

**PETERBOROUGH**



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING**

**HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 30 JANUARY 2018  
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors Bull, Stokes, Clark, Martin, A Iqbal, Ash and Hiller

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Head of Planning  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor

**54. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Serluca and Bond.

**55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hiller declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in item 5.1 by virtue of knowing the neighbour of the application site. He explained that Members may not be aware that a fellow Peterborough City Councillor was the neighbour in question (said Councillor had not made any representations on the application).

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

Councillor Stokes advised that, with reference to item 5.3, upon legal advice, she would be withdrawing from the Committee and making representations as a Ward Councillor.

**57. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2017**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**58.1 17/02105/HHFUL - VINE COTTAGE, BAINTON GREEN ROAD, ASHTON, STAMFORD.**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking planning permission for the 'construction of a 1.5 storey extension to the front of the dwelling, to replace the existing garage structure'.

The proposal would project from the studio room by approximately 9.3 metres in depth and would measure 7.2 metres in width. A dual-pitched roof was proposed, with the proposed ridge to measure 6.1 metres high from the ground level. The space provided would accommodate a disabled bedroom, bathroom and garage at ground floor level, followed by carer accommodation at first floor dwelling.

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report. The Conservation officer had raised some concerns over the proposed development. The proposal would be too overbearing on the local area. Whilst there had been negotiations

between the case officer and the applicant it had not been possible to arrive at a revision that was acceptable to both parties.

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

- There was a need to breakaway from Planning Policy in order to take into account the needs of the applicants.
- Although it was understandable that the officers recommended refusal they had not sufficiently taken into account the disabilities of the person using the extension.
- The village as a whole and the parish council were supportive of the application.
- The individual who would use the extension had severe needs that required attending too on a regular basis.
- The street scene was varied and this application was in keeping with the varied scene of the village. Overall this design was better than what was currently in place and would be in keeping with the character of the area.

Mark Bennis and Mr Wreford, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The current timber building was to be replaced with a larger more practical building.
- This application had been specifically designed for a person who had severe needs and required 24 hour care.
- Raising the height of the roof allowed for better quality of care.
- The size of the additional extension was created to allow enough space for both the patient and carer.
- The extension would be screened on all sides and be in keeping with the local village.
- The application had received support from local residents and the parish council, neighbours had also supported the application.
- The applicant wanted to support the needs of the patient as best as possible.
- Loft space was restricted so there was a need to make it a certain size in order to get bedroom and living space.
- That the design might have to change with the integral garage becoming accommodation instead

The Planning Committee and Environmental Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- If permission were granted it would be unlikely that permitted development rights would be removed regarding conversion of the proposed integral garage to accommodation - this is because there is plenty of space available for parking.
- If approved the planning department would look at conditions on consent especially in regards to materials.
- A condition could be included that would include provision for the application site to not be included as separate dwelling or sold as such.
- It was perfectly reasonable to make this application. A varied street scene is more interesting.
- The application had support from the Parish Council.

- The medical needs were relevant and a need to deviate from the normal policy on such applications was necessary.
- The application was going to improve the life of a very ill lady and provide her with 24hr care.
- Lots of support from the Ward Councillor and the local neighbourhood.
- That in the light of the need to revise the scheme promptly consideration should be given to accepting and consulting on a revised scheme before permission is granted

**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 delegated to officers.

**REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

Proposal is not so harmful to the appearance of the street scene as to outweigh the benefit of the scheme to the occupant in need of care.

Reconsultation on revised plans (the proposed garage to become carer accommodation) and this not giving rise to any objections (otherwise it will return to committee)

Conditions as required being placed on the permission (to include restrictive condition re the extension not being used as a separate dwelling)

**58.2 17/01906/HHFUL - 11 ELMORE ROAD, NETHERTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE3 9PS**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to planning permission for a two storey side extension and single storey front extension.

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report.

Mr Phil Branston addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The latest drawings showed no drainage arrangement on the adjoining property.
- Overall the property was to be enlarged by around 30-40%.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Most of the houses had been extended around that area. The idea of the first floor and ground floor being of different sizes made it more attractive.
- There was no set figure for the maximum floorspace increase percentage that would render a proposal unacceptable. Officers would take each application on its merits. The Committee agreed that there was still plenty of garden space remaining.
- Neighbours concerned about builders gaining access to the land through their garden, they could restrict access to the building but then there were consequences for example the quality of the building work may lessen. This was not a matter for the Committee to determine the application on.

- The application was not adversely affecting the street scene from the front.
- Quite a few properties had large extensions. Objections from neighbour have been well documented.

#### **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 being delegated to officers.

#### **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 proposed extensions would not be detrimental to the general character and appearance of the immediate area of Welmore Road or to the amenities of the occupiers of the two adjacent dwellings in accordance with policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

#### **58.3 17/02255/HHFUL - 40 FARLEIGH FIELDS, ORTON WISTOW, PETERBOROUGH, PE2 6YB.**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking permission for a 1st floor front extension, to form an en suite.

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report.

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

- The property in question had been extended twice before and on one occasion was done permission was applied for retrospectively.
- The rear garden was without sunlight and would be completely overshadowed.
- The extension was not in keeping and would be placed awkwardly above the garage.

Cllr Diane Lamb, addressed the Committee (as the neighbour to the development and not as a Councillor) and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There had been over development of the area. People had suffered major loss of amenities.
- There would be massive overshadowing, photos in the update report showed overshadowing without the extension.
- Detrimentially affected the property from when the property was first built.
- The extension would be looking straight into the front garden from bathroom window.
- The application would deny light and privacy in front garden.
- Past alterations to the house had resulted in little sun getting to the rear garden.
- Parish council had already aired their views and do not support this application.

Kirsty Cleworth, applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Proposed ensuite was to adjoin eldest daughter's bedroom and create extra family space.
- The application should not be influenced by the fact the neighbouring property was owned by Cllr Lamb.
- Previous applications refused then been approved on appeal.
- Materials would match the existing building.
- This was to be a small first floor extension.
- The application was to be the last planning application made on the house as this was now sufficient for the family.
- The house was to be lived in for a long period of time and remain as a family home for a long time.
- Hedge of next door is 2.1m high and the extension would be behind this hedge.
- Ensuite bathroom window would use obscured glazing.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Ridge line of the proposed roof sits below existing ridge line.
- Front gardens were generally not private gardens and was not clear that this extension would be a major issue. Addition of en suite won't make major impact.
- Can't see the extra overshadowing of the application with extra en suite. The application may improve the appearance of the street scene and improve the property.
- The proposed extension was small and insignificant.

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 being delegated to officers.

#### **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 proposed extension by way of its design, appearance, size or form, will not unacceptably harm the character of the area or the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings; in accordance with policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

#### **59. QUARTERLY COMPLIANCE REPORT**

Head of Planning introduced the report. There had been a reduction in the number of cases coming through. Notwithstanding the reduced number of service requests, performance had decreased due to resource gaps. E.g the impact on the case closing rate. Speed of site inspections had also reduced.

A member of staff had been deployed to enforcement activity and the use of agency resource was being put into play. In terms of case outcomes 25% were resolved voluntarily and 50% after investigation found that there was no breach.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Committee noted past performance and outcomes.

**60. 17/00011/R4FUL & 17/00013/R4FUL - JOHN MANSFIELD SCHOOL**

The Head of Planning introduced the report. In summary when applications were brought to the Committee 81 affordable units were part of the s106 agreement, which was above the 61 minimum level.

However, since then cross keys had been successful in getting a grant for these extra 20 units. But wouldn't qualify as the s106 agreement was in place.

It was proposed that the S106 refers only to the number of affordable units required by Local Plan Policy while ensuring that the remainder of the units were provided by way of a condition in the contract of sale between the City Council and Cross Keys which would state that 81 affordable units had to be provided.

**RESOLVED:** (Unanimously) That the Committee agreed:

Provided the 81 affordable units are secured as a condition of the sale of the land by the City Council and / or by way of a restrictive covenant, the S106 agreement be such that in regard to affordable housing, it only refers to the provision of policy compliant levels of provision (61 units). Otherwise, the agreement shall refer to 81 affordable units in accordance with the Committee's original decision on the applications.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 3.05pm