

**Application Ref:** 13/01360/FUL

**Proposal:** Extension of curtilage of dwelling into paddock to enable the building of a two storey garage office and gym building, with associated excavations and re-profiling of ground levels, tennis court and lake.

**Site:** Compass Barn, Main Street, Ufford, Stamford  
**Applicant:** Mr Scott Weavers Wright

**Agent:** H A Architectural Services

**Referred by:** Head of Growth and Regeneration  
**Reason:** Level of Local Objection  
**Site visit:** 15.10.2013

**Case officer:** Mr D Jolley  
**Telephone No.** 01733 453414  
**E-Mail:** david.jolley@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **REFUSE**

**1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal**

**Site and surroundings**

The application site is a C18 barn with adjoining stable range which has been converted into a dwelling. It is located within the Ufford Conservation Area and is constructed from coursed stone with steeply pitched Collyweston stone roof with coped gable ends. The dwelling has large enclosed grounds with various outbuildings and paddock area to the rear.

**Proposal**

Permission is sought to change the use of the paddock to residential curtilage to facilitate the construction of a garage block, tennis court and lake.

The garage, office and gym building would be two stories, curved and measuring 27 metres wide at its widest point by 7.7 metres tall, 5.1 metres projecting above ground. The tennis court will measure 11m x 24m within a 18m x 25m area. The lake will measure approximately 64 metres by 25 metres, no information regarding its profiling or depth has been submitted with the application.

**2 Planning History**

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
13/01246/HHFUL	Canopy porch over entrance door and erection of external storage building	Pending Decision	13/11/2013
12/01563/HHFUL	Construction of tree house (retrospective)	Application Permitted	28/12/2012
12/00528/HHFUL	Construction of replacement garage and new stables	Application Permitted	25/06/2012

### **3 Planning Policy**

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

##### **Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

###### **CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

###### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

###### **CS20 - Landscape Character**

New development should be sensitive to the open countryside. within the Landscape Character Areas development will only be permitted where specified criteria are met.

###### **CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside**

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

#### **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

##### **PP02 - Design Quality**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

##### **PP03 - Impacts of New Development**

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

##### **PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

##### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

#### **Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages**

##### **Uff 1**

The design of any new building or an extension to an existing building should be sympathetic to its neighbours and in keeping with the village environment.

#### **Uff 7**

All new buildings and extensions should be appropriate in size to the proportions of the space available and should not overlook or dominate existing buildings and gardens or infringe privacy.

#### **Uff 10**

Existing open spaces and views should be retained. New development should not result in the loss of important open views, in particular, of the church, Ufford Hall and the roof lines and frontages of old buildings in the conservation area.

### **4 Consultations/Representations**

#### **PCC Conservation Officer (02.11.13) – Objects**

The conservation area boundary of Ufford was extended following the adoption of the conservation appraisal of 2009. This was done to reflect more of the important physical historical development of the village and relate better to historic field boundaries and reflect the landscape setting of the village.

The site the subject of this application was a former 'close' along with similar 'closes' to the north and south, all of which can be seen in the extract from the 'Enclosure Act 1799' below. Ufford village would have comprised a series of closes at this time, land farmed for domestic benefit. The landscape of Ufford was much affected by the completion of the enclosure. This site and adjacent paddocks are surviving remnant of the completion of the enclosure. Such remnants are extremely important and worthy of preserving. The site and adjacent land reflects the historic landscape that is part of Ufford; the land use at the time of enclosure marking an ancient settlement envelope.

From a heritage consideration the proposed works would harm the character and appearance of the Ufford Conservation Area and the application should be refused. The site is an important part of the historic landscape of the village marking part of the ancient settlement envelope. The application is also contrary to planning policy regarding development in the open countryside.

#### **PCC Minerals And Waste Officer (Policy) (30.10.13) - Objects**

I object to the proposal. The proposed development extends the curtilage of development beyond the Village Envelope and into the Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for limestone to the east of the village. The purpose of MSAs is to ensure that proven mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development. Policy CS26 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy states that;

Development will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated to the Mineral Planning Authority that:-

1. the mineral concerned is no longer of any economic value or potential value, or
2. the mineral can be extracted prior to the development taking place, or
3. the development will not inhibit extraction if required in the future, or
4. there is overriding need for the development and prior extraction cannot be reasonably undertaken, or
5. the development is not incompatible.

The application as submitted does not demonstrate any of the above, and is therefore contrary to policy CS26.

#### **Transport & Engineering Services (30.10.13)**

No objections

#### **Wildlife Officer**

No comments received

## **Drainage Team**

The use of soakaways is acceptable

## **Ufford Parish Council (13.11.13) - Objects**

- (a) The applicant is either unaware or chooses to ignore the fact that all the proposed developments lie outside the village envelope, which follows the eastern wall of the Compass Barn buildings. It does not even include the gardens to the rear between the buildings and the wall. All the ground between the buildings and the eastern boundary of the so-called "paddock" is classed as open countryside in which all building and development is discouraged, the only exceptions being certain agricultural buildings. To allow the building of a block of garages to accommodate 5 cars, with or without a basement gymnasium and offices, would establish an unacceptable precedent, particularly in a small village such as Ufford, which has retained its rural character throughout the centuries. The Local Development Framework supports the retention of village envelopes. A resident cannot determine where he wants the limits of the village envelope to be set.
- (b) Compass Barn is designated as a Listed Building which protects the entire property from inappropriate development.
- (c) The Compass Barn buildings, gardens and paddock are all at the very centre of Ufford's Conservation Area. The proposed developments would detract from the attractions of the old village rather than complementing and enhancing them.
- (d) There are serious omissions in the details given in the Design and Access Statement.
- (e) How can the lake be "naturally sustainable" as claimed? What is the water source? How is the water going to be held in? It appears that soil and subsoil is being moved round the site. Have boreholes been dug to ascertain the nature of the rocks and the depth of the water table? It is claimed that "it will be large enough to prevent dramatic water loss through drought". Has the surface area/depth ratio been calculated?
- (f) Aquatic planting details are required showing planting proposals at several different depths. There is a claim of "diversity" of aquatic flora and fauna.

## **National Grid**

No comments received

## **GeoPeterborough (Sites of Interest)**

No comments received

## **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 17

Total number of responses: 9

Total number of objections: 9

Total number in support: 0

**9 Objections** have been received in relation to the proposal, raising the following points;

- a) The proposal is clear domestication of agricultural land and foremost would require change of use.
- b) The proposed development is within the revised conservation area of Ufford
- c) That the proposed buildings contravene the policies set down within the Planning Statement and the Peterborough Local Plan insofar as the proposals neither reinforce or are compatible with the sense of place and relationship with the village and associated buildings
- d) That the agricultural land shall be designated "open countryside" with a presumption against development of housing or industry. Consequently any such development will blight the amenity and enjoyment of my property

- e) That the development obliterates the existing easement and right of access of National Grid utilities / transformer to the villages of Ufford and Barnack
- f) I am also exceptionally concerned for the welfare of the horses should the domestication proceed. The likely activities of shooting, golf practice, fishing and general social activity will undoubtedly detract from the quite grazing which is currently enjoyed and will impact upon the welfare of the horses.
- g) The proposed garage building, with a footprint of around 170 sq m is larger than most dwellings in the village and therefore out of scale with the character of a designated 'small village'. Also there are numerous omissions, anomalies and errors in the wholly inadequate plans and supporting documents.
- h) It will set a precedent for other landowners in the village to change their 'agricultural' land to residential. The conservation area needs to be protected and this proposal clearly ignores such status.
- i) This application appears to be part of a sustained process, seeking to spread domestic development and creeping urban development into the open countryside.
- j) The concentration of the proposed development is in fact located to the rear of Bluebell Cottage and the adjacent properties rather than to the rear of the applicant residence at Compass Barn, it is clear that the adverse impacts of the garage and tennis court have been moved as far as possible from Compass Barn itself and imposed on the existing neighbours.
- k) The LDF and national policy have an explicit in favour of sustainable development the scale and nature of the proposal in a rural location is clearly contrary to material planning policy and is not sustainable and therefore contrary planning policy.
- l) The proposal It is clear that there is a creeping domestication of the application site from what was formerly a rural paddock to a manicured grassed extension to the operational curtilage of the applicant's home. The change of use from agriculture / open countryside to domestic uses is development for which planning permission is required and it is apparent that this may already have occurred and as such it may be the case that this part of the submission should be retrospective.
- m) The change of use of the paddock is contrary to development plan and national planning policy. No statement of mitigation or justification has been submitted with the application to demonstrate special planning circumstances to override the planning policy presumption against this erosion of the countryside.
- n) Planning policies at both national and local levels seek to restricting development in the countryside to essential agricultural or genuine countryside activities. It is clear that the proposed development is for domestic purposes, and as such fails to comply with the provisions of PPS7. The same is true of the provision of the tennis court which is not a rural activity and as such should not be permitted in open countryside.
- o) It is certain that the proposed construction of both the tennis court and the garage block would lead to very significant changes of level in the vicinity of the development. It is requested that the application provide full levels and drainage details (as well as details for the disposal / removal of spoil) for this proposal so that these specific impacts can be assessed fully.
- p) It is certain that the proposed garage block would be lit with a significant walk from the garage back to the main house. The addition of domestic lighting into the open countryside would cause additional harm to the rural nature of the site by introducing light pollution to a rural area.

- q) The inclusion of the large office and gym indicate that the use of this block is intended to be both commercial and recreational which will increase frequency of the use and impact on the countryside and neighbouring properties. No details of lighting are provided with the tennis court. Please can you request the applicant to clarify this significant issue (as the introduction of lighting into the rural night is materially harmful to the character of the area)
- r) Operational development construction of the Lake. There seems to be no planning justification within the submission setting out the rationale for construction the lake on this part of the site, it appears to be for domestic purposes rather than agriculture (or legitimate countryside activities) and as such is contrary to PPS7. Notwithstanding the above, and given the topography of the site it is not clear how the proposed lake would be filled and the levels / extent of excavation necessary in order to construct as it appears to be on a slope within the site.
- s) The proposed garage block (including the office and gym) and tennis court would be situated on the skyline when viewed from the patio area of Bluebell Cottage; this is due to the change of ground level and the rising ground west east. The relative ground levels would make this a particular intrusive element which would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the garden of and aspect from the rear of Bluebell Cottage.
- t) The introduction of a tennis court close to the rear garden of my client will introduce addition noise and disturbance close to the peaceful patio area of his garden. Mr Tee of Bluebell cottage is undertaking an on-going programme of landscaping the garden and is working from the house up the garden. Within this year he is planning to re-landscape the top of the garden to incorporate a sitting out area to increase the amenity of this part of the garden as it enjoys evening sunshine and is remote from the noise of the road. The potential introduction of noise from the use of the garage block and the tennis court proposal would adversely impact on the enjoyment of this part of the garden.
- u) Adverse impact on Conservation Area The extensive garage unit with its high extensive roof and urban design will have an adverse impact on the character of the Ufford conservation area contrary to the Councils SPD 'Design and Development in Selected Villages' relating to Ufford and the provisions of Core Strategy policy CS17. The inclusion of the tennis court is also contrary to the aims of the above document which seeks to maintain the existing form and character of the village. Conclusion It is considered that the proposal as a whole is contrary to both local and national material planning policy and represents an attempt to expand the domestic activity of the house into the open countryside. In addition the garage / office/ gym will have a significant impact on the character of the conservation area and residential amenity of the residents of Bluebell Cottage and adjacent homes and as such is contrary to material planning policy at both local and national level.
- v) No justification for greenfield development as no housing is provided.
- w) The site is not a small holding, nobody earns a living from the site, no permitted agricultural development.
- x) There is already an existing pond on site. The main benefit of another lake would appear to be the creation of a significant source of soil for alterations elsewhere on site, of which no information is provided.
- y) The application form states no provision of sewage is required. Given the proposal this seems unlikely.
- z) The applicant is either unaware or chooses to ignore the fact that all the proposed developments lie outside the village envelope, which follows the eastern wall of the Compass Barn buildings. It does not even include the gardens to the rear between the buildings and the wall. All the ground between the buildings and the eastern boundary of the so-called

"paddock" is classed as open countryside in which all building and development is discouraged, the only exceptions being certain agricultural buildings. To allow the building of a block of garages to accommodate 5 cars, with or without a basement gymnasium and offices, would establish an unacceptable precedent, particularly in a small village such as Ufford, which has retained its rural character throughout the centuries. The Local Development Framework supports the retention of village envelopes. A resident cannot determine where he wants the limits of the village envelope to be set.

- aa) Compass Barn is designated as a Listed Building which protects the entire property from inappropriate development.
- bb) The Compass Barn buildings, gardens and paddock are all at the very centre of Ufford's Conservation Area. The proposed developments would detract from the attractions of the old village rather than complementing and enhancing them.
- cc) There are serious omissions in the details given in the Design and Access Statement.
- dd) How can it be naturally sustainable as claimed? What is the water source? How is the water going to be held in? It appears that soil and subsoil is being moved round the site. Have boreholes been dug to ascertain the nature of the rocks and the depth of the water table? It is claimed that it will be large enough to prevent dramatic water loss through drought. Has the surface area/depth ratio been calculated?
- ee) Aquatic planting details are required showing planting proposals at several different depths. There is a claim of diversity of aquatic flora and fauna. What exactly? How is oxygenation to be achieved?
- ff) It has to be mentioned that the applicant has not had a very good record in pond management. There was a very small natural pond on the spring line in the south eastern corner of the plot when the present owners bought it. Without asking for a survey of flora and fauna by the Wildlife Officer and without planning permission, the owner had it extended and all the unrecorded flora and fauna were lost. The pond dried up and was replaced by a larger pond with a liner to hold in the water. It is not known how successful it has been.
- gg) No information is given about the native hedge, tree and wild flower species which are proposed. A detailed planting scheme is requested. Does the owner know how difficult it is to grow wild flowers from seed?
- hh) Is it to have a grass or all-weather surface? What kind and height of fencing is proposed?
- ii) There are serious concerns expressed by all the neighbours, notably about the visual impact, for example the loss of open views and the tree species proposed for screening. There is a widespread concern that, if planning permission is granted, the developments will have a detrimental impact on the village environment as well as opening the floodgates to further incursions into the open countryside surrounding the village.
- jj) Contrary to the application the development could be seen from two footpaths.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are

- The principle of development
- The impact of the proposal on the character of the conservation area
- The impact of the proposal on the setting of a listed building
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings
- Minerals and waste safeguarding area

The absence of detail in the plans and accompanying submission, in particular the lack of proposed block plans, cross sections, levels information, planting specification, heritage statement and justification; Do not facilitate a full and proper consideration of an application that is close to a listed building and outside of a village envelope. Particularly it is a requirement of policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) that all development proposals that would potentially affect any heritage asset will be required to; describe and assess the significance of the asset and/or its setting to determine its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest; and identify the impact of works on the special character of the asset. Also required is a clear justification for the works, especially if these would harm the asset or its setting is also required and that the level of detail required should be proportionate to the asset's importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on its significance and/or setting. No attempt by the applicant has been made to provide any of this required information.

### **The principle of development**

The proposed development seeks to extend the domestic curtilage of Compass Barns to the east and construct a lake, tennis court and garage building. The land is presently open countryside and in agricultural land use classification. The land is outside the village envelope as defined in the adopted Peterborough Development Plan Documents. Policy CS1 states that development outside of the village envelope will not be permitted unless it is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and access to natural green space, transport or utility services. Clearly the proposal satisfies none of these criteria and the applicant has provided no justification for the development and it is considered to be contrary to policy CS1. The principle of development is not sound and cannot be supported by the Local Planning Authority.

The granting of this application would set an unwelcome precedent. Given that there is no justification for the expansion of the village envelope, any future proposals of a similar nature would be far harder for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to resist and the character of many of the villages could face further erosion and harm. Decision of villages is resisted at a local and national level and as such the development is unsustainable when considered against both local policies and the NPPF.

In addition to being unsound in its principle, the proposal also suffers from a number of issues in terms of both the information submitted with the application and its impacts upon character and amenity. These shall be discussed below;

### **The impact of the proposal on the character of the conservation area and listed buildings**

The purpose of village envelopes is to protect the open countryside by restricting new development to that essential for agriculture and similar activities. Without such a policy much of the land surrounding villages would inevitably take on domestic character and appearance to the detriment of the character of the village and harm the countryside.

The conservation area boundary of Ufford was extended following the adoption of the conservation appraisal of 2009. This was done to reflect more of the important physical historical form of the village and relate better to historic field boundaries and reflect the landscape setting of the village. The domestication of the paddock would introduce domestic paraphernalia into an undeveloped landscape, fundamentally changing the character of this part of the conservation area.

The paddock is visible from a footpath to the north and owing to the scale of the garage proposed is likely to be visible from the road to the front of the site. The domestication of the area is not compatible with the rural character of the areas surrounding the paddock and would result in an undesirable juxtaposition of natural and man made environments. The proposal consists of terracing of the sloped land and the construction of a tennis court which is completely at odds with the current paddock/agricultural character of the area. The tennis court may require high fencing and lighting and it is also possible that the garage and terracing will be lit. No information regarding these elements was submitted with the application and as such it is difficult to assess the full impact of the final proposal. The surface of the court is not stated, but regardless of surface it is



considered that significant harm will occur. These elements will further erode the agricultural character of the area, this loss of part of the natural environment is harmful and the proposal is considered unacceptable in this regard.

Lakes are not considered to be natural features within the nassaburgh limestone plateau and there are few if any natural lakes in the vicinity of the application site. The size of the lake, which is to be constructed on sloping ground would require the removal of a vast quantity of earth and would completely alter the gently undulating character of the surrounding area. A lake of this size, in this particular location is likely to appear unnatural and incongruous and harmful to the character of the wider area.

### **Impact of the proposal on the setting of listed buildings**

The host dwelling within the site is a large grade II listed building with outbuildings. The extending of the curtilage and the construction of the proposed garage and tennis court would detract from the significance of the principal listed building, in particular the garage who's above ground element would measure 27 metres wide by 5.1 and as such would impact wider views from public footpaths remote from the site.

### **The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings**

The garage will occupy an elevated position to the rear of the site, it is considered that this will result in noise and light disturbance to the occupiers of nearby dwellings as the sound from the vehicles entering and leaving the garage will be directed towards the neighbouring dwellings. As stated above no information regarding illumination was submitted with the application but it is considered likely that the area will be illuminated and this illumination, in its elevated position will detract from what is currently a dark area outside of the village area.

The tennis court will generate a significant level of noise when in use from both the noise of ball strikes and the noise from people participating. This noise will result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers of nearby dwellings. Any lighting of the proposed garage could be achieved without material harm to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. However flood lights for the tennis court would require planning permission and it would be unlikely that floodlights in this location would be approved.

### **Minerals and waste safeguarding area**

The site lies within a minerals and waste safeguarding area. Development in such locations can only be permitted where the mineral concerned is not of economic value, could be extracted prior to the development or when development is compatible if there is an overriding need for the development. The proposal satisfies none of these criteria and as such is considered to be contrary to minerals and waste core strategy policy CS26. Whilst it might not be the case that the applicant wished to see minerals extracted from his land in its current agricultural state it would act as a buffer between the dwelling and its curtilage and any extraction site beyond. If the application were approved this buffer would be lost and therefore a buffer would eat further into the safeguarded area.

### **Other matters**

A number of objections have been received in relation to the proposal, many have been addressed in the text above. Those not yet discussed shall be addressed below.

#### **(a) Drainage**

An objector has stated that no information regarding drainage has been submitted with the proposals. The drainage team were consulted as part of the application and consider the proposed use of soakaways as an acceptable method of surface water disposal. The foul drainage from the development could be conditioned to be connected to the adopted foul sewer

#### **(b) Electricity line consent**

An objection has been received stating that the proposal contravenes an easement and right of access for the transformers serving Ufford Village. At the time of writing no response has been

received from national grid in this regard. If such a limiting easement exists the granting of planning permission would not circumvent or override this easement.

### **(c)Horse Welfare**

The objection regarding the welfare of horses is not considered to be a material planning consideration in this instance as LPA has no policy under which to assess such matters.

### **(d)Justification for proposal**

An objector has highlighted that lack of justification for the proposals, in particular those of the pond/lake. Planning proposals of this nature do not require a justification to be provided unless the proposal is contrary to policy and a case is being made as to why an exception should be made. However the design access and statement includes the applicant's justification for the proposal. This justification is not accepted by the LPA.

Finally an objector highlights the lack of detailed planting plans for the proposal. Whilst this would be crucial were the scheme to be approved, such matters can be dealt with by way of planning conditions.

## **6 Conclusions**

The proposal is 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.

## **7 Recommendation**

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that planning permission is **REFUSED**

R 1 The proposal is outside of the village envelope and is not essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation, access to natural green space, transport or utility services. This is contrary to policy CS1 which states;

*CS1 - Development outside of the village envelope will not be permitted unless it is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and access to natural green space, transport or utility services.*

R 2 The tennis court, garage, office, gym, associated terracing and lake are not compatible with the open, undeveloped agricultural character of the area which is located between the Ufford village envelope and conservation area boundaries. The proposed developments by way of their scale, appearance, materials and location will result in development on land which is currently undeveloped appear incongruous and dominate wider views, when juxtaposed against the surrounding undeveloped land. The resulting loss of undeveloped paddock will be detrimental to the character of the Ufford Conservation Area. This is contrary to policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) which state;

*Policy CS16 - New development should respond appropriately to the particular character of the site and its surroundings, using innovative design solutions where appropriate; make the most efficient use of land; enhance local distinctiveness through the size and arrangement of development plots, the position, orientation, proportion, scale and massing of buildings and the arrangement of spaces between them; and make use of appropriate materials and architectural features.*

*Policy CS17 - All new development must respect and enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the area in which it would be situated, particularly in areas of high heritage value.*

*Policy PP2 - Planning permission will only be granted for development where the layout, design and appearance of the proposal:*

*(a) would make a positive contribution to the quality of the natural and built environment (in terms of its location, size, scale, massing, density, proportions, materials and design features); and*

*(b) would not have a detrimental effect on the character of any immediately adjoining properties or the surrounding area.*

*Policy PP17 - All development proposals that would affect any heritage asset will be required to:*

*(a) describe and assess the significance of the asset and/or its setting to determine its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest; and*

*(b) identify the impact of works on the special character of the asset; and*

*(c) provide a clear justification for the works, especially if these would harm the asset or its setting, so that the harm can be weighed against public benefits.*

*The level of detail required should be proportionate to the asset's importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on its significance and/or setting.*

- R 3 The tennis court, garage, office, gym associated terracing and lake would be visible in the foreground and block views of the sites listed building and other listed buildings within the village when viewed from public footpaths to the north of the village. The scale of the proposed development would result in harm to the significance and setting of the site and other listed buildings beyond. This is contrary to policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) which state;

*Policy CS16 - New development should respond appropriately to the particular character of the site and its surroundings, using innovative design solutions where appropriate; make the most efficient use of land; enhance local distinctiveness through the size and arrangement of development plots, the position, orientation, proportion, scale and massing of buildings and the arrangement of spaces between them; and make use of appropriate materials and architectural features.*

*Policy CS17 - All new development must respect and enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the area in which it would be situated, particularly in areas of high heritage value.*

*Policy PP2 - Planning permission will only be granted for development where the layout, design and appearance of the proposal:*

*(a) would make a positive contribution to the quality of the natural and built environment (in terms of its location, size, scale, massing, density, proportions, materials and design features); and*

*(b) would not have a detrimental effect on the character of any immediately adjoining properties or the surrounding area.*

*Policy PP17 - All development proposals that would affect any heritage asset will be required to:*

*(a) describe and assess the significance of the asset and/or its setting to determine its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest; and*

*(b) identify the impact of works on the special character of the asset; and*

*(c) provide a clear justification for the works, especially if these would harm the asset or its setting, so that the harm can be weighed against public benefits. The level of detail required should be proportionate to the asset's importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on its significance and/or setting.*

- R 4 The noise nuisance resulting from the use of the tennis court and garage and the light nuisance resulting from any lighting likely to be installed to facilitate the safe use of these developments will result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings; this is contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) which state;

*Policy CS16 - New development should not result in unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties.*

*Policy PP3 - Planning permission will not be granted for development which would result in unacceptable:*

*(c) noise and/or disturbance for the occupiers or users of any nearby property or land; or*

*(f) odour and/or pollution (including light pollution);*

- R 5 The site lies within a minerals and waste safeguarding area. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the underlying minerals are not of economic value, that they could be extracted prior to the development or that development is compatible with mineral extraction, or that there is an overriding need for the development. This is contrary to minerals and waste core strategy policy CS26 which states;

*CS26 - Development in safeguarding areas can only be permitted where the mineral concerned is not of economic value, could be extracted prior to the development or when development is compatible of there is an overriding need for the development.*

Copy to Cllr DE Over