



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 5 JULY 2016**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Bull, Hiller, Martin, Sylvester, Clark, Bond, Ash, and Bisby

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Head of Planning  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highways)  
Hannah Edwards, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Casey and Stokes. Councillor Bisby was in attendance as substitute.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were received.

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

No Members' declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillors were received.

**4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 26 April 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2016 were approved as a correct record.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**5.1 16/00349/FUL – Land to the East of Manor Farm, Nene Way, Sutton, Peterborough**

The Committee was presented with an application for the demolition of farm buildings on land to the east of Manor Farm, Nene Way, Sutton, and the construction of two dwellings together with associated works.

The Head of Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Jane Scriven addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Ms Scriven had owned Manor Farm for the past 25 years, which had previously included the application site.
- There was no objection in principal to the application, which greatly improved on the previous submission.

- There were two main points of concern. It was questioned whether activities that had been acceptable in the past would cause a nuisance to new residents.
- It was suggested that plot 2 be turned so that the main rear elevation did not face the neighbouring muck pile.
- Two windows on plot 1 were considered to overlook the neighbouring garden, which was currently not overlooked by anything.
- It was advised that Ms Scriven had tried to discuss these matters with the agent, with no success.

Richard Dunnett, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Following the rejection of a past proposal at this site by Committee, the development had been redesigned to address the concerns raised.
- New architects had been commissioned along with a heritage advisor, and discussions had taken place with the Council's Conservation Officer.
- The applicants had engaged with the Parish Council, who were supportive of the scheme, considering it to be a huge improvement from the last.
- The section of the development outside of the village boundary was the access and landscaping.
- The proposal would enhance the eastern approach to the village and, in doing so, would reflect a planning gain.
- It was believed that the objections put forward were overstated and that the neighbouring farm was purely a small holding.
- It was noted that the applicants did attend a Parish Council meeting, at which the residents of Manor Farm were also present.
- It was considered that the distances between the neighbouring property and the proposed development were substantial.

The Committee sought reassurance that due consideration had been given to the potential for loss of amenity with the application. The Head of Planning advised that such consideration had been given and that the scheme had been assessed in light of its rural setting, characterised by detached dwellings and spacious grounds. It was accepted that the proposal represented a change to amenity, however the distances provided for were believed to be acceptable.

The Committee sympathised with the concerns of the neighbouring residents, however, noted impact would be minimal. It was further noted that the proposal would improve the approach to the village.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The proposal was, on balance, considered to be acceptable 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 principle of residential development, the loss of the agricultural buildings and a small encroachment into the open countryside was acceptable in this instance;
- On balance, the impact on the Minerals Safeguarding Area would not justify a reason for refusal of the application; and was less intrusive than the previous 2014 scheme;
- The proposed dwellings were large and laid out to allow for good light penetration and no unacceptable mutual overlooking or overshadowing. Amenity space was adequate. Whilst the noise and smells associated with the farmyard/small holding use at the Manor Farm would be unacceptable to some people, it was considered that people buying the new dwellings could decide for themselves whether to live there;
- The separation distances would make unlikely any unacceptable impact on existing residents (Manor Farm) by way of overshadowing, overbearing impact or noise.
- It is considered that satisfactory access to the site and parking could be provided, and was in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13;
- The proposed dwelling and removal of the existing agricultural buildings would preserve and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and would not have a harmful impact on the significance of the adjacent Grade 2 listed building;
- The impact on trees, ecology and archaeology was considered to be acceptable, subject to conditions;
- The fall-back position for conversion of the exiting agricultural buildings to dwellings, as set out in the report, was unlikely to happen and was therefore afforded little weight in the Planning Authority's decision making.

## **5.2 16/00497/HHFUL – 20 High Street, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7LS**

The Committee was presented with an application for a front porch and single storey rear extension at 20 High Street, Glinton, Peterborough.

The Head of Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Parish Councillor Johnson addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Parish Council unanimously supported the objections of the neighbouring residents at number 18 and number 22.
- It was believed that the plan presented to the Committee was incorrect, as it did not include previous extension on number 20.
- It was considered that the proposal represented overdevelopment and would cause detriment to the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- The extension was believed to be around 35% of the existing building, which was believed to be a large increase.
- The Parish Council believed that the proposed extensions would be detrimental to neighbours and that the same weight should be given to adjacent properties as is given to the public from the front of the house.
- Including the summer house that was currently housed in the garden of number 20, there would be only a very small amount of garden left if this proposal was allowed.

Mr Grierson addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Grierson was representing the residents of both number 18 and number 22 High Street.
- No issues were raised in relation to the front porch proposals, it was purely the rear extension that neighbours were concerned about.
- It was believed that the proposal would block light in the neighbouring gardens and would impact on the character of the conservation area.
- The extension was considered to be very large, which was a concern because the property had already been extended twice.
- Even with the reduction in height from the original proposal, the development would have significant visual impact.
- It was believed there were numerous acceptable ways to extend the dwelling without these impacts.
- Mr Grierson expressed disappointment in the lack of communication from the new residents and that the Committee did not visit neighbouring properties during their site visits.

The Committee were advised that the potential detrimental impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties should be considered, and that the 'fall back' position of permitted development was not a key factor.

The Committee discussed the application and considered that the proposal did not represent a loss of amenity for neighbouring residents. The concerns of the neighbours were noted, however, it was not believed that the development would overlook either neighbours. The extension could not be seen from the main road, as such, the Committee determined that the proposal did not impact on the conservation area.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

#### **Reasons 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 proposed extensions would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the host building or street scene, and would preserve the setting of the Conservation Area, and would accord with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposed extensions would not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and therefore accords with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would not result in a highway safety hazard and sufficient car parking can be provided thereby according with Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

### **5.3 16/00590/FUL – Fitzwilliam Hospital, Milton Way, Bretton, Peterborough**

The Committee was presented and application for extensions to create new administration accommodation with theatre suite in Fitzwilliam Hospital, Milton Way, Bretton. The application also included an associated link corridor, new first floor level modular construction theatre store, and new single storey waiting area. Various internal remodelling works to the restaurant, physiotherapy department, and main reception waiting accommodation, and external works to create additional parking bays were also presented.

The Head of Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Carl Cottam, General Manager, and Jim Lomas, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Lomas considered the proposed extension to be a modest one, required in order to expand the work of the hospital and assist the community.
- The proposal was three storey, however at the point where the development neighboured residential properties, as a result of the landscape, the building was lower than the highest point of the existing building.
- A rationalisation of the hospital car parking was to take place. It had been calculated that even in a worst case scenario the proposed level of parking should be more than sufficient.
- No windows were proposed for walls that faced residential areas and it was believed that the separation distances provided for were generous.
- Noise levels were to be controlled via condition.
- It was considered that the cedar wood proposals would improve the design of the hospital and provide some natural relief.
- A mobile CT scanner would take up seven spaces in the car park, two days a week. It was considered that even with this, there would be surplus parking available.
- If necessary, additional signage for the car park could be looked into.

The Committee considered that the application addressed any potential concerns that could be raised, and congratulated the applicant on being a good neighbour.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Reasons 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 proposal would result in additional healthcare facilities and services which would be of benefit to the community of Peterborough, in accordance with paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- The proposed extensions and car park reconfiguration would not result in an unacceptable impact upon 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);

- The proposal would provide adequate on-site parking facilities to meet the demands of the proposal and, in the even that increased on-street parking results in a danger to highway safety, adequate measures can be implemented to address this, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposal would preserve the character and setting of nearby designated heritage assets, in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would not result in the loss of trees which are of key amenity value to the locality and adequate mitigating planting can be secured, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

#### **5.4 16/00671/FUL – 3 – 7 Oxford Road, Millfield, Peterborough, PE1 3BL**

The Committee was presented an application for alterations to 3 - 7 Oxford Road, Millfield, Peterborough, including a conversion to create an additional shop at ground floor, and eight one bedroom flats at first and second floors

The Head of Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Councillor Shearman addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- A number of residents had raised concerns with Councillor Shearman in relation to the proposals.
- The resident of number 21 Oxford Road raised objection to the proposals in light of the additional traffic they believed it would cause and the windows that would face directly onto their back garden.
- Councillor Shearman highlight the current traffic and congestion problems experienced on Oxford Road. It was believed that an additional eight flats would exacerbate these problems and would impact upon the whole street.
- The Councillor also raised the matter of the 'Can Do' area, which support the enhancement of residents' quality of life.
- The proposed development appeared to be cramped, of poor quality, and not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- It was suggested that the developer did not seemed to be concerned about the impact of the development, which would be a detriment in terms of design, parking, amenity of residents and traffic flow.

Daniel Coulling, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Coulling noted that the conversion and division of the existing building did not require planning permission.
- The proposal included modest external alterations, working mainly within the existing property footprint.
- It was not considered that the design would have any detrimental impact in relation to its scale or in terms of overlooking.
- The site location in a district centre meant that the proposal was sustainable and appropriate for local residents' use.
- The principal for flats above shops was well established. There would be nine car parking spaces, one for each flat and one for visitors.
- No first floor windows were proposed within the development. Two roof lights were outlined in the plans, however these would be too high to overlook anything.
- A transport statement had been submitted in relation to traffic. There was not going to be any increased use of the site and not there was no requirement to provide commercial parking within the community centre.
- The Committee discussed the permitted development on the site. The Head of Planning advised that the development had potential for 12 flats without planning permission. It was further advised that the only proposed windows that could overlook neighbouring properties were set too high on the roof to do so.

The Planning and Highways Lawyer advised that the unauthorised development referenced by public speakers was subject to separate enforcement action, and should not be considered by Committee.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The motion was carried nine voting in favour, one voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (nine voted in favour, one voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Reasons 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 retention of a retail use at ground floor level with the creation of residential accommodation above was compatible with the surrounding uses and the identified Millfield District Centre;
- The proposed first floor extension and external alterations would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP11 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the Peterborough Shop Front Design Guidance SPD (2014);
- The proposal would not result in an intensification of traffic movements to/from the site and would provide adequate on-site parking to meet the needs of the development thereby not resulting in undue impact to the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);

- The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would afford future occupants an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

#### **5.5 16/00861/FUL – 85 Mayors Walk, West Town, Peterborough, PE3 6EY**

The Committee was presented and application for an extension to three shop units at 85 Mayors Walk, West Town, Peterborough.

The Head of Planning provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Mr Shah Lal and Phil Branston, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Branston suggested that the front elevation of the proposal would not be significantly different.
- The area into which the extension would take up was originally left for car parking, which was no longer permitted.
- The development would remain subservient to the existing buildings.
- Mr Lal, as a prospective tenant, advised that the additional space provided for by the extension would ensure the development was more suitable for shop purposes.
- It was suggested that the proposal would still sit back from the lineage of the neighbouring buildings.
- It was considered that the objections raised were subjective based on design.

The Committee discussed the application and considered that the proposals were incongruous with their surroundings, and detracted from the street scene.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, as per officer recommendation, for the reasons set out in the report and update report. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report and update report.

#### **Reasons 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 set out in the report and update report.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 5:00pm