



**RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON TUESDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

**5.1 18/01101/R3OUT - LAND NORTH OF THISTLE DRIVE STANGROUND  
PETERBOROUGH**

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officer recommendations and **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 for and 4 against) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

**REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

The proposal would result in the loss of open space that was available within the ward, which was deficient in open space, and had been contrary to Paragraph 97 of the NPPF (2018).

**5.2 18/01129/HHFUL - MOUSE COTTAGE 1 NORTH FEN ROAD GLINTON  
PETERBOROUGH**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**REASON 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:

- On balance, the proposal would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the site (including the non-designated heritage asset) and the surrounding Glington Conservation Area. The proposal was in accordance with Section 72 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policies LP16 and LP19 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

- It was not considered that the amenity of surrounding neighbours would be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP17 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).
- The proposed development would not unacceptably impact upon the trees on-site or immediately off-site, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP29 of the emerging Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) (2018).

**5.3 18/01495/HHFUL - 40 BROAD WHEEL ROAD HELPSTON PETERBOROUGH PE6 7EE**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

The application had not appeared to be detrimental to the street scene. There had also been no objection to the application for Ward or Parish Councillors. The revised drawings had also been an acceptable amendment to officers.

**5.4 18/00002/TPO - 291A THORPE ROAD PETERBOROUGH**

**RESOLVED:**

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

**REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

T1 Sycamore Tree was a mature and attractive tree. It was in good health and conservatively had 20-40 years lifespan. The tree made a positive contribution to the amenity value of the area.

The proximity of the Sycamore Tree to the dwelling at 291A Thorpe Road was not deemed a major concern and with regard to shading and seasonal nuisances these were no more than to be expected by any other tree subject to a Tree Preservation Order and therefore were not considered appropriate reasons for the tree's removal.