



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 4 MARCH 2014**

Members Present: Councillors Serluca (Chairman), Harper (Vice Chairman), Hiller, North, Casey, Shabbir, Sylvester, Kreling, Lane and Harrington.

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Group Manager Development Management
Julie Smith, Highway Control Manager
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development, Highway Control)
Ruth Lea, Lawyer
Hannah Vincent, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Karen S Dunleavy, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Todd.

Councillor Kreling was in attendance as substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Harrington declared an interest in item 5.1 as he was the ward councillor for the application but stated that this would not affect his decision.

Councillor Hiller stated that he was a member of the Environment Agency's Regional Flood and Coastal Committee and the Internal Drainage Board who were consultees, but that he had not discussed the case with either of them. He also stated that with regards to Item 6, the conservation area in question was in his ward.

Councillor Kreling stated that she was the ward councillor for the area where the regional college was situated in item 5.2 but stated that this would not affect her decision.

3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor

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

4. Minutes of the Meetings held on 4 February 2014.

The minutes of the meeting held on 4th February 2014 were approved as an accurate record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 13/01471/OUT - Land to the South of Northam Close, Eye Green, Peterborough

Outline planning permission was sought for a residential development comprising 25 dwellings with 30% for affordable housing. It was proposed to provide 450 square

metres of the site area to be designated for public open space. The average density of the proposed development was approximately 22no. dwellings per hectare. The indicative master plan indicated that the majority of the buildings were 1.5, 2 and 2.5 stories. Vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access was proposed from Crowland Road between properties 102A and 104 Crowland Road.

As the application was for outline permission, matters relating to the design of the buildings, scale, layout, access to the site and landscaping were not for consideration as part of the application and these would be dealt with by way of a reserved matters application if outline planning permission was granted.

The Group Manager Development Manager addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Representations from the Council's recreation team had expressed concern about the lack of open space, but condition 15 in the report required a certain level of open space to be part of the proposal;
- The Wildlife Officer had requested a contribution towards the improvement of the nearby Eye Green gravel pit wildlife site, however since this was premised on open space concerns, an additional financial contribution to the wildlife site was not considered necessary;
- The site could be drained without any flooding risk caused nearby;
- Regarding pressure on school places nearby, the Council's education service had not objected and instead sought a contribution;
- The officer recommended adding an additional condition to secure the 20% lifetime homes required by council policy; and
- The officer's recommendation was therefore to approve the application subject to conditions outlined in the consultations.

Mr Andrew Middleditch, a Chartered Surveyor acting on behalf of the landowners, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary points raised included:

- All statutory consultees had been satisfied;
- Residential concerns would be addressed at a later stage in the application;
- Commitment had been made to secure financial contributions to be spent on enhancing education in the area;
- Members suggested including bungalows as part of the application to offset the problems with school places as these would attract older residents. Mr Middleditch stated that this would be looked at in a later stage of the application.

Debate was conducted around the matter in which the following points were raised:

- Senior Engineer (Development, Highway Control) stated that a nearby bus stop would need to be relocated as well as traffic calming measures and stated that he was confident this was possible.

A motion was proposed and seconded to approve the application, as per officer recommendation. A vote was taken and the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) to grant the application, as per officer recommendation, subject to:

1. The conditions C1 to C21 as detailed in the committee report; and

2. If the S106 had not been completed within 3 months of the date of the resolution without good cause, the Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason R1 as detailed in the committee report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the 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 site was allocated for housing and would provide housing to support the City Council's growth agenda;
- The development would not have any significant adverse impact upon highway safety and safe access from the adopted Highway could be provided;
- The development could be accommodated within the site without any significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the neighbouring properties;
- The development could be accommodated without any significant adverse impact upon existing landscaping;
- The impact of the proposed development upon wildlife and ecology of the site was considered to be acceptable;
- The development would allow for the provision of 450 square metres Public Open Space;
- The proposal was conditioned to mitigate against impact on archaeology;
- The site could be adequately drained;
- The proposal made satisfactory provision for affordable housing within the site; and
- The proposal makes a contribution towards the social and physical infrastructure demands that it will place on the area.

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policy CS1, CS2, CS8, CS10, CS11, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS19, CS21, CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) policies SA4 and SA5 of Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012), policies PP01, PP02, PP03, PP12, PP13, PP14, PP16, PP17 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Sections 4, 6, 10 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

5.2 14/00062/FUL - Peterborough Regional College, Park Crescent, Peterborough, PE1 4DZ

The application sought planning permission for the erection of a 6.4 metre high black fabric mesh fencing along the southern boundary of the playing fields of Peterborough Regional College, immediately adjacent to the Sports Hall building. The netting would be capable of being raised and lowered when the pitches were in use and it was proposed to ensure that the footballs and rugby balls were contained within the site whilst matches were being played, thereby preventing damage to the building adjacent. The total length of fencing proposed stood at 60 metres. The Group Manager Development Manager addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- There would be no views of the fencing in nearby areas;
- There would be no harm to residential amenity or the conservation area; and
- The officer's recommendation was to approve the application.

Councillor Peach, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- Representations had been received from residents in nearby areas expressing concern about the impact on amenity and the park conservation zone; and
- Not enough sports were carried out on the grounds to justify the proposal.

Members debated the application and the following points were raised:

- There was scepticism expressed regarding the impact, if any, that the fence would have on the conservation area and it was confirmed by officers that the proposal was not in the conservation area;
- The proposal was too similar as the last one to be necessary and was not in keeping with the nearby conservation area; and
- The proposal would not impact lighting.

A motion was proposed and seconded to approve the application, as per officer recommendation. A vote was taken, 9 in favour, 1 against and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED: (9 for, 1 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation, subject to:

1. The conditions C1 to C2 as detailed in the committee report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of 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 proposed fencing and netting would not appear incongruous or overbearing within the public realm and would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

6. The Deeping Gate Conservation Area Appraisal

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the outcome of the public consultation on the Draft Deeping Gate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and proposed amendments to the Conservation Area boundary. Members raised questions and comments, including:

- The Parish Councils were keen to have the document available to them.

All Members expressed their support for Mr Daley to take the report to the next stage.

RESOLVED:

The Committee:

1. Noted the outcome of the public consultation on the Deeping Gate Conservation Area

Appraisal;

2. Recommends that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Housing, Economic Development and Business Engagement considers and approves the proposed boundary change; and
3. Supports the adoption of the Deeping Gate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Deeping Gate Conservation Area

Reasons for the decision:

Adoption of the Deeping Gate Conservation Area Appraisal as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Area would:

- Fulfil the Local Planning Authorities obligations under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to prepare and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas;
- Provide specific Conservation Area advice which would be used as local design guidance and therefore assist in achieving the Council's aim of improved design standards and the delivery of a high quality planning service; and
- Have a positive impact on the enhancement of the Conservation Area by ensuring that new development in the historic environment was both appropriate to its context and of demonstrable quality.

Chairman
1.30pm-2.10pm

This page is intentionally left blank