

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER 2017
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Harper (Chair), Casey Vice-Chairman (Vice-Chair),
Councillors Ash, Bull, Clark, Amjad Iqbal, Hiller, Serluca, Martin, Bond and Stokes.

Officers Present:

Amanda McSherry	Principal Development Management Officer
Lee Collins	Development Management Manager
Simon Ireland	Principal Engineer (Highways)
Louise Humphreys	Planning and Highways Lawyer
Matt Thomson	Senior Development Management Officer
Karen S Dunleavy	Democratic Services Officer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

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 PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON 4 JULY 2017**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate
record.

5. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

**5.1 16/01361/FUL - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF LAWRENCE ROAD, WITTERING,
PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning Committee received a report in relation to a proposal of a residential
development comprising of 190 dwelling with associated access roads and
landscaping.

The purpose of the report sought approval of full planning permission for 190
residential dwellings, together with access roads, open space and landscaping. The
190 dwellings proposed comprised 12 x 1 bedroom, 24 x 2 bedroom, 103 x 3
bedroom and 51 x 4 bedroom properties. 57 of the 190 residential properties were
proposed to be affordable, to meet the 30% affordable housing requirement of the

scheme. Two new vehicle access were proposed to serve the development, one from Lawrence Road and one from St Mary's Avenue. Two areas of open space were proposed within the housing layout, together with a large open space area space on the eastern side of the site adjacent to the A1.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report and update report.

Councillor Lamb, Ward Councillor for Wittering village addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Wittering village residents in general were not opposed to building new houses, but had significant concerns regarding the size of the proposed development.
- The proposed development of 190 homes would have a massive impact on the village of Wittering.
- There would be a highways impact on residents in respect of access from the A1 and A47 routes.
- Wittering village had been defined as a limited growth village within the Local Plan, with 300 new homes to be built across seven villages between 2014 and 2026. If the application was approved, Wittering village would provide two thirds of the total housing requirements, which seemed unfair.
- The Principal Development Management Officer confirmed that the Framework Travel Plan for the proposed development had been provided by Highways England.
- There were no extra facilities such as Dental, Doctor and schools spaces identified within the developer's proposal. Wansford and Stamford Schools were already at full capacity and there was no secondary school facility in Wittering village.
- The current infrastructure for surface water drainage and sewer arrangements struggled to cope in Wittering village.
- There were parking issues in Wittering village and construction vehicles would struggle to access the site. In addition the current surface damage to roads in Wittering village had deteriorated significantly and would be impacted further as a result of the proposed development.
- Concerns had been raised by the Wildlife Trust in regards to the ecological survey, which had not met current guidelines.
- The Council's Wildlife Officer had also raised concerns over the lack of ecological enhancements suggested as part of the proposed development.
- In view of the strong objections and in line with Parish Councils and the MP for Peterborough the Committee were asked to reject the planning application.
- It had been appreciated that the additional 30 proposed properties were to be built on employment land in Wittering village, however, prior to the application the total amount originally included within the Local Plan LP was for 140 dwellings, which was subsequently increased to 160 dwellings.

Richard Drain and Paul Haynes, objectors addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Wittering action group, which included members made up of villagers and forces personnel were objecting to the application.

- The main concerns highlighted within the written objection outlined inadequate junction provision for Wittering village on the Townsend junction of the A1, the lack of Doctor, Dentist, Post Office, shop and school facilities.
- There was only one church in Wittering village and not two as stated in the report.
- The Lawrance Road corner was usually flooded a majority of the time. In addition, Lawrance Road would be impacted as a result of construction and emergency vehicles as there were existing parking issues.
- Concerns over current surface water drainage and sewage disposal were raised.
- The amount of dwellings proposed for the development had been vastly inflated for such a limited development site.
- There were 450 residents living in Wittering village that had objected to the application.
- The play parks and nursery provision referred to in the report had been provided by the Royal Air Force.

Mark Mann, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Larkfleet Homes was a local house builder based in Bourne, which had won awards for their housing developments.
- The application had been objected to by Councillors and local MPs despite the document being included in the LP approved at Full Council in 2012, which had been independently inspected.
- The developers had not wanted to encourage development of an industrial site, which would also attract commercial traffic. For this reason, an extra 30 dwellings were being applied for.
- Following discussion with Council Officers Larkfleet had decided to omit the employment element of the LP requirement in their proposals and provide a green buffer between the proposed dwellings and the A1.
- The key concerns raised by residents was in relation to Lawrance Road and a second access point off St Mary's Avenue. Following this an amended scheme was submitted to Council Officers in 2016.
- There were no main objections to the proposal from the key statutory consultees including Natural England, Highways England, Anglian Water and the relevant Council departments.
- There would be a £1.2m CIL contribution to develop the transport improvements necessary.
- A traffic plan was submitted and accepted by Council Officers and Highway's England.
- A sustainable drainage scheme was considered to be satisfactory by the statutory agencies and had enhanced the biodiversity of the site.
- There had been adequate education provision in Wittering village to accommodate the development.
- The full construction details were pending for the proposed two new access points on Lawrance Road and St Mary's Avenue. The full construction details regarding the two new access points would not allay the concerns raised by objectors regarding the Townsend A1 junction turning at Wittering village, however, these concerns could be resolved by CIL funding.
- The provision of a travel plan would be supported by identifying ways of new residents taking up the option of alternative travel arrangements, which would be supported by a travel coordinator.
- It was anticipated that a flyover could cost £20 - £25 million and Larkfleet were submitting £1.2m CIL funding towards junction improvement. The

additional funding would need to be acquired from other developments in the area and the Highways Agency.

- The Wittering bus service had been included in the Transport Assessment and the design layout had been developed to extend into the proposed site.
- The travel plan would be phased in as the proposed site was being developed over a four year period.
- The southbound A1 junction was not deemed adequate however, Larkfleet would continue to encourage involvement from Highways England to implement improvements.

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

- Water related impact in regards to ecology were sent to Natural England and an amended condition was requested to ensure that there would be no impact on the Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) in the development area.
- A flood risk assessment had been carried out on the proposed site which demonstrated that Wittering village had adequate drainage subject to the details being secured by conditions.
- A refuge tracking report was provided by the applicant in regards to refuse vehicles turning in the road. It was felt by Council Officers that the current arrangements were satisfactory and no additional condition was required.
- Highways England had raised no objection and were satisfied that the travel plan would not present an immediate risk on the A1 Townsend junction.
- Members were being asked to consider an application for the development of a total of 190 dwellings, which included 1 hectare of allocated employment land for 30 dwellings plus the 160 dwellings on 6.7 hectare of allocated dwelling land.
- Highways England had removed similar turning junctions on the A1 as it was their responsibility to do so where necessary.
- Road traffic accidents (RTAs) that had occurred within 150m of the Townsend Road A1 junction had amounted to two fatal, five serious and 23 slight between 2012 - 2016. The junction on the old A47 Oundle Road turning into Wittering village had experienced slight RTAs. The A47 junction had been remodelled recently and was found to be sufficient to accommodate the proposed development.
- The RTA figures had not included RTAs on the Wansford junction.

Members noted that Council had approved the site allocation through the LP for the development and all of the statutory agencies had raised no objections to the proposal. However, Members expressed a significant concern over the implications of granting the proposed 190 dwelling application and the impact it could have on the traffic volume and potential RTAs on the A1 Townsend junction. Members also commented that it would be premature to grant approval until the A1 Townsend junction had been improved.

Members requested that further information would need to be provided by Officers in respect of the traffic impact on the A1 Townsend junction for the development of 190 dwellings against the development of 160 dwellings plus employment land. Members also requested up to date data in respect of the Transport Assessment.

14:37 At this point Members took a ten minute comfort break.

A motion was proposed and seconded to **DEFER** the decision to a later date as the Committee required further information from Highways Officers.

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **DEFER** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **DEFER** the planning permission.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Committee **DEFERRED** their decision as further information was required from Highways Officers to detail the following:

1. Further information was required regarding the differing traffic implications on the A1 Townsend junction following the impact of the 190 dwelling development compared to the development of 160 dwellings plus the employment land; and
2. That the data within the Transport Assessment was updated to provide survey information not older than three years.

5.2 17/00645/FUL - THE ELMS, HELPSTON ROAD, ETON, PETERBOROUGH

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the Erection of a Farm Shop, cafe/restaurant with associated vehicular access, parking, hard and soft landscaping pursuant to relocation and expansion of Willowbrook Farm Shop.

The purpose of the report sought approval for the erection of a farm shop, butchery, bakery, café/restaurant and educational element including, a craft workshop associated with the relocation of an existing facility at Scotsman's Lodge on Stamford Road, Marholm, which operated as 'Willowbrook' farm shop.

The building would be single storey and have an 'L'-shaped footprint with a floorspace of 720 meter squared. A new access would be created off Glinton Road (B1443) and the site would provide 39 car parking spaces.

The scheme as initially submitted referred to a second phase development of an events area. Phase two had since been deleted from the scheme and the application assesses the acceptability of phase one only.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report.

John Dickie, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The current Willowbrook Farm Shop facility was restricted to provide educational lessons and visits.
- Student and apprenticeship opportunities covering butchery and farming would be offered through Willowbrook Farm as part of the government directive.
- There would be an increase in highway movements for the new site location compared to the current Scotsman Lodge site, however it was not anticipated to be overbearing.
- Learning opportunities such as dry stone walling and thatching would be offered as part of the proposed Willowbrook Farm Shop facility.
- The objections received from Etton Parish Council had focused on conflict of trade for the Golden Pheasant. However, it was felt by the applicant that

increased business could be attracted to the GP establishment due to the visitors to the proposed Willowbrook Farm Shop.

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

- A facility of rural education benefits was attractive to the area and the Morton family had over 100 years of experience in rural, quarrying and crafting skills.
- It was felt that the Golden Pheasant could grow to appreciate the footfall they would receive as a result of visits to the educational facility.
- Members were surprised by the objection made by Etton Parish Council.
- Members welcomed the apprenticeships opportunities that would be on offer through the proposed Willowbrook Farm Shop.

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions.

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 development for the relocation of an existing Farm Shop would enable the expansion of a successful rural business which would be closely related to the agricultural use of the site 'Elm Tree Farm';
- The 'model' of the business required a rural location associated with local agriculture and as such it had not been considered that the proposal would impact on the vitality and viability of any commercial centre or set an undesirable precedent;
- The design of the building and boundary treatment would not impact on the visual amenity of the character area and appropriate mitigate would assimilate the development into the open countryside;
- The site would provide adequate parking provision and it was not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse highway implications; The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; and
- The proposal would result in an enhancement to the landscaping features of the site and a net gain in biodiversity.
- Hence the proposal accords with policies PP2, PP3, PP8, PP9, PP12, PP13 and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS1, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS20, CS21 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and sections 2, 3, 4, 7 and 11 of the NPPF.

5.3 17/01220/FUL - LAND TO REAR OF 37 AND 39 LINCOLN ROAD, GLINTON, PETERBOROUGH

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the proposed erection of detached garage for new bungalow on Land To Rear Of, 37 And 39 Lincoln Road, Glinton, Peterborough.

The purpose of the report sought planning permission for the erection of a single storey garage, which would have a floor area of 3.75 meter x 5.6 meter and proposed

to stand at 2.4 meter to eaves and 4 meter to ridge. The materials would match the to-be built dwelling, with pilgrim buff brick and sandtoft double pantile (terracotta red) with a cream roller shutter door.

Planning permission was required as the garage would be over 2.5 meter in height situated within 2 meter of a boundary.

Condition 3 of the 2015 planning permission for the bungalow also restricted permitted development rights for outbuildings as Officers were concerned of the size of the dwelling itself situated within the plot, but also to ensure a sufficient sized garden would be retained to serve future occupiers.

The Senior Development Management Officer introduced the report and update report.

Phil Branston, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Construction work had started on the site.
- The driveway would be widened as a condition planning approval. The garage would be used for daily storage of a vintage vehicle and there would be no noise impact.
- There were parking spaces on front of driveway.

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

- It had been demonstrated that the proposed garage within the rear end of the plot would not be visible from the driveway and would not impact on privacy.

The Planning and Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions.

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 garage would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the area, and would accord with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposed garage would not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and would retain sufficient garden for future occupiers, and therefore accords with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would not result in a highway safety hazard and sufficient car parking could be provided on site thereby according with Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

6. PLANNING COMPLIANCE QUARTERLY REPORT

The Committee received a report, which outlined the Planning Service's planning compliance performance and identified whether there were any lessons to be learnt from the actions taken.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and asked the Planning and Environment Protection Committee to note past performance and outcomes.

The Planning and Environment Protection Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to note the past performance and outcomes.

AGREED ACTION

For the Development Management Manager to provide the Planning and Environment Protection Committee with a briefing note outlining whether a public educational opportunity could be developed as a result of the increase to the no breach found category within the Planning Compliance report.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

To help inform future decisions of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee and potentially reduce costs.

Chairman
1:30pm – 3:38pm