



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

HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 18 OCTOBER 2022  
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chair), Bi, Jones, A Bond, Rush, Hiller, Hogg, Simons, Jamil, Sharp, and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead  
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Edna Johnson, Planning Solicitor  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Sarah Hann, Principal Engineer  
Shaheeda Montgomery, Development Management Officer  
Phil Moore, Development Management Team Leader  
James Croucher, Interim Principal Planning Officer

**21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hussain and Councillor Iqbal. Councillor Simons and Councillor Bi were in attendance as substitutes.

**22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations of interest were declared for the following agenda item 5.1 - 22/00823/Ful - L2 The East Of Bramble Close, Newborough, Peterborough, from Councillors Hiller and Simons

- Councillor Hiller was a member of the North Level Internal Drainage Board, however he had not discussed the application and the interest was non-pecuniary he would not take part in the decision: and
- Councillor Simons as a member of the North Level Internal Drainage Board, however he would stand down for the item as he was registered to speak on the item.

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

Councillor Simons declared that as a ward Councillor agenda for item 5.1 22/00823/Ful - Land To The East Of Bramble Close, Newborough, Peterborough he would represent Newborough Ward and was registered to speak on the item.

**24. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23 AUGUST AND 6 SEPTEMBER 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 August and 6 September 2022 were agreed as a

true and accurate record.

At this point Councillor Simons stood down from the Committee.

## **25. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

### **25.1 22/00823/FUL - LAND TO THE EAST OF BRAMBLE CLOSE, NEWBOROUGH, PETERBOROUGH**

The Committee received a report, which sought approval for the erection of 30 affordable homes with a new vehicular access onto Thorney Road and a pedestrian link to Hawthorn Close.

The application was a 100% affordable housing proposal, the applicant being a Registered Provider of affordable housing who had secured Government grant funding for the scheme.

The application had the full support of the Council's Housing Team. The 30 proposed dwellings would include:

- 17 for Social Rent properties
- 11 for Shared Ownership
- 2 would be offered on the Rent to Buy scheme

A mix of property sizes were proposed, which included detached, semi-detached, terraced and cluster homes which in combination would provide:

- 4 one-bedroom properties
- 14 two-bedroom properties
- 12 three-bedroom properties

All of the proposed new buildings would be two storeys in height, sharing a common palette of materials and modern contemporary design. Proposed onsite open space comprised of a play area as well as replacement landscaping to the Thorney Road frontage and incidental landscaping elsewhere within the site.

The Interim Principal Planning Officer introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report.

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

- There were concerns raised about the B1443 Thorney Road, and the Highways team had been aware of the concerns. It was therefore felt that the application would contribute further to the danger of the road, particularly where pedestrians used it and there had been no evidence produced to prevent road accidents.
- The site known as St Martin's Road, had 62 dwellings allocated to it and this included Bramble Close. Bramble Close had 42 homes, which should leave an allocation of 20 dwellings, so the application had been out of the ordinary.
- The application would access Hawthorne Close, currently a quiet cul-de-sac, which could present a disaster.
- The catchment secondary school, Aurthur Mellows was currently at capacity and it was questioned where the extra students would be accommodated.
- The design of the application would provide affordable homes for 126 residents,

and there was uncertainty about the provision of amenities such as bus routes and cycle and pedestrian services.

- The Parish Council had no issue with development of the site. The issue had been due to the lack of amenities required for the proposal such as the oversubscribed village schools and a Doctors Surgery.
- Concerns were raised over the provision of utilities such as electricity and sewage as the village had already suffered from several electricity and power cuts.
- There were concerns raised over how school children would cross the road as currently a footpath was located on the opposite side of the road to the site. This meant that school children would have to cross several roads, which was feared to result in further road fatalities.
- The current village bus service was inadequate.
- Western Power Distribution (WPD) had confirmed that the power cuts in Newborough Village had been due to demand in the village.
- A footpath was proposed through Hawthorn Road; however, the shortest route was to use Thorney Road and there had been a fear that children would use this route to access the shops and school bus.
- It was hoped that an adequate supply for electrical provision for the proposed development, would be in place to improve the power cut situations being experienced in the village, however, the Parish Council was not optimistic.
- Alternative schools in the area such as Norwood, had not thought to make provision for Newborough Village pupils. In addition, there had been no bus or cycle routes provided for access to that school.
- The nearest Doctor's Surgery was located in Eye and Thorney villages and currently it was too difficult to make an appointment. It was felt that the proposed development would exacerbate the issues currently being experienced.

Chris Taylor and Trevor Edwards, objectors addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The main objection was the in relation to access to Thorney Road. The Police carried out a speed traffic survey conducted in August 2019 for seven days. During that period, 85% percentile of the speed travelled by vehicles along the road was 47 miles per hour (mph) on a 30-mph restricted road and more than 91% of the 30,000 vehicles were speeding. The top speed recorded captured was 95mph and hundreds of vehicles that travelled down the road every day at 60 mph.
- Chicanes had been introduced on Thorney Road before the speed limit was reduced from 40 – 30 mph, however, this was not adequate due to the width of farm vehicles, which need to be accommodated.
- Thorney Road was a link road which joined the A47, A15 and A16, which routed around the city to join major artery roads, therefore, it was a very fast-moving road. A few weeks ago, a vehicle mounted the chicane and collided with the proposed entrance to the development.
- A further incident of concern had involved an infant child that had escaped onto the main road, however, was rescued by a passing motorised. The incident should be treated as a public safety issue and measures should be put in place to prevent anything similar occurring in the future.
- The site access proposed should be redesigned to remove the entrance on Thorney Road and change it to travel through to Hawthorn Close for both vehicles and pedestrians.

- The main concern raised was in relation to why 30 dwellings were required on the proposed site. There were 42 houses on Bramble Close on 1.8 hectares with 23 dwellings per hectare and there was 50% more per hectare proposed.
- Bramble Close was the most frequented hectareage in the village. There had been 820 dwellings, with 20 dwellings per hectare throughout the village, so it was queried why there was a need for 50% more per hectareage for Bramble Close.
- The pavement was in an inadequate state of repair and a further 60 people walking up and down would cause significant impacts. It was therefore hoped that the pavement would be renewed. Residents also wanted reassurance against their houses cracking due to subsidence, as pilling that had already been undertaken on Williams Close.
- The residents would be against vehicle access for the proposed Bramble Road site to Hawthorn Close.
- The density concern raised had been in relation to the impact on infrastructure.
- The inadequate state of the pavement had caused residents to walk on the road.
- Hawthorn Close residents had not been consulted by the objector in relation to an access point through that road. However, it was felt by the objector that an entrance at Hawthorn Close would be wide enough for vehicle and pedestrian access and would be safer than the proposed access through the Bramble Close development.
- One of the objectors would be content with a reduction of dwellings for the proposal.
- The safety issues raised in relation to pavements and antisocial behaviour issues had been raised with the Council and Parish Council for Bramble Close.

Mr Peter Wilkinson, the Agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposed development was embedded in the village of Newborough. There were housing developments on three sides on Thorney Road to the North.
- There was one derelict house near the site with bushes and fruit trees on the perimeter. These would be retained where possible, with the installation of a two-metre-high fence, which would be installed following consultation with the landowner.
- The scheme was for 30 affordable homes of one to three bedrooms. Other schemes on Bramble Close to the west had not offered any affordable homes.
- The density of the scheme was only 33 dwellings per hectare and had been appropriate for the site. Furthermore, the required privacy space, distance and parking standards for the proposed development would be maintained.
- The proposed development would provide a focussed view of the open space and linked pedestrian access through Hawthorn Close and was thought to provide a sense of place.
- The link through to Hawthorn Close was important, as it would provide a shorter connection to many amenities such as schools and shops. In addition, there legally was no space to provide a footpath adjacent to Thorney Road.
- All statutory consultees, such as Highways, drainage and education were content with the scheme.
- The development would also provide sustainability of commercial services such as the shop and pub.
- The developer would provide a financial contribution towards improvements for the speed calming measures along Thorney Road.
- The scheme was a grant funded proposal would provide much needed homes for

the Peterborough and specifically Newborough.

- The Highway Authority was satisfied with the adjustment made to the access road and avoided vehicles needing to hill start.
- The £20,000 contribution towards the speed restriction improvements would only be for the development, however, it would contribute to the £170,000 village wide scheme, which was felt by the developer to be a fair contribution.
- There could be a condition made on the proposal in relation to the method of pilling in order to prevent cracks to current homes in the area.

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

- Members were advised that the B1443 speed calming scheme had been considered by Highway officers,
- Installation of a path along the B1443 would not be feasible due to space currently available as well as the expense it would entail.
- Access proposed into the site had been similar to other developments such as Bramble Close. If the road was up for adoption, it could be considered in the future.
- Members were advised that the geometry of the vehicle access and visibility onto the B1443 road from the proposed site, had not caused Highway officers safety concerns for the type of road given the speed travelled of 30 mile an hour speed limit. The 30-mph limit on the B1443 would be adequate despite the 47mph reported in the traffic survey mentioned by objectors.
- Members commented that most of the concerns raised in relation to the proposed development had been satisfied, however they were concerned over the access onto the B1443 and whether the incline too high for vehicles exiting the site onto a notoriously busy road.
- The density of the development had not been an issue for Members and the affordable housing options were seen as a positive aspect to the proposal.
- The housing association was a well-established developer, and Members were confident that a high standard in construction would be maintained.
- The concerns raised by residents were understood.
- A condition in relation to the pilling would be welcomed by Members.
- It was felt that the proposed development would not contribute to the speed issues being experienced along Thorney Road and that the situation should be improved by the introduction of additional traffic calming measures.
- The electric power supply should be improved as the developer would need to implement connections to meet the national grid standards.
- The development would serve many families in Peterborough with an affordable housing scheme.
- There was a similar development in Eye Green with less garden space.
- It was a surprise to some Members that the application had only been for 30 houses.
- Some Members were concerned about the installation of a link footpath into Hawthorn Close as it could turn into a rat run for people frequenting the pub or using other facilities.
- Clarification was provided to Members in relation to several conditions. Condition 19 included in the application would cover the gradient for the access onto the B1443 carriage way and this would be undertaken at the build stage of the development. A condition could also be included in relation to pilling and agreed with the LA.
- Members were advised that the contributions towards traffic calming would not be set to £20,000 as previously advised by the Agent but would be an amount set by using the S106 calculation process.

- Members commented that it was hoped that all the road traffic measures that could be implemented, were done so, in order to make the proposed junction on the B1443 safe.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application as per the officer recommendation. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimous) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to conditions planning permission subject to conditions including an additional condition to control the method of piling to prevent impact on adjacent dwellings.

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

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The principle of locating housing on this site was acceptable and accordance with Policies LP2, LP3 and LP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The traffic impacts of the development were acceptable. The vehicular access point was established via the Development Brief. The design of the internal access roads was acceptable in principle and the development would provide sufficient car parking. The development was therefore considered to comply with policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The design of the new houses were considered to be appropriate for their setting and accordingly the proposed development accorded with Policy LP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The development would not have any unacceptable adverse impact upon any existing property and would afford the future occupiers a satisfactory level of amenity. The development therefore accorded with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The development would not have any unacceptable ecological impacts. New landscaping and habitats would be provided. The development therefore accorded with Policies LP28 and LP29 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The site could be adequately drained in accordance with Policy LP22 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

At this point the Committee took a short break.

#### **25.2 22/01007/HHFUL - 322 OUNDLE ROAD, WOODSTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE2 9QP**

The Committee received a report, which sought retrospective permission for an outbuilding with footprint 4m x 6.1m with 2.8m height to eaves, and 4.5m height to roof apex, sited next to the eastward boundary shared with No.320 Oundle Road. The outbuilding was finished in facing redbrick, with 1.6m overhanging canopy to front and white uPVC fenestration.

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

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

- The officer's recommendation to refuse the retrospective application on Oundle Road was supported.
- It was highlighted that local residents had issues with the application due to the overbearing nature of the extension, which had been in relation to LP17.
- An application for the extension had been submitted originally, which was refused. A further application was submitted for the installation of a brick shed to replace the old dilapidated wooden shed. However, the development was so much larger than what was in situ.
- The size of the old wooden shed had been the same size as the brick building installed; however, it was the roof that had made it overbearing with an overhang of 1.5m.
- There were only two out of the six neighbours consulted that had raised an objection to the proposal, however, it was felt that there had not been more because most residents were renting their properties in the area. Those that were renting were happy for their views to be communicated to Committee.

Councillor Imtiaz Ali, objector addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The application had been for a shed, however, the proposal had suggested more of a living space as the plans had included toilet, shower and insulation.
- The objector was no longer able to hit his golf balls into the area where the shed roof had been installed.
- The roof had completely closed off the views in the objector's kitchen.
- The outbuilding applied for had significantly impacted the objector's view and could be seen from front room, dining room, three bedrooms and front garden.
- It was felt that the residents survey conducted by the Ward Councillor had a good response level of 33%.
- The incremental development of the site had amounted to a 42 square metres extension, which was felt to be double the footprint of the main house.
- A secondary day room of 24 metres was felt by the objector to be too imposing on top of the 42 square metres, and for this reason it was hoped that the Committee would reject the application.
- The referral to Committee was made by a non-ward Councillor and it was felt that this should have been brought to of Ward Councillors attention. The Ward Councillors were of the opinion to agree with officers to refuse the application and therefore, should not have been called in to Committee.

Mohammed Akhtar, and his daughter addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The previous building was a shed, the building that had been constructed was of a higher standard. Unfortunately, it had been built slightly taller than a shed with a front canopy.
- The applicant had not accepted that a slightly larger building would be overbearing.
- There was a structure in 324 Oundle Road, which was felt to be larger and more overbearing. In addition, the properties on 320 and 318 Oundle Road, which had constructed large garages on the boundary of 322 Oundle Road. There had been other properties with similar large constructions. Furthermore, the applicant felt that it was unfair that the properties mentioned had been permitted, when his extension was being recommended for refusal.

- The drainage had been upgraded.
- The development had aesthetically improved a very unkempt area. Furthermore, the structure was not detrimental to the area and had been a great improvement to the surrounding area.
- The builders had made a mistake when constructing the day room, which had resulted in it being one metre taller and included a canopy which had not been in line with the plans.
- The applicant felt that the canopy had not affected the neighbours view due to the size of their own properties.
- An alternative application was not submitted as the applicant was unaware that the building would be too high.
- The space between the day room and the back of the house that had not been block paved and was not intended for further development and it was intended for a recreational area.
- The applicant had changed the doors, windows and the canopy to what had been originally applied for as he had changed his mind.
- The Council had given planning permission for a shed; however, the applicant had built a day room instead. A retrospective application was submitted to the planning department, which officers had refused. Subsequently, the application was called into Committee.
- The applicant had not changed the design format as the architect had advised that the plans were standard.
- The applicant felt that it would cost the same money to build a playroom instead of a shed.
- The height was the only change from the original plans and a toilet had been installed to accommodate his wife as she was not able to walk far due to medical reasons.

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

- The area on the site that had not been block paved would not be considered by officers as it was not part of the application.
- The permission was for a shed, however there had been substantial changes made to the design and the canopy had made the building appear larger than what it actually was.
- Members felt that there could have been an adjustment to the roof to reduce the size or design.
- Members had not wanted to set a precedence and approve the application and supported the reasons for refusal. The Committee had not wanted more retrospective applications submitted.
- The building had been constructed 1m higher with a 1.6m canopy, which was over and above what had been applied for.
- Members felt that Mr Aktar may not have been aware of the overbuild on height; however, the application was one that had been submitted and refused before. Furthermore, it had come back to Committee for a retrospective approval which Members also had issues with.
- The issue with the application was not that it had been retrospective, the issue was that the same plans had already been refused by a planning officer and had been built despite their decision.
- Some Members felt that there had been no evidence to contradict that the building was not overbearing.
- Members commented that they were disappointed that the Councillor that had called in the officer's decision for refusal and had not attended the meeting or



produced any supporting evidence for the call-in.

- The Members agreed with officers that the application was out of scale and design, out of character and had too much impact on neighbours.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application as per the officer recommendation and following a vote (Unanimous) the proposal was **REFUSED**.

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

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below:

- The outbuilding, by way of its siting, size, scale and appearance was at odds with the established character of the application site and wider area. It appeared unduly dominant and incongruous and failed to respect the character of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore resulted in harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the locality and was contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The outbuilding, by way of its siting, size and scale, which resulted in an unacceptably overbearing impact to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings. The development appeared as an unduly obtrusive and dominant feature for the occupiers of No. 318B Oundle Road, 320 Oundle Road, and 324 Oundle Road, harming the enjoyment of the garden area/outlook and to the detriment of occupier amenity. It was therefore contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

At this point the Committee took a short break.

#### **25.3 22/01217/HHFUL - 1 THORPE AVENUE, PETERBOROUGH, PE3 6LA**

The Committee received a report which sought planning permission to significantly extend the dwelling with a single storey side extension, two storey front and side extension with balconies to the south and alterations to the roof. The proposal was identical to a recently refused application (22/00212/HHFUL) with the exception of the front balconies which had been pulled back by 600mm. The applicant had not appealed this decision or amended the proposal to overcome all of the reasons for refusal.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- There were two things to consider, the provision of prestige homes under LP09 against the maintenance of a Special Character Area (SCA) under LP20.
- The Ward Councillor was not against people extending their properties, however, it needed to meet the requirements of the Local Plan.
- The SCAs around Peterborough were chosen for a reason and the park land affected by the proposal had been of important natural beauty to the area.
- The proposal, if agreed, could damage the look and character of the Thorpe

Road area.

- The common thread of diverse properties, constructed along Thorpe Road needed to be maintained.
- Under LP09, there was provision for large luxury homes to be converted and the conversation officer was not entirely against the extension of properties in the area, as there had been several properties altered. However, the proposed extensions or changes to luxury homes in the area needed to meet the SCA requirements of the area.
- The concerns made by residents in the area, had been in relation to massing, proximity to the neighbours and height of the proposed extension.
- The home could be extended into a luxury home, however the design needed to be reconsidered by the applicant and comply with the SCA of the area.

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

- The objector was speaking on behalf of neighbours at 188 Thorpe Road and 133 Thorpe Avenue.
- All of the Special Character Areas (SCA) in Peterborough highlighted in the 2019 Local Plan (LP) were designated for amongst other reasons, their architectural quality.
- LP20 stated that alterations should be sympathetic to the original building design and appropriate style to maintain character.
- LP20 sub paragraph c, stated that the development must respect the scale, massing, depth, materials and spacing of established properties.
- The Conservation Officer, had confirmed that the particular SCA, had an early to mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> century character. However, plans had been shared to show how the area was developed from the 1940's.
- Number 1 Thorpe Avenue was a good example of the 1940's character, built of a locally distinctive Stanford brick with unusual green glazed tiles. It had a varied roof line and an attractive frontage to Thorpe Avenue, which made a positive contribution to the SCA.
- The proposal was going to wrap the property with anonymous rendered finish with grey cladding and tiling.
- In order to accommodate the swimming pool on the northern side of the plot, the proposal would push the extension 11m into the garden on the southern side. This would result in a first-floor bedroom balcony 3.9m away from the bathroom window at 188 Thorpe Road. It was felt that despite a reduction in size, there remained to be a privacy issue for 188 Thorpe Road.
- Natural light would also be lost on the ground floor and utility room at 118 Thorpe Road.
- Concerns were raised as to whether the planting between the properties would survive a 3.9m tunnel needed to install the swimming pool.
- The neighbouring houses would be dwarfed by the proposed extension as the footprint would be doubled and the ridge height would be nearly 10m.
- There was scope to extend the property but following the existing style of the original building and sympathetic to the area.
- LP20 sub paragraph c, had been relevant and referred to a design policy for SCAs and would apply to both extensions and new builds.

Simon Machen, the Agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal was to provide a family home and was not a proposal from a developer.
- The house was not a listed building and was not included on the Council's list of Heritage Assets, which was not a protected properties list.
- The site was not on the Longthorpe Area and therefore had no statutory heritage protection.
- The house could be demolished within a 28-day demolition notice.
- It was felt that officers had given the level of weight afforded to a proposal within a Conservation Area, which was not what the Committee needed to consider.
- The Thorpe Road area together with the village of Wothorpe were designated SCAs within the LP. The primary purpose of the SCA designation was to prevent plot sub-division and to maintain the supply of large homes to support the recognised need for prestige homes in the area. The type of homes which businesspeople and entrepreneurs wished to live in.
- It was the large homes with large plots dominated by a tree canopy that defined the area. Furthermore, there was no predominant architectural style on Thorpe Road.
- The majority of properties on Thorpe Avenue was dominated by 1970's to 1980's manicured suburbia style. There were some old properties, however, the character of Thorpe Avenue was not 1920's in style.
- It was felt that the objections to the proposal were more in relation to a fear of change versus aspiration, innovation and recognition of the needs for a modern and diverse community.
- Peterborough was a University City where young people needed to be inspired and it was felt that most young people would want to live in a house with an extension that had been proposed, rather than a 1940's property.
- Planning Officers would be reluctant to accept a proposal to green tiles as an option for the roof material.
- The harm to a Conservation Area had been reconsidered by the Planning Officer, however, was no longer applicable.
- The site was screened by trees, hedges and had not been visible from the parkland area despite the Planning Officers comments. It was felt that the existing house would not be visible from the parkland.
- Officers had not raised a conservation issue for an identical proposal submitted in the area.
- The bathroom window visibility issues had been resolved with Planning Officers and was no longer a concern.
- The proposal was a substantial house on a large plot and similar to 188 Thorpe Road.
- It was a shock to the applicant to receive a planning refusal given that the Senior Conservation Officer had agreed with the proposal.
- Mr and Mrs Dalton's property had not been accessed by the applicant or agent in order to assess the application from their perspective, as it would be unusual to do so and there had been no invitation.
- A previous speaker had explained his view of the LP20 definition, however, that had not meant that all planners would agree with it.
- The property would be twice the size of the footprint, however there were only certain aspects of properties in the area that would be seen from the parkland.
- The view seen at the top and bottom of the parkland photographs had shown a small section of Thorpe Road. The pictures presented had not shown an accurate representation of Thorpe Road in its entirety as the view should show a row of

houses along that road. Therefore, the pictures presented had demonstrated a wider panoramic view of the parkland which gave a false impression of what could actually be seen.

- The bathroom window of the neighbouring property was obscured by a hedge. If the hedge was not present, the neighbour's bathroom would overlook the applicant's garden.
- From parts of the neighbour's garden, the proposed roof could be seen, however it depended on where they were stood in the garden as it could not be seen from their patio area, however, in other parts of the garden they would see a glimpse. The question was whether the view would cause the neighbours any material harm and the agent had believed it would not.

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

- Members were advised that the extension massing for 188 Thorpe Road and surrounding area would be detrimental and overbearing.
- The foliage in some seasons of the year would expose some of the properties on Thorpe Road could be seen from Thorpe Hall gardens.
- Members were advised that the reasons for refusal in relation to the conservation aspects had remained consistent during the process and there had been no deviation from that. The report stated that the application had no public benefit, which was the reason for the impact on the SCA.
- None of the properties that had been extended in the area were uniform, however, the existing property would be more prominent and not in keeping with the view.
- Members commented that the extension appeared to look more like a hotel than an extension to a home.
- Members felt that the paragraphs stated in LP20 related more to the design of an extended property and was not just related to sub-division.
- A modest extension had been more likely to be accepted.
- Following a site visit, it was obvious that the proposed extension would be overbearing to the neighbours at 188 Thorpe Road.
- The design was characterless and there had been no consideration to the SCA.
- The scale, mass and depth should pay regard to LP20 and it had appeared on the site visit, that the proposal would not meet the criteria.
- Members commented that a proposal that was more in keeping with the area would be more acceptable.
- Most of the houses in the area from the 1940's had been extended, and for that reason some Members felt that the proposal was acceptable.
- Members commented whether the impact on the area be acceptable. The character of the area was a SCA and should be maintained.
- The balcony had been accepted by officers; however, it was not acceptable to Members.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application as per the officer recommendation and following a vote (9 for, 2 against) the proposal was **REFUSED**.

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

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material

considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

- The proposal by virtue of its design, scale, height and mass, as well as the prominent corner plot location, would appear contrived, unduly dominant and obtrusive and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Thorpe Road Special Character Area, and the setting of the adjacent Longthorpe Conservation Area, contrary to Policies LP16, LP19 and LP20 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.
- The proposal, by virtue of its design, scale, height and mass, as well as its close proximity to No. 188 Thorpe Road, would result in an unacceptably dominant and overbearing impact to No.188 and its garden. The proposal would therefore have an unacceptably detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of that property, contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

CHAIRMAN  
1:30 – 5.00pm