

**PETERBOROUGH**



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

**HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 6 NOVEMBER 2018  
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors, Brown, Amjad Iqbal, Shaz Nawaz, Martin, Hiller, Rush, Stokes, Bond and Serluca

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Development Management Manager  
Amanda McSherry, Principal Development Management Officer  
Bryan Clary, Tree Officer  
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor

**Others Present:**

**24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hiller declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 18/01101/R3OUT - Land North Of Thistle Drive Stanground Peterborough by virtue of being a Director of Medesham Homes and would leave the room before the item was debated or voted on.

**26. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS  
WARD COUNCILLOR**

There were no representations to make declarations as Ward Councillor.

**27. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 16 OCTOBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

1:31pm At this point Councillor Hiller stepped down from the Committee for item 18/01101/R3OUT - Land North Of Thistle Drive Stanground Peterborough.

At this point the Committee agreed to extend the speaking scheme from five to ten minutes for item 18/01101/R3OUT - Land North Of Thistle Drive Stanground Peterborough

**28. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

## **28.1 18/01101/R3OUT - LAND NORTH OF THISTLE DRIVE STANGROUND PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application which sought planning permission for outline planning permission, with all matters (access, appearance, layout, scale, and landscaping) reserved for future applications, for the erection of up to 20 dwellings.

An indicative plan had been submitted in support of the application, which illustrated one possible way that 18 x dwellings each with two off-street parking spaces could be accommodated on site. However, Members were not being requested to determine the layout at this stage. In addition Members were informed that the site was often referred to as 'Tenter Hill'.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report. Issues highlighted within the update report included, residents' concerns about the loss of open space and the impact it may present to health and wellbeing, issues with alteration and closure of the bridleway, over development in the area, highway issues and school space availability. It was confirmed by the Development Management Manager that all issues raised would be dealt with under reserved matters should the outline application be granted.

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

- There would be a detrimental loss of open space in the area for residents.
- There seemed to be a lack of affordable housing applied to the application.
- Issues that may arise with parking in the area if the proposal was accepted.
- It was felt important for residents of all ages to have access to a recreation area.
- The land had been designated as common ground previously, however changes in land registry had meant that the land transferred to Council ownership.
- The land was regularly used by Stanground and Fletton residents and in particular the local Scout Group whose club hut adjoined the land.
- The ward had been 5.7 hectares deficient in park area and Planning Policy (PP)14 would be sufficient reason to refuse the application.
- The proposal had not been included in the forthcoming draft Local Development Plan.
- There were only four dwellings being offered as social housing for the proposed site, which had raised questions about why there had not been more allocated given the current housing shortage in Peterborough.
- Parking had been a current issue with access to the site restricted for residents attending clubs such as gymnastics, Therefore, building extra homes would exacerbate the issue.
- There had been a further online petition of over 230 signatures.
- Paragraph 97 of the planning and conservation act in relation to existing open spaces and recreation land outlined that an assessment should be carried out

to investigate whether the land was surplus to requirements and for this reason the application should be rejected.

- Families could be found playing games, picnicking and enjoying the calm and peaceful area.
- Tenter Hill had appeared in the local plan previously as a bio-diversity site.
- The area was used by elderly residents from Kingfisher Court.
- Councillors were expected to promote active lifestyles for residents and Tenter Hill was the only place in the area that could provide the opportunity to them.
- There would be extra pressure on local services, such as doctor surgery and schools created if the development was to be approved.
- There would be an increase in traffic which may cause hazards for the community centre and create pollution.
- Emergency vehicles had recently struggled to gain access to Wessex Close, which was close to Tenter Hill at Thistle Drive and this would be exacerbated by further houses being built. Therefore local road access was inadequate for the proposal.
- The development was too small to impact the housing need.
- Developments should have a positive impact on local residents and the proposal was negative.
- There had been 2,000 residents on various petitions in objection to the planning application, which was a good representation for the area.
- There were two further green space areas near the proposed development side, one at Chapel Street and the other at South Street, however, Children would have to cross the road to access them.
- Some of the area was unusable due to flooding, however had been good for dog walking.
- The only other open area was a floodplain and small sections adjacent to the proposed site.
- The proposals was granted, it would reduce parking for the clubs that take place in the adjacent building.
- The number of houses available for social rent outlined in the proposal would be four houses.

Pete Lumley, Scout Leader Third Nene Scout Group, Pat Corcoran, Roz Wright, Rachel Fisher and Simon Wright local residents addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Paragraph 97 of planning policy detailed that existing open space should not be built on unless an assessment had been conducted to confirm that the land was surplus to requirements.
- The proposed site was used by 100 Scouts meetings during each weekday evening and many outdoor activities were held on on the proposed site. If granted, the proposal would impact on Scouting activities in the future.
- When part of the area was designated as a bio-diversity area, 850 square metres had been set aside and regularly maintained by the Council in order for the activities to continue. There had been no mention within the proposal how the loss of space would be replaced as per paragraph 97 of the planning policy.

- There were currently drop of and collection traffic issues in the area, which would worsen with a reduction of road space.
- There had been no notice or publication of the proposed development placed in 2012 on the western boundary or in Stanground as a whole.
- The field flooded on the western boundary regularly and Anglian Water could be found pumping 32,000 gallons of water through the backwater that lead to Cambridge. If this area was to be blocked it could cause further flooding issues.
- The lock keeper would have no access to and from her property if the bridleway was to close during construction. It had been advised by the PCC Officer that a traffic order would be required and diversion provided and checked regularly during construction. However, a Highways engineer had recently advised that any diversion should be free of traffic and should be three metres wide. The revised proposed development plan had shown no allocation of bridleway and the entire length and width appeared to propose a highway.
- Parents, children, the elderly and cyclist use the Wessex Close Road regularly for access onto the bridleway and the site proposal would create extra traffic, which could cause a hazard for these users. There were 188 cyclist who used the bridleway each day.
- Tenter Hill had been designated common land since the 1700s, the land was registered to Peterborough City Council in 1995 and residents felt that this was to keep it in trust and not to be sold off.
- The Community Secretary had recently commented that local authorities should manage finances more effectively and not sell off parts of small green open spaces.
- Tenter Hill was a hill that dropped by six metres with the bottom of it flooding on a regular basis.
- There had been no notification received by residents in writing that the land had been designated for development within the 2012 Local Development Plan Document.
- There should be no development as there had already been a number of buildings placed in Cardea and Hampton further reducing open space in the city.
- The current lock keepers family had been living in the area since 1921. The basin previously used to graze farm animals had become a rubbish dump over time and would be contaminated land.
- The nearby appleyard had been donated to Stanground residents as compensation.
- The Scout Leader confirmed that there were activities such as compass training, team building and tent pitching and the Tenter Hill area was used for these activities. There would be no alternative open space available in the area to safely include 6-8 year old Beavers in the scouting activities.
- Scout meetings were held during term time and the Scout hut was also used as headquarters to prepare for camping events and had been used as a polling station.
- Access to the bridleway would be hindered during and after construction if the proposed development was granted. The bridleway was also used by organisations such as natural england and emergency vehicles.

Phil Blythe the agent, and Peter Hiller the Director for Medesham Homes addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal had aimed to provide much needed housing for the City, particularly in relation to affordable and shared ownership. The proposal was for up to 20 homes and had been approved in the Local Development Plan.
- There would be six houses allocated for affordable accommodation
- The application had been reduced slightly from the original allocation of 30 homes.
- Highway access to the development site would be submitted in a reserved matters application, which would be considered by Members at a later Planning Committee meeting.
- There had been a survey conducted at the time of site allocation before it had been included in the Local Development Plan and there had been no objections raised at the time of consultation.
- Paragraph 11 of National Planning Policy Framework had promoted approval of sustainable development without delay.
- The Authority's highways expert had not objected to the proposals.
- The bridleway would be retained under condition 15 of the officers recommendation for approval either alongside a future access road or separate arrangement.
- Waste collection would be accommodated under condition 16 of the officer's recommendation, whereas there would be a turning circle created within the proposed development.
- There had been no objection made by organisations such as Natural England or the Wildlife Trust.
- The site had already been approved for development and therefore public open space would not be a strong reason for Committee refusal. There would however, be open space accommodated through a section 106 agreement.
- The proposed site was not a protected open space and therefore, paragraph 97 of the NPPF was not relevant. There had been significant consultation undertaken on the Local Development Plan Document through Cabinet and Council in 2007, which had received over 4,000 comments, which had been a four year process.
- Parking would be considered under reserved matters and the scheme had demonstrated how parking would be accommodated for 18 dwellings.
- None of the comments received following consultation of the DPD had included concerns about the Tenter Hill site, however, it would be difficult to pinpoint comments made directly about the proposed site in the inspectors report.
- Medesham Homes would provide a minimum of six affordable homes and could possibly include the whole site.

2:32pm At this point Councillor Hiller left the room.

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

- There had been no objections received regarding the inclusion of the proposed development site in the DPD despite two exhibitions held in the Stanground area in 2008 and 2010. The main discussion at those meetings were made in regards to a rail freight proposal.
- There had been no information to identify what development sites Medesham Homes would apply for in the future. However, the land north of Thistle Drive was selected because it was Council owned.
- The Open Space Officer had objected to the proposed site in principle on the grounds of the loss of open space. Even though PP14 and NPPF 97 had been identified as a reason to object, Tenter Hill was an allocated site which had outweighed these reasons.
- Reserved matters would be applied for at the next planning stage. This application had been to propose the site for development in principle.
- A reserved matters application for the proposed development site would focus on the design and materials used to construct the dwellings and Members would approve the scheme, which would be in keeping with the area.
- The Authority had liaised with Natural England in order to mitigate any ecological impact on the Nene Wash area and £25,000 had been set aside to facilitate the provision.
- An assessment on the loss of open space would not be required as the site had been allocated as part of the Local Development Plan process.
- In other circumstances the loss of open space would be a material consideration and such an application would be refused, however the land was approved in principle during the DPD stage.
- There was no procedure to remove an allocated site from the DPD. The only way to do this would be not to include it in a future DPD.
- Medesham Homes would commission a survey to ensure that the proposed site was suitable for development. There would be conditions put in place through the planning process to ensure that land was not contaminated.
- The DPD consultation meetings were held in Stanground in 2008 and 2010, however the main public interest at that time was in relation to the railfreight interchange proposal.
- There had been no reasons why the proposed site had not been included in the emerging DPD, however, the Committee would be required to reach a decision based on site allocation in the adopted within the document.
- There was an archaeological condition attached to the planning application, which meant that the applicant would be required to undertake exploration test in the form trial drenching in the area. If the land was found to have archaeological significance, such as a Roman settlement, then the site allocation would be reviewed.
- The bridleway (known as bridleway three) leading up to the lock was maintained by the Authority and was not adopted highway. The bridleway formed part of the Greenwheel and should remain on its existing route. If there was a requirement to reposition the bridleway then the Town and Planning Country Act or a Highways act s118 and s119 would be invoked to modify the public right of way.
- The bridleway three route was in use for access to the lock, pumping station cottages and the Scout hut, however these were grant of access routes and not adopted highway. The nearest access route would be located on Daffodil

Grove and Wessex Close. Vehicles currently parking in the area were doing so on private road.

- Emergency vehicles were able access the private road leading to the lock keepers cottage, however there would be potential to improve access via Wessex Close, to widen the road, which was owned by the Authority.
- The bridleway had crossed Wessex Close, however, the final access arrangements would be considered under reserved matters.
- A s106 agreement would provide for provision for the loss of open space at Tenter Hill, however it would not mitigate the overall deficiency of open space in Stanground.
- Tenter Hill was an historic site, which dated back to 1800 century and was a valuable open space for the residents who had outlined the importance of its use for many recreational activities.
- Some members felt that despite the proposed site being included in the DPD residents views should be taken on board particularly in regards to the loss of open space. The construction of 20 dwellings had not seemed to be more important than the loss of open space.
- Some Members commented that if the Committee were minded to oppose the officers recommendations, then such a decision would likely be appealed. However, if a decision to go against officers recommendation was approved, then it was hoped the inspectors would appreciate the public opinion in respect of the loss of space and the fact that the site had not been included within the emerging DPD.
- Members had sympathised with the public objection over the proposed development application, however, there had been a stronger case in respect of planning policy not to oppose officers recommendations, despite the fact the allocation had not been included in the emerging DPD.
- Members commented that the reasons for objection in respect of open space, wildlife protection, access and parking had been addressed through officers responses. The confirmation of affordable housing provision had also been clarified within officers and the applicant's response.

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).

At this point Councillor Hiller returned to the room.

#### **28.2 18/01129/HHFUL - MOUSE COTTAGE 1 NORTH FEN ROAD GLINTON PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application which sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing flat

roof double garage and utility room, the erection of a two storey side extension; a double carport building and store to the front of site, and the conversion and extension of the barn to the rear of site.

The proposed two storey side extension would be constructed on the east elevation of the dwelling and would be an overall depth of 7.9 metres. The proposed front elevation would measure 4.3 metres in width. The highest point of the proposed roof would be 5.1 metres above ground level, with the eaves height on the frontage to be 3.6 metres high above ground level. The eaves height at the rear would measure 4.4 metres above ground level. Two dormer windows were proposed on the south roof slope, to serve 'Bedroom one'.

The single storey extension to the rear of the two storey extension would project approximately 8 metres in depth. Its overall width was 6.7 metres, though this would narrow to 3.3 metres at its furthest rear point. A mono-pitched roof had been proposed over the utility, hallway and kitchen, with a maximum height of approximately 4.1 metres above ground level and 2.4 metres to eaves height. A dual-pitched roof was proposed over the porch, with a ridge height of 3.3 metres and eaves height of 2.4 metres. Finally, the flat roof / first floor balcony over the remainder of the kitchen/patio area would measure approximately 2.2 metres above ground level.

At the front of site, a double carport building with store was proposed. The carport would be an overall width of approximately 7.8 metres and a depth of 5.9 metres. The adjoining store would encompass a footprint measuring 3.3 metres by 3 metres. A pitched roof was proposed, with the ridge height measuring approximately 3.9 metres above ground level and the eaves height 2.7 metres. The proposed pitched roof of the store would be lower with a ridge height of approximately 3 metres above ground level, and eaves height of 2 metres.

The existing barn to the rear of the site was proposed to be extended to both the north and south.

To the south, a timber structure (with 'open' sides) would project approximately 4.5 metres in depth and would measure 4 metres in width, to create a covered patio area. The proposed roof would be hipped, with an approximate ridge height of 4.4 metres and eaves height of 2.7 metres.

To the north, a one and a half storey and single storey extension was proposed. This would include an overall depth of 10.3 metres and an overall width of 4.1 metres. At its shortest point, the width had been proposed to be 3.5 metres. The proposed extension would provide a games room, bathroom and tractor store at ground floor. For the one and a half storey games room extension, the ridge height would measure approximately 5.6 metres above ground level, with an eaves height of 3.8 metres. The roof height dropped down to over the single storey tractor shed and bathroom extension, where the proposed ridge would drop down to 4.2 metres with eaves at 2.7 metres.



The originally submitted drawings of the proposed extensions and garage had been amended following advice from the Conservation Officer, along with corrections made to previous errors on the plans.

The proposed tree survey has also been revised, following the advice of the Tree Officer, to accurately represent the tree works proposed.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report and update report. The main issues highlighted were in relation to the impact on the conservation area, street scene the size of the proposed extension and garage, use of the barn conversion, concerns raised in respect of the neighbours Sycamore tree and the building materials proposed. The applicant had provided additional solutions with the aim to address the Glington Parish Council's concerns.

Glington Parish Clerk John Haste addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr John Haste was speaking on behalf of Glington Parish Council who was opposed to the application in relation to the scale, building materials, impact on streetscene and disregard of planning policy.
- The Mouse Cottage was a non-designated heritage asset in a conservation area and had been used previously as a farm labourers cottage, which was converted into a single dwelling in 1972.
- The proposed application would increase the footprint of the property by 60-70% and not 15% as outlined by the applicant. The barn would also increase in double the size and the garage and carport proposal was also of significant size. For that reason, Glington Parish Council had considered the application would result in over development of the area.
- Although the garage would be located at the back of the property, it would be seen by neighbours, therefore affecting the streetscene.
- Part of the proposed development, which would be constructed with the undesirable building materials, would be seen by neighbours.
- The planning officers assessment particularly on page 30 of the policy, which had stated that building materials used should be sympathetic to neighbours and the surrounding area and it had been felt that this had not been addressed by the applicant. Some concerns raised had been addressed by planning officers and Glington Parish Council would support the conditions recommended by officers such as C4 C5 C6 and C7.
- The proposed development would be visible to number three North Fen Road particularly the existing garage.
- There were barns in the area, such as the one attached to Manor Farm that were built from stone and not wood shiplap as proposed for the Mouse Cottage conversion.

Ian Hopkins the applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Hopkins and his family had lived in Glington since 2002 and owned three properties. The family were not however, property developers.

- Mouse Cottage was an old building which required substantial maintenance to rectify issues such as poor insulation, rising damp and old electrics issues.
- Great care had been undertaken when the application was prepared for submission. The applicant had consulted many architects, builders, the planning department and local residents to provide an acceptable proposal.
- Regretfully the applicant had not engaged with Glington Parish Council sooner and felt that they may have been more sympathetic to the proposal if consultation with them had been undertaken.
- The farm labourers cottage ceased to be a cottage in 1972 and had been converted into a single dwelling.
- The footprint increase to the main house was 15% and would ordinarily be permissible under planning rules. The increase in area alluded to by Glington Parish Council would be in relation to other areas of the site, such as the garage.
- The southwest elevation of the building would be fitted with door placement changes to ensure that it retained the workers cottage appearance as per officers recommendations.
- The original proposed development of the southwest side of the building had been abandoned due to the conservation officers concerns.
- The property was dwarfed by neighbouring buildings, that had already been extended beyond their original status.
- A pre-planning application process had been undertaken, which removed many of the original plans such as installation of dormers and a reduction in ridge height in order to accommodate the conservation officers recommendations.
- There seemed to be confusion over the streetscene comments raised regarding the garage and obstruction of the house, however, the proposals would not impact on the view of the house. It had also been felt that the garage proposal would hide the appearance of cars on the driveway thus enhancing the appearance of the property.
- There would be no loss of privacy to the adjacent properties.
- The two neighbouring properties were in support of the application once adjusted through the pre-planning process.
- The applicant would be in agreement to review and change material choices with planning officers and where possible, old material would be restored and utilised.

Mr Robert Johnson objector addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Johnson was a resident at number five North Fen Road and was in opposition.
- Mr Johnson's property abutted the back of the proposed extension.
- The extension of the barn would affect the tree roots.
- The condition had not mentioned the root protection of trees off site, which should be reviewed by officers.
- Extensions should be made from matching materials should be the same and not yellow ochre as per planning policy.
- A similar application in the area had insisted that original building material had to be used.

- The neighbour that lived at number three had not objected and the property at number five that abutted the land had not been consulted. The property either side of the proposal had been consulted.

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

- The planning policy 1-7 alluded to in the Glington Parish Council representation had been referenced on the last page of the report, however had not covered PP10 as this related to outside the conservation area and the proposal had made been for inside.
- Page 51 of the officer's report had outlined a plan to accommodate the impact on the neighbouring trees, which included a Sycamore and a condition had been attached to request a method statement on how the applicant would protect the roots during construction.
- Although planning policy had been specific about building material matches, in some cases that had not been possible. It had been felt that the site was quite well screened. The front extension would be built from reconstituted stone and rendered at the rear, however the building material condition could be reviewed by officers if Members felt that would be appropriate.
- The site could accommodate the alterations and extensions proposed.
- Although the application proved to be sensitive due to being located in a rural area, the owner had thoroughly researched and consulted on his proposals throughout the process to ensure that the extension would be acceptable.
- The building materials for the extension construction could be reviewed to ensure that they were sympathetic to the neighbour's and Parish Council concerns. In addition building materials to be used should be reviewed to ensure that the streetscene would definitely not be impacted.
- The applicant was in agreement to review the building material proposed for the extension work.
- Exceptional attention to detail had been paid by the applicant throughout the process.
- This was a family home to accommodate their needs and had not appeared to be extending with a view to rent out any part of the property.
- Consultation with the neighbour at number five could have been more effective.

#### **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 Glinton 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).

### **28.3 18/01495/HHFUL - 40 BROAD WHEEL ROAD HELPSTON PETERBOROUGH PE6 7EE**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application which sought planning permission for the following: The application sought planning permission for a single storey front and side extensions . It would project to the side by 5.8 metres and have a front projection of between 1.3 metres and 2.3 metres. The extension would encompass two gable ends to the front with a small recessed section in the middle. The overall height would be 5.1 metres (2.4 metres to the eaves). A new 1.80 metre high fence was also proposed.

All external materials were proposed to match the existing dwelling.

It should be noted that the proposal had been amended with the first floor element initially proposed omitted.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report. The updated report included a revised plan, which officers were in agreement with and would implement and condition appropriately if the Committee felt that the planning permission should be granted.

At this point the Committee agreed that Councillor Over would be permitted to speak as ward Councillor on the application.

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

- The proposal was a village concern and had been found to be acceptable to all residents, which had also included the Parish Council.
- The applicant wished to undertake the extension proposed in order to care for her elderly parents.

- The proposal had defined rural and village lives.
- Helpston had experienced lots of development and people had relocated to the area to enjoy village life.
- The application was a moral and social imperative and there was no reason to believe that the building would be sold or split into two properties.

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

- The applicant had lived in Helpston Village in 2000 and had raised her family in the house.
- The applicant's mother was wheelchair bound due to multiple sclerosis and her father had terminal Cancer. The bathroom design had been made into a wet room to accommodate the applicant's parents care needs.
- The applicant's wishes had been for her parents to live comfortable lives with the provision of their own rooms.
- The officer report had suggested a change to the front extension however, it would not accommodate for wheelchair requirements and was a fire risk to the applicant's parents.
- The annex and bathroom required to accommodate the applicants parents needed to be fully wheelchair and hoist compliant design with no lips or steps, and the officers recommendations had been contrary to this.
- Medical beds were required in the rooms and for that reason the size could not be reduced.
- Hoists and wheelchairs could not be store in the main house as they were required for use at all times of the day.
- The proposal submitted had allowed for the accessibility and care needs of the applicants parents as well as their independence, privacy and emotional wellbeing.
- An extra room for carers would be required if the applicant's parents lived in social housing, however there were no plans to apply for one.
- Planners had agreed to a 1.8 metre fence in order to obscure the street view.
- The applicant welcomed a condition to be placed for the property could never to be subject to subdivision.
- The neighbours and Parish Council were fully supportive of the proposals.
- To extend at the back of the land would cause significant drainage issues.
- It was intended that the applicant's grown children would live in the main house if the applicant had relocated to the annex in later years.
- The original two story extension was withdrawn due to planning officers concerns and the ground floor extension would accommodate the applicant's parent's needs.
- An award winning architect had been commissioned to draw the planning application together.

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

- A condition in respect of subdivision was not required as this would be undertaken through separate planning processes such as enforcement if necessary.

- Personal circumstances were not a planning consideration.
- The application had not been objected to by the Ward Councillor, neighbours or the Parish Council despite its proposed size.
- The application had not been detrimental to the streetscene.
- The original plan to also extend on the first floor had been amended by the applicant.
- The planning officers concerns had been considered.

**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.

**28.4 18/00002/TPO - 291A THORPE ROAD PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application which had sought planning permission for the following: A provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 18/00002/TPO at 291A Thorpe Road, Peterborough, PE3 6LU had been served following a 211 Notification (17/02082/CTR) which requested the removal of t1 Sycamore. The provisional TPO had been the subject of public consultation and as an objection was received, the Committee were required to determine the application in accordance with para 2.6.2.2 (f) of the Council's Constitution.

The main considerations were:

- Was the tree worthy of inclusion into a TPO in terms of public visual amenity value?
- Was the proposal reasonable and justified having regard to the objections raised?

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

- The tree had added purpose to the area and would do so in the future and therefore a TPO was appropriate.
- The owner would not be prohibited in maintaining the tree and this would be undertaken through a planning application process, which would be subject to no fee to the applicant.
- The tree predated the building and was around 30 years old.

**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.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 5:29 pm