Area – The cumulative impacts; associated with noise during the operational scenario for the Must Farm quarry; associated with the effect on groundwater flows; associated with both the operational and restoration scenarios from a landscape and visual impact perspective; and associated with the restoration scenario and ecological impact. The proposal is not therefore in accordance with policy CS27.

A number of additional concerns have been presented through the consultation process, which, whilst representing a depth of feeling in the locality, do not constitute material planning considerations.

## **5.2 16/02419/OUT – Land to the South of Oakdale Avenue, Stangroud, Peterborough**

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

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

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

- the application site is allocated for development in the adopted Site Allocations DPD (2012) and already benefits from an extant outline planning permission. Accordingly, the principle of residential development is already established in accordance with Policies CS2 and CS5 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy SA1 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012);

- the site is considered to be a sustainable location with acceptable connections to local facilities;

- the development of the site for housing will contribute towards ensuring that the Council can demonstrate a five year land supply going forward;

- the traffic generation arising from the proposed additional dwelling numbers would not pose an unacceptable danger to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);

- adequate provision will be made for the development to be readily accessible by all means of sustainable travel, with improved foot and cycle links as well as buses, in accordance with

Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);

- the layout, density and design of the proposal would preserve the character, appearance and visual amenity of the wider SSUE so as to not appear incongruous or at odds with its context, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);

- the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable degree of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core

Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);

- the development would adopt sustainable drainage systems to ensure that surface water drainage is adequately managed on site and discharged at a rate no higher than the existing greenfield levels. Accordingly, the proposal would not be at unacceptable risk from flooding itself, or pose an increased flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2012) and the Flood and Water Management Act 2010;
- the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to species of principal importance and would secure biodiversity enhancement, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- no trees of key landscape value would be harmed by the proposal, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to undiscovered buried heritage assets, in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- contaminations risks on the site will be adequately mitigated to ensure that no undue risk to human health or controlled waters results, in accordance with Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- whilst the proposal would not provide the requisite level of public open space as prescribed in Policy PP14 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), it is considered that adequate open space provision would be met to meet the needs of future occupants;
- the proposal would afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- whilst the proposal would not provide the requisite level of affordable housing as prescribed in Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), the Applicant has adequately demonstrated that the development would be unviable in such an event.

Whilst it is identified that some degree of harm would result from the failure to provide the policy requirements in terms of public open space and affordable housing provision, it is not considered that this adverse impact significantly or demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the scheme when assessed against other policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) or adopted Local Plan. Accordingly, and applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the proposal is considered acceptable on balance.