



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 23 NOVEMBER,  
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, BITTERN WAY, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chairman), Hiller (Vice Chairman), S Bond, Brown, Dowson, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, Rush, and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Alex Woolnaugh, Highways Engineer  
Nick Harding, Head of Planning  
Janet MacLennan, Principal Development Management Officer

**31. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrew Bond. Councillor Sandra Bond attended as substitute.

**32. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 19 OCTOBER 2021**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record save for the inclusion of Councillor Jones who was in attendance at the meeting.

**33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

Cllr Warren declared an intention to address the Committee on item 5.3 as the Ward Councillor.

**35. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**35.1 21/01151/R4OUT - Former Peterborough Market And Car Park Site Northminster Peterborough**

At this point Councillor Hiller left the Committee in order to speak on the item as a representative of the applicant.

The Committee received a report, which sought seeks outline planning consent, with all matters other than access reserved for the following:

- A residential development of up to 315 units. The indicative scheme shows a mix 20% one-bed two person apartments, 27% two-bed three person apartments, 25% two-bed

four person apartments, 15% three-bed five person apartments, 7% three-storey townhouse apartments, and 6% two-storey maisonette apartments.

- Two commercial units are proposed to the south of the principal building; one unit having a floorspace of 225 sqm and one unit having a floorspace of approximately 325 sqm with first floor roof terrace.

- A resident's courtyard (private open space) and enhancement to Laxton Square (public open space).

- A food and beverage pavilion approximately 100sqm within Laxton Square.

- Vehicular access to the site would be from Northminster leading to an external car park at the northeast corner of the site comprising approximately 50 car parking spaces.

A suite of plans supporting the application to illustrate the scale and layout of the development, as well as floor plans to demonstrate how the quantum of the development can be accommodated on site.

The indicative scheme provided shows a building with a 'k' shape footprint, comprising 10 storey elements located along Cattle Market Road and Northminster, with a three-storey north and south facing link building.

Parameters plans have been submitted in order to control the height of the development and proposed uses ahead of a future reserved matters application.

The scheme has been revised since the initial submission reducing the overall height of the development by 2 no. storeys from 39m to 33.3m and the number of units from up to 335 to up to 315.

A further round of consultation had taken place.

The proposed scheme would provide for Build to Rent accommodation. This type of development is defined in the NPPF as 'purpose built housing that is typically 100% rented out. Schemes will usually offer longer tenancy agreements of three years or more and will typically be professional managed stock in single ownership and management control.' In this case, the applicant proposes a specific type of Build to Rent scheme known as Private Affordable Rent where the rents will be maintained at 80% of local market rent levels. This is a type of affordable housing for rent, as defined in the NPPF.

The proposals under consideration as part of this application do not include for the relocation of the indoor market. This will be undertaken by the Council as part of its responsibilities as the landowner. A separate project is underway to provide for a new location for the market to Bridge Street, elsewhere within the city centre.

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the report and highlighted the key points in the application. Members were also directed to the update report which contained a number of revised and additional conditions and are outlined below:

The following conditions are amended:

C30 Prior to first occupation of the development, the proposed vehicular accesses on Northminster and Cattle Market Road shall be laid in accordance with the approved plans and hard surfaced and drained in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy LP13 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C33 Prior to first occupation of the development, the highway works along Northminster and Cattle Market Road shall be laid and constructed in accordance with drg. nos. PC1626-RHD-GE-SW-DR-R-1000 revision P04, PC1626-RHD-GE-SW-DR-R-1001Rev

P01, PC1626-RHD-GE-SW-DR-R-0052 (PG-01/02) Rev P02 and PC1626- RHD-GE-SW-DR-R-0052 (PG - 02/02) Rev P02. Reason: In the interest of highway safety and in accordance with policy LP13 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

The following additional conditions are added:

C41 Prior to first occupation, the existing accesses to Northminster and Cattle Market Road shall be permanently and effectively closed and the footway shall be reinstated in accordance with drg. nos. PC1626-RHD-GE-SW-DRR-1001Rev P01 and PC1626-RHD-GE-SW-DR-R-0052 (PG - 02/02) Rev P02. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy LP13 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C42 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, visibility splays shall be provided as shown on submitted plan PC1626-RHD-GE-SW-DR-R-1000 revision P04 and shall be maintained thereafter free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway. Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy LP13 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C43 No development above damp proof course level shall take place, until details of the Travel Information/Welcome Packs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Information/Welcome Packs shall include either one bus taster ticket from Stagecoach (the main bus provider in Peterborough) or a £50 cycle voucher.

David Turnock, on behalf of the Peterborough Civic Society and Bryan Martin, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Peterborough Civic Society did have a number of reservations over the development, especially in relation to views of the cathedral. However with the reduction in size of the application the Civic Society no longer had any objections in terms of height and massing of the development. The heritage of the cathedral was now maintained with this reduction in height.
- There were still concerns over how much regeneration this would ultimately bring to the city centre. It was noted however that the proposed moving of the market to the city centre would help with regeneration.
- In terms of the car parking proposal the 50 spaces were not enough. It was difficult to see how people could visit the city centre and be close to the main attractions with limited parking provision. If the parking was to be reserved for the flats this again was not enough for the proposed 315 units.
- Further clarification was also needed over how the affordable housing scheme would operate for this development.
- Based on the revised plans and conditions the Civic Society were now happy to support the proposal and no longer had any objections.
- Mr Martin, a local resident stated that this was an important decision for the city to take and would affect the residents for a number of years to come.
- It was too early to make a decision on this application. There had been no firm plans over the relocation of the market. It was noted that the public consultation on the relocation of the market had not yet closed and was only due to finish towards the end of December. What had been proposed so far for the market relocation did not seem appropriate and because of this the committee needed to refuse the application in front of it and wait for the consultation to close.
- This was an over development of the site and it only provided for one parking space for every six flats.
- If the application was refused the developer could take on board the comments

made and re-submit the application with a more modest development which would more likely gain support of residents.

- The proposed services plan would also be a detriment to residents of the city centre and cause disruption to people moving in and around the city centre.
- If the Council had secured the new location of the market it would overcome some of the objections, however only 50 car parking spaces and the servicing of the site was still detrimental to the residents of the city.

Mr Jeremy Good, Mr Howard Bright and Cllr Hiller, as applicants and agents, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Cllr Hiller as a board member for the Peterborough Investment Partnership (PIP), welcomed the comments made and the presentation from officers. It was pleasing to hear that the Civic Society had withdrawn their objection to the scheme.
- The key principle for the application was the regeneration of the city centre. It was hoped that the application would breathe new life into the area, as what was there currently was not overly attractive.
- The PIP had a vision for the future of the city and this was to try and create a new vibrant city centre. Conversations with the officers of the Council had shown that they also shared the same vision. It was hoped that the proposal would help invigorate the city with new hotels, bars, restaurants, offices and flats.
- The current site was an unloved area and so this was a new vision around Northminster. The proposal was for 315 affordable living apartments. There were also retail opportunities and parking provision for the flats. This was expected to be a great place for people to live and grow in.
- There were examples of new public open spaces within the development. At all times the applicant had tried to be as open and transparent as possible. A number of exhibitions and public consultations had taken place to show the residents of the city the proposals.
- If the application was approved the developers had hoped to be on site at some point in the New Year. Members were informed that this development was an allocated site in the local plan. In addition, there were proposed links to the heritage of the city.
- It was not very often that the skyline of cities was improved for the better, however, this application was an example of improving the skyline. Members were reminded that the PIP had also been the creators and visionaries for the Fletton Quays development which had improved the skyline of the city centre and was an example of what could be achieved with the city.
- With regards to the parking provision, it was important to note that the policy for parking in city centres stated that no parking needed to be provided. This was an exception whereby 50 spaces were being provided for residents of the development. There were further sustainable elements of the development, for example a number of electric car charging points were to be installed.
- The 50 car parking spaces were to be allocated to the residents of the development and would not be public car parking. People who wanted to live in the city centre were aware of the parking provision and could make an informed decision over whether the units would be for them. It was proposed that the parking spaces would be allocated to certain flats within the development.
- The trigger for delivery of contributions was to be set out in the S111 agreement but would eventually form part of the S106 when the delivery of this would happen. Further discussions after the application was approved would need to

take place over when the contributions would be triggered. Members were informed that the Council had five years in which to carry out any of the work that was required.

- Any reserved matters would need to go through further consultations and be agreed upon at a later date. This was an outline application, for which the access ways for the proposal were being agreed along with an outline of the site.
- In terms of the affordable renting this was not to be confined to a particular group. Anyone could apply to rent one of the apartments and would be advertised as such.
- The servicing of the apartments had been raised; however this was a city centre development and there were physical constraints. Highways had stated that they are ok with this and the applicant would work closely with them on this application.
- The waste disposal bins were a reserved matter, however one of the conditions addressed the need for additional information on this to be provided.

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

- Servicing arrangements for Northminster had been secured. This included provision of loading bays which were located near the bin collection areas. Cattle Market Road was to be used for the main servicing supply.
- Members were reminded that the waste management plan would be part of the reserved matters application. Condition 38 to this application asked for details of the waste management plan to be included at the next stage and how this was going to be carried out.
- The Highways officer confirmed that the applicant demonstrated that refuse vehicle could turn around on Cattle Market Road. There was to be no loss of disabled parking bays. Any on-street parking bays would be amended accordingly.
- There was concern over the demolition of the market at this stage as the public consultation on the relocation of the market was still open and was not due to close until the 21 December 2021.
- The process for relocating the market was separate from this planning application. There were also contractual arrangements that needed to take place over ownership of the land from the Council to the PIP. There were separate triggers that took place outside of the planning system.
- The demolition of the site was under a prior approval application and needed to be determined by a certain period. This would not normally come to committee as it looked at the method of demolition and how the land was to be left, rather than the principle of demolition, which was being decided on by way of the planning application in front of committee.
- When the prior approval application for demolition was presented, approval for this was needed within 28 days of submission which the Council had done in this instance. Members were informed that this did not activate the demolition of the site but merely allowed approval for the method of how this was to be demolished should the planning application presented by PIP be approved.
- The prior approval was a two-stage process, the Council in the first stage has requested to see details of how the site was to be demolished. Have asked the applicant to submit further information on this. Once this had been submitted officers would decide to approve or refuse the demolition and would take place in the next few weeks.
- Members were informed that the relocation of the market was served under

different legislation and it was believed that all market traders had been served notice to vacate the premises. The consultation was based on where the new market would be placed, so that the new market would be up and running sometime after the market holders had vacated.

- Members were made aware that although there was some link between the application and the relocation of the market they were separate from each other and members needed to decide on the application in front of them and whether to agree to the outline planning permission being sought by the applicant.
- Some member expressed concern that the Council was giving consent to demolish something that has not been agreed as to where it was moving or why it was moving. There had been no final confirmation over whether the market traders or public were happy with the proposed move.
- In terms of car parking provision members were drawn to a number of conditions, mainly condition 31, requiring a car parking management plan, condition 39, requiring a travel plan and condition 43, requiring travel packs for new residents.
- There were rare circumstances whereby the Secretary of state could call in a planning application and a planning inspector could make a final decision. This tended to be for the most significant schemes in the country. However, private individuals had the ability to make a request to ask the Secretary of State to make a final determination.
- In overall terms it was difficult to make a decision on the application. There were a number of questions and reservations which had been covered off, especially in terms of parking provision and the provision for affordable rent which would assist with the housing needs in the city centre.
- There were real concerns over the future of the market stalls and traders. It had seemed that this had been an afterthought. There were no firm plans over the relocation of the market. It was concerning that a demolition order was going through the process of being approved before a public consultation had finished. At this stage the application had been submitted too early for a final determination to be made.
- The consultation was about where the market was going to go rather than the market staying. The applicant had submitted the demolition order so that this could be put in place should the application be given approval today.
- Members agreed that there was a need to see an improvement in the Northminster area. Other large cities had good markets in central locations.
- This scheme should be welcomed, it was acknowledged that this was an outline application and that reserved matters would come back to committee at a later stage. Regeneration was required for the area and this was a high-quality scheme which would provide affordable housing.
- There was no impact to highway and the conservation area. There had been provision for car parking which was an extra for some of the residents. It was pleasing to see that the Civic Society were supportive of the scheme.
- Ward Councillors had raised concerns over the market, however, the proposal that had been mentioned for the market going forward looked acceptable and in that instance the proposal was an improvement for the area.
- It would have been good to see a provision for local residents getting first refusal on the affordable units. Members were informed that this was an open rental scheme and had to be made available to anyone to rent
- The proposal being suggested that the market be relocated to the centre of the city was a good idea. Scrutiny committee members had voted in favour of the market relocating to a central location. It would put this back at the heart of the city centre.

## **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 for, 2 abstentions) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to the application not being called-in for determination by the Secretary of State and that the legal agreement and relevant conditions be delegated to officers.

## **REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, and the securing of the planning obligations through a legal agreement, 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 site lies within the Northminster Development Area, within the City Centre Core and the proposal would deliver a high quality development, which would enhance the vitality and viability of the city centre and stimulate further investment in the city centre; while at the same time would boost the supply of housing in what is a highly sustainable location. The proposal therefore accords with policies LP3, LP6 and LP47 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paras. 86 and 119 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposal is a 'build to rent' scheme and would provide a 100% affordable private rent tenure in accordance with Annex 2 of the NPPF (2021) and NPPG (2018); and will meet access standards and the changing needs of people over time in accordance with policy LP8 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2021);
- The substantial public benefits of this proposal would outweigh the identified harm due to the best views from Northminster moving forward to become a framed view, which is less than substantial. The proposal would not have an unacceptably adverse impact on the setting and significance of the Grade I listed Peterborough Cathedral, the Grade II Peterscourt or on the character and appearance of the Park and City Centre Conservation Areas and therefore accords with policies LP19 and LP47 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paras. 194, 197, 199 and 202 of the NPPF (2021);
- An programme of archaeological works would be secured to ensure that disturbance to buried archaeological remains is minimised and managed in accordance with policy LP19 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paras. 194, 195 and 205 of the (2021);
- Illustrative plans indicate a building of high quality design which would respect the surrounding context and has the potential to add to the local distinctiveness of the area and create a sense of place. Hence the proposal accords with policies LP16 and LP31 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paras 126 and 130 of the NPPF;
- The proposal would not unduly impact on the surrounding highway network. The site is accessible by a choice of means of transport the proposal would ensure that a safe and convenient access for all users would be available. Hence the proposal would accord with policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paras 110 and 111 of the NPPF (2021);
- Illustrative plans indicate an enhancement to the public realm and Laxton Square to the benefit of the visual amenity of the area, along with biodiversity enhancement in accordance with policies LP16, LP28 and LP29 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- Obligations would be secured for the enhancement of off-site Public Open Space in accordance with policy LP21 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposal has demonstrated that the site can be suitably drained, will incorporate SuDS into the proposal to reduce surface water run-off and adequate foul water treatment and disposal can be achieved. The proposal therefore accords with policy LP32 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and para 169 of the NPPF (2021);

- Subject to appropriate noise mitigation the proposal would provide a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupants of the development in accordance with policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- Illustrative plans indicate that the development can be implemented without any unacceptable adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity in accordance with policy LP17 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2021);
- Subject to conditions any contamination within the site will be identified and satisfactory remediation would be secured in accordance policy LP33 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and para. 183 of the NPPF (2021).

At this point Councillor Hiller re-joined the meeting.

### **35.2 21/00913/FUL - 197 Crowland Road Eye Green Peterborough PE6 7TT**

The Committee received a report, which sought to construct a detached, 4no. bedroom dwellinghouse. The existing static caravan would be removed and the proposed dwelling would be constructed over and across the existing slab.

The proposed dwelling would measure approximately 17 metres in depth by 12 metres in width. There are a number of different roof forms proposed to the dwelling, but the main and highest ridge of the proposed dwelling would be approximately 6.3 metres from ground level, with the associated eaves to measure approximately 2.5 metres in height from ground level. The existing hard standing to the front of site, used for vehicular parking and turning, and the existing garden to the rear of, shall be retained.

The Head of planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- The family had lived on the site for a number of years. There had been objections from local residents over the proposal. Furthermore, there had been no objections from any of the statutory consultees.
- There was no identified application policy in the Local Plan for this type of application.
- Members needed to bear in mind that this was more than just a caravan and needed to understand the family's situation in order to understand the reasons for wanting to build a brick house on the site.
- There had only been one letter of objection which had come from the local parish council.
- Local Planning policy LP11 allowed for permanent dwellings on open space. The family would accept any conditions imposed on the application if it allowed them to build their house.
- A brick-built home would be more environmentally sound than a mobile home. The replacement dwelling was more than twice the size of the mobile home.
- There were no issues over the size of the dwelling as it was needed for the family to grow into. Again, it was stressed that the neighbouring properties supported the application.

Kelly Smith and Tim Slater, applicant and agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The family had been living on the site for nearly ten years. The original mobile



unit was in a state of disrepair and the family's son had just been diagnosed with asthma, therefore this had to be taken away and a new mobile plastic unit was purchased which was currently on site.

- The current setup was not suitable for the family. The mobile unit was too small and the children now needed a more permanent setup. Although the family were a part of the gypsy and traveller community they had not been travelled as much over the past few years.
- The family had been a part of the local community for a long time and had a number of expressions of support over the application. This new home would also be more energy efficient.
- The planning system had failed the family and had been poor in developing solutions for issues such as this. The family wanted to play an even bigger part in the local community.
- There were no technical or policy objections made in relation to the application and members of the committee needed to view the circumstances of the family when making a decision.
- This application would not cause any harm to the local countryside and the material considerations needed to outweigh any local plan policies.

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

- Members could be minded to putting some weight to the fact that although this was in open space it did form a pocket of development and that the harm to the countryside would be modest.
- Members were informed that generally speaking there was an aversion to bricks and mortar developments within the gypsy and traveller community. It would be difficult to find another family to take on the development if this was made available. Members needed to take a balanced view of the needs of the family and planning policy.
- There was a danger that the property would be difficult to pass on. The committee could include a condition that the property could only be sold or used by another gypsy or traveller family.
- There was an understanding of why officers had recommended refusal, however there was a need to be flexible in certain circumstances. The needs of the family outweighed the planning policy. The family had been an important part of the local community and it would be unfortunate to not allow this application which would enhance the local area.
- This was an exceptional application and should be viewed as such. The circumstances of the family were relevant in this instance and needed to be taken into account. It would be a good idea to condition the application so that this property could only go to another gypsy and traveller family in the future.
- Members were informed that they did not need to put a condition on the property with regards to this being passed onto another gypsy or traveller family.
- There was a danger that if no condition was imposed this site would be lost forever to the gypsy and traveller community.

#### **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** (8 for, 2 against and 1 abstention) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to the restriction to gypsy and traveller occupation and other conditions delegated to officers.

## **REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

The proposal was acceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan.

### **35.3 21/01418/HHFUL - 54 Tollgate Bretton Peterborough PE3 9XA**

At this point Councillor Warren left the Committee in order to speak on the item as Ward Councillor.

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the following elements:

- A rear extension sited 0.5m from the northward boundary, with dimensions 3.8m wide x 8.4m deep and a flat roof with total height of 2.89m topped with a lantern rooflight, to extend the existing kitchen into the rear garden;
- A two storey side/front extension of dimensions 2.6m wide x 2m deep with a flat roof to accommodate a new WC and Lobby, with glazed entrance door and a window to front elevation on the ground floor, and provide additional floor space to existing bedroom on the first floor with a window above the proposed WC;
- A two storey side extension with staggered side elevation, with a maximum width of 3.25m and 6.45m depth which would accommodate a store room and an additional living room on ground floor and create additional floor area to existing bedrooms as well as an en-suite bathroom. The roof apex would be of the same height as the existing dwelling and the rear dormer would be extended on the east elevation; and
- A 600mm high brick wall with an inward opening gate along the southward boundary hard up to the back edge of the footway running along School Close.

All external finishing materials are to match the existing dwelling.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- The applicant wanted to create a family home. At the current time the property was too small and was in essence a two bedroom home as one of the bedrooms was too small.
- A nearby property had recently had a similar size extension approved. The applicant would accept any conditions that were attached to the application. The open space was not relevant to this application. It was difficult to see why there would be any objections to building close to open space.
- There had only been one objection to this on grounds of parking, however there was a garage space at the back of the property and parking space available at the front of the property. It was understandable that there may be concern over whether this was going to be turned into a house of multiple occupation (HMO), but this was not the case. The other objection was around building noise, however this would be carried out during the daytime.
- The site was on a junction, to which there was a school nearby. However, the flow of traffic was through the school and back out again rather than causing congestion at the junction.
- The person who spoke against the application did not mention the detriment to

the street scene when conversations were had.

- Members were informed that there was a mirror image extension to No.37 Tollgate.

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

- The essence behind the application was to build a larger family home. The family had lived in the property for 15 years. There were three children in the house and the bedrooms were not sufficient for the growing family.
- There was no flat roof to the side it continued with the roof line right across the property.
- There was a flat roof to the front of the extension and not to the side as was mentioned. The extension to the side was pitched to the front and rear of the property.
- The objector had concerns with original plans as the rear extension was going to the back of the property and connecting to the garage at the rear, which the objector felt was too long. The plans had since been changed to try and accommodate the objections.
- It was unclear as to why the objector still had the objections as it was thought these were resolved.
- There had been a number of neighbours who had stated their support of the application and were accepting of the need for the family's extension.

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

- The proposed extension was large and did take up a lot of space on the site. However, the design was attractive and there was an understanding of the family's position.
- There were concerns that this extension might contravene LP17. There were no concerns over the impact on LP16.
- It was understandable why planning officers had reservations over the application, however there had been only one objection to the proposal and a number of supporters.
- The biggest concern was over the lack of privacy by the removal of the brick wall. There needed to be some form of privacy for all parties before the application was acceptable.
- A further concern was over the roof element of the extension as this projected out into the path. A better design of this would make the application more attractive.
- Officers confirmed that a condition could be inserted that a 1.8m high boundary treatment was submitted to the local planning authority so that the issue over privacy could be overcome. This would need to be given permission as it would need to allow enough visibility for traffic.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officers recommendations and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 for, 2 against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to the submission of details for 1.8m high boundary treatment and any other necessary conditions delegated to officers.

#### **REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

The proposal is acceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations,

including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan.

At this point Councillor Warren returned to the Committee.

### **36. Appeals Quarterly Report Jul-Sep 2021**

The Committee received a report in relation to appeals to planning applications received from July to September 2021.

The Head of Planning introduced the report and stated that from July to September there had been three appeals decided, of which only one was allowed and therefore the performance figure was 33%.

With regards to three appeals, the applications in relation to Ivy Cottage and Cobnut Cottage were dismissed. The application in relation to The Bungalow, Buntings was allowed.

It was noted that thanks be given to the planning team for the results and the work that had been put into the appeals and the percentage of cases going to appeal were low.

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

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** (unanimous) to note the report.

CHAIRMAN  
1.30 - 5.15PM