

PETERBOROUGH



RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 28 NOVEMBER 2017

5. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

5.1. 16/01361/FUL - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF LAWRENCE ROAD WITTERING PETERBOROUGH.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions.

ACTION AGREED

It was agreed that the Chairman would write to the Government and Highways England in regards to the application and ask for consideration to be given to reduce the speed limit over a two to three mile distance to 50 miles per hour at the A1/Townsend junction of Wittering village.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

The accident data submitted showed that at the A1/Townsend Rd junction of the seven slight accidents over the five year period, none were as a result of vehicles entering or leaving Wittering junction. The updated traffic surveys and traffic distribution data, demonstrated that there was capacity at this junction to accommodate the development proposed. It also showed that for the 190 dwellings now proposed that there would be 38 less trips in the morning peak hour and 28 less in the evening peak hour than the allocated mixed use development (160 dwellings and 1 hectare of employment land). The data also showed that there was capacity at the A47/Oundle Rd junction to accommodate the development proposed. Therefore the existing A1/Townsend Rd junction had capacity to accommodate the development proposed and the impact on traffic flows would be less for this development than the previously allocated 160 dwellings and 1 hectare of employment land.

5.2. 17/01426/FUL - 53 HIGH STREET EYE PETERBOROUGH PE6 7UX.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached 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 proposal would provide six one bed residential units for persons with a physical or learning disability for which there was a demand within Peterborough. This would result in a significant benefit to the wider community, in accordance with Policy PP8 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment proposed would not result in an unacceptable impact to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, 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 preserve, and to some degree enhance, the character and appearance of the Eye Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of key listed buildings contained therein, in accordance with Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- the proposal would result in some degree of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants of number 12 Back Lane however it was considered that this harm was outweighed by the public benefit arising from the provision of housing to meet the needs of persons with physical and learning disabilities;
- safe access would be made for all users of the site and the proposal 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);
- the proposal would not result in harm to or loss of the adjacent protected beech tree which was of key amenity value to the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- 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
- the archaeological potential of the site was deemed to be negligible.

5.3. 17/01615/HHFUL - 8 BORROWDALE CLOSE GUNTHORPE PETERBOROUGH PE4 7YA.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

The planning application was refused on the grounds of it was too overbearing to the neighbours amenity and therefore it would be contrary to policy PP3.

5.4. 17/01753/FUL - 11 NORTHFIELD ROAD MILLFIELD PETERBOROUGH PE1 3QQ.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (7 voted in favour, 3 voted against, 1 abstained from voting) to **REFUSE** planning permission.

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.

The proposal would result in an increased demand for car parking from the site, in an area with an existing parking problem. The applicant had not proposed to provide any off street parking or drop off/pick up facilities for the proposed use therefore people were likely to seek on street parking. The increase in vehicle trips to the site and increased parking demand would be to the detriment of other highway users and may result in vehicles being parked in unsuitable locations on the adjoining public highway. This was contrary to policies PP12 and PP13 of the adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011. R 2.

The proposal by way of the number of expected pupils per day, would result in unacceptable noise disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, to the detriment of their amenity. This was contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

5.5. 09/01368/OUT - LAND TO THE NORTH OFF NORMAN CROSS LONDON ROAD PETERBOROUGH

RESOLVED:

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee considered the report and **APPROVED** (Unanimously) to extend the authorised delegation to officers to refuse the application if the S106 Agreement has not been completed by 28 February 2018.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

The application gave rise to significant infrastructure requirements notably in respect of school provision, community facilities, transport including public transport provision, affordable housing, open space, ecology and archaeology. In the absence of a S106, Agreement these infrastructure requirements were not met. The development was therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of policy CS13 of the adopted Core Strategy.

6 APPEALS PERFORMANCE 1 MARCH TO 31 OCTOBER 2017

RESOLVED:

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee considered and **RESOLVED** to note the past performance and outcomes.