



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 8 FEBRUARY,  
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, BITTERN WAY, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chair), Hiller (Vice-Chair), A Bond, Dowson, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, Jones, I Hussain, Rush, Sharp and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Louise Simmonds, Development Management Manager

**46. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Brown. Cllr Rush attended as substitute.

**47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

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

There were no declarations of intention to make representation as Ward Councillor.

**49. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**49.1 21/01734/HHFUL - 40 Westwood Park Road, Peterborough, PE3 6JL**

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

- alterations to the principal elevation to create an enclosed porch;
- the removal of the existing garage and summer room and replacement with a ground and first floor rear extension.
- the ground floor rear extension with 3nos. roof lights, would have an overall depth of 12.8m providing an open plan kitchen, dining and living area. Part of the ground floor extension would project 8m beyond the first floor extension with a flat roof to a height of 3.3m. On the south (towards No.38 Westwood Park Road) this single storey height section of the ground floor rear extension would project up to the line of the rear wall of the existing summer room and to the north (towards No.42 Westwood Park Road) the extension would be cut back from the shared boundary line by 3.43m
- the first floor rear extension would extend by 4.7m providing 2 en-suite bedrooms. It would have a hipped roof to match the existing dwelling; and
- loft conversion for two en-suite bedrooms with rooflights.

The application is a re-submission with an amendment to the previous application reference 21/00832/HHFUL, which was refused in October 2021 for the following reason:

R1- Neighbour amenity The proposed development, by virtue of its siting, height, scale

and orientation of the single storey rear extension, would result in an unacceptably overbearing impact to the adjacent residential dwelling of No.42 Westwood Park Road. The proposal would result in significant overbearing impact to the immediate outdoor amenity area and main habitable spaces located to the rear of the property such that unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupants would result. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

The Development Management Manager introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report.

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

- This was a revised application set out by the applicant following the original application being refused by the committee.
- Although there were issues with the original application these had now been rectified and resolved satisfactorily.
- The plans showed that the extension had been scaled back and was now going to be an attractive addition to the street scene.
- The applicant had liaised with the planning officers to address the issues that resulted in the application being refused the first time.
- It was understandable that some of the objections raised related to the house potentially turning into a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) however the applicant had given assurances that this was not the case.

Richard Perkins, objector, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Many of the objections that had been brought before this committee previously still remained. There was no objection to the applicant developing his property there had been no communication made by the applicant despite a number of attempts to meet up and discuss the proposals.
- This new application was against LP17 for a number of reasons, including the boundary fence which was now 1.8m high. This affected the light into the property.
- The new application impacted on amenities and it was surprising to see officers accept the new proposals, especially as the plans were rejected last time when the extension was 3.2m high and was now 3.2m high. There were planning precedents that set this height at 2.4m.
- The boundary fence was just 23cm from the objector's ground-floor extension. It was noted that the plan was overbearing in terms of its height, scale and proximity to the property that it had an adverse impact on the family's enjoyment of the property.
- It was not acceptable to build closer than 1m from a boundary wall and this practice was not advised by surveyors.
- The committee were urged to take all of this into account when deciding on the application and it should be refused on these grounds.

Paul Sharman, agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included

- The previous application was refused by the committee as a single storey extension as this was going to be overbearing on neighbouring properties.
- The one ground for refusal of the previous application had now been addressed and overcome.
- The applicant had the opportunity to appeal the decision of the committee at the last application which would have cost everybody a lot of time and money; but instead, they chose to listen to the advice given to him by planning officers and then amend the application accordingly.
- Planning officers had worked with the applicant and altered the application in line with these recommendations.
- There had been extensions granted for other applications on the same street that were larger than what was being proposed.

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

- Officers were now satisfied that the application was compliant with LP17. Committee members were reminded that the original application had been refused due to the massing and amenity loss to the neighbouring property. The current proposal had taken away some of this massing and was now satisfactory.
- The alteration made by the applicant was now acceptable and there were no planning grounds to refuse the application.
- The applicant could have appealed the last decision, however they had listened to the planning officers concerns and addressed these sufficiently.
- It was understandable why the objections had been made against the application, however the applicant had done all they could to comply with the officers recommendations.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (10 for, 1 abstention) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to other necessary conditions delegated to officers.

#### **REASONS FOR 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 proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Neighbours surrounding the application site would retain an acceptable standard of amenity, and is considered that on balance would comply with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would meet the Council's parking standards as required for dwellings of this scale, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

#### **49.2 21/01803/HHFUL - 39 The Green, Werrington, Peterborough, PE4 6RT**

The Committee received a report which sought planning permission for the construction of a first floor side extension to form bedroom and bathroom and to include internal alterations.

The proposed first floor extension would be sited above the existing ground floor study, with the front, side and rear elevations flush with to the ground floor footprint. With regards to the roof, an existing front gable would be extended to the width of the extension, with an additional gable to the rear. The window to the existing ground floor study would be reduced in size to match the proposed first floor window, which would serve a new bathroom.

It should be noted that this is a resubmission application of ref 21/01317/HHFUL, for which Officer recommendation was refusal. The application was withdrawn by the Applicant before the decision could be issued. This resubmitted proposal is largely the same, with the only change being a reduced sized window to the ground floor study.

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

- There was a property to the left of the application site that had an extension which overlooked a number of properties. The applicant was looking to build upwards over the single storey so that this would be level across the property.
- This property was 100ft away from the highway so it did not have an impact on the conservation area in Werrington.

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

- The application was simple in design and did not have any impact on the properties at the bottom of the drive as these were more than 35ft away.
- It was not acceptable to set the extension back 400-600mm as this would create an ugly looking property and required more work than what was being proposed.
- The purpose of the extension was to create an upstairs bathroom and one further bedroom. The property had been lived in for 16 years and the family felt part of the local community.
- It was not the intention to bring harm to the conservation area and it was difficult to see how this would affect the conservation area.

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

- If the applicant had agreed to the setting back of the extension it would most likely have had to include a mono pitch roof. This would also most likely have included some supporting structure.
- Historic England tended not to comment on household applications, instead leaving technical comments to the Council's conservation officer.
- With regards to the conservation area there was a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the conservation area with any development or alteration. If this was not the case it was automatically deemed harmful.
- Officers concluded that the benefit to the owner with this extension did not outweigh the conservation area statutory duty and did not enhance the conservation area for the benefit of the public.
- The house in question was a long way back from the main road and people would only be able to glance at the property as they drove by. It was felt that this therefore did not harm or impact the conservation area.
- The current flat roof for the single storey was more of a dominating view than if the property had a level roof across its entirety.
- A common sense approach was needed for this application and it was difficult to justify not allowing the extension to go ahead.

- Officers recommended that conditions be attached if the committee were minded to go against officers recommendations.

**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** (Unanimous) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to other necessary conditions outlined below to be delegated to officers.

1. Standard time limit
2. Compliance with the approved plans
3. Submission of material samples (N.B. this will likely be a pre-commencement condition given the nature of the development so will need to be agreed by the Agent before the decision can be issued)
4. Obscure glazing and non-opening windows (unless openable parts are 1.7m or more above floor level) to the side elevation

**REASONS FOR DECISION:**

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

CHAIRMAN  
1.30PM - 2.25PM