

## Agenda Item 2

### Planning and EP Committee 28 November 2017

<b>Application Ref:</b>	17/01426/FUL
<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of existing building and development of six self-contained one-bedroom supported living apartments, ancillary staff accommodation and associated external works, landscaping car parking
<b>Site:</b>	53 High Street, Eye, Peterborough, PE6 7UX
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr J Mills
<b>Agent:</b>	Mrs Becki Hinchliffe Eden Planning
<b>Referred by:</b>	Eye Parish Council
<b>Reason:</b>	Overdevelopment of the site, no provision shown for bin storage and lack of parking
<b>Site visit:</b>	22.08.2017
<b>Case officer:</b>	Mrs Louise Simmonds
<b>Telephone No.</b>	01733 454439
<b>E-Mail:</b>	louise.simmonds@peterborough.gov.uk
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<b>GRANT</b> subject to relevant conditions

---

---

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

### Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a one and a half storey commercial building located on the southern side of the High Street. The site is presently in use as a car sales unit, with showroom to the front elevation (onto the High Street) and open car sales/storage to the rear. The site occupies the entire depth of the block which runs along the High Street and Back Lane albeit there are numerous examples of backland residential development which has resulted in a frontage being created to Back Lane. The surrounding area is of varied character, with commercial/retail premises to the High Street and residential dwellings to Back Lane and beyond to the south. Vehicular access is granted to the site via a dropped kerb crossing from Back Lane.

The site is located partially within the identified Eye Local Centre Local Centre and entirely within the designated Eye Conservation Area.

### Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing commercial unit and construction of 6no. 1-bed supported living apartments (Class C3) for persons with physical and learning disabilities. The new apartments would be split between a two and half storey building (herein referred to as the main building) sited directly off the High Street, and a smaller single storey detached building sited off Back Lane. The proposal also includes associated parking, landscaping and a small staff office with shower room (not living accommodation).

It should be noted that the proposal has been amended from that which was originally submitted to address comments raised by Officers. These alterations mainly relate to the design of the rear portion of the main building (setting it away from neighbouring boundaries and altering the fenestration/internal room layout) and the siting/length of the single storey building.

## **2 Planning History**

No relevant planning history.

## **3 Planning Policy**

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

### **Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

#### **Section 66 - General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

#### **Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.**

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

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

#### **Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets**

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

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

#### **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.

#### **CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development**

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

#### **CS08 - Meeting Housing Needs**

Promotes a mix of housing the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing), 20% life time homes and 2% wheelchair housing.

#### **CS14 - Transport**

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

#### **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.

### **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.

#### **PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development**

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

#### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

#### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

#### **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 Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document took place between December 2016 and 9 February 2017. The responses are currently being reviewed. At this preliminary stage only limited weight can be attached to the policies set out therein.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **Archaeological Officer (27.09.17)**

No objections - Given the known history of land-use and anticipated degree of truncation and/or disturbance caused by past development, the archaeological potential of the subject site is deemed to be negligible.

### **PCC Conservation Officer (19.10.17)**

No objections – The existing building does not contribute positively to the streetscene or Conservation Area and as such, its demolition can be supported. The proposed building to Back

Lane can also be supported. Whilst a single storey building deviated from the two storey heights that flank either side of it, this is not considered significant enough to warrant a refusal. The proposal for the elevation fronting the High Street is deemed to be proportionate to its surroundings and, whilst some discordance would result from the ridge being set further back and higher than its neighbour, the improvement overall will be marked and sufficient mitigation.

**PCC Pollution Team**

No comments received.

**PCC Peterborough Highways Services (16.10.17)**

No objections - The Applicant has not shown the requisite 1.5m vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays for the parking bays. However, due to the width available this could be achieved. Request that a Construction Management Plan be conditioned, along with parking provision prior to first occupation.

**Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service**

No comments received.

**North Level District Internal Drainage Board**

No comments received.

**Eye Parish Council (09.10.17)**

Objection - This development is in the Conservation Area and we consider it to be overdevelopment of the site. The demolition and rebuilding would have a significant effect on the local area. The plans do not show any provision for individual or communal refused bins. There is also very little parking provided and the nearby streets have limited parking available. Where will the 6 residents and their visitors park?

**PCC Tree Officer (07.11.17)**

No objections – The proposed development is feasible without causing harm to the adjacent beech tree which is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Request a condition securing a detailed method statement for those resurfacing works which will take place within the root protection area. Facilitation pruning may be required however this would need to be subject to a separate application.

**Waste Management (31.10.17)**

No objections - A bin store has been provided for the domestic flats which is easily accessible for both residents and the collection crews.

**Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 10

Total number of responses: 5

Total number of objections: 4 (including the Parish Council)

Total number in support: 1

Two rounds of public consultation have taken place albeit objections have only been received from local residents during the first round. A total of 3no. objections have been received raising the following:

- Feel that the site is far too small for the proposal.
- Believe that my (No.12A Back Lane) privacy will be greatly reduced and my property will be overlooked to such an extent that my everyday life could be under scrutiny.
- If just one property was being built, I (occupant of Back Lane) would have no objection to it.
- We have serious parking issues in Back Lane already and this will be made even worse by visitors to the occupants.
- Cars already park on double yellow lines outside our property (occupant of Back Lane)

causing access issues onto our driveway. We can only see this getting worse with the new building.

- The High Street can't take another 6no. properties due to restricted access already.
- Any building work and demolition will affect our adjoining (No.55 High Street) property.
- The proposal will overlook our (No.12 Back Lane) house and garden, blocking light into our garden and removing any privacy that we have at the moment.

In addition, 1no. letter of support has been received albeit the comments request that a drawing be approved to support the wall and garage of the adjoining property (No.55 High Street).

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

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including heritage assets
- Neighbour amenity
- Access and parking
- Trees
- Future occupant amenity
- Archaeology

### **a) Principle of development**

Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) highlights the importance of providing homes for all parts of the community, including those with physical or learning disabilities. The proposal would provide residential accommodation for 6no. persons with both physical and learning disabilities, for which there is a shortage of provision within the City. The accommodation, as set out by the Applicant, would be managed and occupied 24 hours a day by staff who are on-hand to support occupants in living as normal and independent a life as possible. The proposal would therefore generate a significant benefit in terms of contributing towards providing this much-needed housing, and this must be afforded significant weight.

With regards to the location of the site within an identified Local Centre, under adopted policies this is where main 'town centre' uses should be located. Whilst the proposal does not fall within this category, both the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Council's adopted Local Plan emphasise the need to create balanced and mixed communities. The proposal would provide key residential accommodation for occupants with limited mobility within walking distance of key services and facilities, and it is considered that this would fully accord with the requirements of adopted policies.

Accordingly, it is considered that the principle of development in this instance is acceptable.

### **b) Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including heritage assets**

#### Demolition

With regards to the existing building within the site, it is considered that this is not of significant architectural merit and does not make a positive contribution towards the overall amenity of the streetscene. The City Council's Conservation Officer shares this view and has advised that the building, along with its poor quality and unsympathetic alterations, does not contribute positively to the character or appearance of the Eye Conservation Area. Accordingly, it is considered that its demolition would not harm, and to some degree may improve, the character of the locality.

#### Redevelopment

Turning first to the main building, this would front onto the High Street. The building has been designed to incorporate many of the traditional architectural proportions of the surrounding properties, taking its principal cue from No.51 to which it would abut. The building would be of

symmetrical form, continuing the eaves line and window depths of the adjacent property. However, it would have a ridge set higher and further back than its immediate neighbour which is not fully in accordance with the built line of the streetscene. Notwithstanding this, the Conservation Officer has advised that the overall appearance of this building would be of significant improvement to the overall character and appearance of the streetscene and this part of the Conservation Area and this small area of discordance would not be so significant to warrant refusal of the scheme. Furthermore, the increased height is not to such a degree that views towards key Listed Buildings (such as the Church to the east) within the locality would be interrupted, thereby preserving their setting.

To the rear, the main building would be of a more modern design incorporating double storey mono pitched elements and a single storey flat roof. This design would be in complete contrast to the traditional frontage and those Georgian/Victorian properties which surround it. However, views towards this rear elevation would be relatively limited and the overall design approach assists in breaking the mass/bulk of the resultant development. Accordingly, it is not considered that it would appear such an alien or incongruous element that unacceptable harm would result to the wider character of the surrounding area.

In terms of the single storey detached building, this would front onto Back Lane and again be of modern design. The building would be of modular appearance, with a flat roof form and mixture of cladding and render to the elevations and to a maximum height of only 3.2 metres. Whilst this form and appearance (materials proposed to include render and cladding) would differ from those residential properties along Back Lane, the character of this streetscene is varied and does include single storey dwellings. Accordingly, it is the view of Officers and the Conservation Area that a reason for refusal on this basis could not be sustained as the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area.

It is noted that the objections received from the Parish Council and local residents relate to the proposal representing overdevelopment of the site, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. These concerns are noted and it is acknowledged that the proposal would increase the level of built form on the site. However, both the main building and single storey detached building would follow established building lines along the High Street and Back Lane, with the latter appearing as backland infill development. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposal would appear unduly dominant or obtrusive within the locality and does not represent overdevelopment of the site.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the locality. Furthermore, the proposal would preserve, and to some degree enhance, the Eye Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **c) Neighbour amenity**

#### **Main building**

Turning first to the main building, the proposal would result in additional two storey development across almost the entire width of the plot which would increase the level of development in proximity to Nos.51 and 55 High Street. However, it is not considered that the impact arising from this would significantly differ from the existing situation or unacceptably harm the amenities of those neighbouring occupants.

With regards to No.51 High Street, only the first floor is in residential use and there is a first floor kitchen window in close proximity to the shared boundary. Whilst the proposal would result in two storey development along the shared boundary to a depth of 2.2 metres beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property, the proposal then steps in from the boundary by some 1.5 metres.

When compared to the depth of existing development along this shared boundary, and its one and half storey height, it is considered that the proposal would not unduly increase the overbearing and overshadowing to this neighbouring window. With regards to potential overlooking, the proposal does include first floor windows facing towards No.51. However, by virtue of the staggered building line, any direct views to the neighbouring windows would be blocked thereby prevent loss of privacy to neighbouring occupants.

With regards to No.55 High Street, the increase in the amount of development adjacent to the shared boundary would be more substantial. However, the neighbouring residential dwelling is set some distance away from the shared boundary by some 8 metres and there are incidental outbuildings and mature shrubbery which lie between. Furthermore, the proposal has been designed such that it would not immediately abut the shared boundary and is of mono-pitched design to ensure that the least overall height is achieved. No facing windows at either first or second floor are proposed, and as such, no overlooking would result to the neighbouring amenity area. Taking this into account, whilst the proposal would be readily visible to occupants of No.55, it is considered that it would not appear unduly prominent or obtrusive to primary habitable rooms or the outdoor amenity area.

To the rear, the proposal would result in two storey development which encroaches further into the site than the existing. Accordingly, there would be reduced separation to both Nos.12 and 12A Back Lane. However, the two storey bulk of the development would be set some 14.8 and 18 metres from the primary habitable rooms of these neighbouring dwellings respectively which is considered sufficient to prevent undue overbearing impact. Whilst the distances to the neighbouring gardens would be less than this, the main building would be sited such that it would not appear an unduly dominant feature to those neighbouring gardens. Furthermore, the only first floor window which would permit views to the rear of the site would be screened from No.12 by virtue of a staggered two storey intervening element, and would be set some 20 metres from No.12A. This relationship is considered sufficient to ensure that no unacceptable degree of overlooking or loss of privacy results to either occupants.

#### Single storey building

Turning to the proposed single storey building, this would be situated to the rear of the site between Nos.12 and 12A Back Lane, and would be sited immediately adjacent to No.12. The building would be of a flat roof design, standing at a maximum height of 3.2 metres. It would project beyond the line of the rear elevation of No.12 by some 4.2 metres which would be obvious to those occupants. Whilst the height may result in some degree of dominance to those occupants, the majority of the rear garden to No.12 would not be subject to this relationship, and would benefit from some relief. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the degree of harm that would result would be outweighed by the benefit to the wider community through the provision of much-needed housing for disabled persons.

With regards to No.12A Back Lane, the proposal would be set away from the shared boundary by some 2 metres and given the off-set of the neighbouring garden from this shared boundary, the proposal would be sited from 4.5-5 metres from the neighbouring garden. This level of separation, given the limited single storey height of the building, is considered to ensure that no undue overbearing impact would result.

#### Overall development

At present, the site is in use for car sales with a considerable number of vehicles on display/parked within the rear yard area. Such a use can result in a relatively significant level of intensity and noise. Whilst the proposal would result in occupancy over and above those single dwellings which surround it, it is considered that the comings/goings associated with 6no. assisted living units would not exceed those of a vehicles sales use. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would not result in increased noise or general disturbance to neighbouring occupants.

It is noted that some concern has been expressed with regards to the impacts arising from the construction/demolition phases. These concerns are noted and, given the relatively constrained

nature of the site being surrounded by residential properties, it is acknowledged that some disturbance would result. However, a condition securing a detailed Demolition and Construction Management Plan would ensure that measures to control noise and dust emissions could be secured to try and mitigate the harm as far as is possible.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable degree of harm to the amenities of most neighbouring occupants albeit some harm would result to the occupants of No.12 Back Lane. However, this degree of harm is considered to be outweighed by the public benefit arising from the provision of housing for disabled persons.

#### **d) Access and parking**

The proposal seeks to use the existing dropped kerb access from Back Lane which extends across the entire width of the plot. From this, would be 2no. parking spaces which would not provide any turning however this is no different from the current situation. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has raised no objections to this arrangement albeit they have requested that the scheme be revised to ensure that the parking spaces show the required 1.5 metre x 1.5 metre vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays. This is noted, however at present the entire width of the plot is a dropped kerb and parking/vehicular access is taken from the entire frontage. There are presently no visibility splays and it is not considered that the proposal would represent an intensification of this substandard arrangement. Furthermore, there is no pedestrian footway to this side of Back Lane and pedestrians would be using the footway to the opposite side of the highway. Accordingly, it is not considered appropriate to require this amendment as it is not necessary in planning-terms.

With regards to pedestrian access, the proposal includes a covered walkway at ground floor level within the building which would provide an entrance onto the High Street. This walkway would be available for use by all occupants and would therefore allow for safe and convenient pedestrian access directly to those services/facilities offered within Eye. This would prevent the need for unsafe pedestrian access out onto Back Lane which is deficient in terms of its footway width and would not be safe for occupants who use wheelchairs.

In terms of the proposed parking provision, it is noted that the Parish Council and local residents have raised objections. Primarily, their concern relates to the lack of parking provision for both staff and visitors which they fear would increase on-street parking congestion and worsen existing dangerous parking along Back Lane. These concerns are noted however the LHA has not raised any objections to the level of parking provision owing to the type of accommodation proposed. Given that the residential units would be for persons with a physical or learning disability who require assistance to live, it is not anticipated that they would own cars. Furthermore, only one staff member would be present within the site on a full-time basis, with other care providers and support assistants coming and going throughout the day. Whilst it is acknowledged that there may be some instances whereby visitors could exceed the 1no. space available, this would not generate additional on-street parking demand above and beyond the existing site which does not provide any formal parking for staff or customers. Accordingly, as agreed by the LHA, the level of parking for the use proposed is considered sufficient and not likely to result in an unacceptable highway safety danger.

As this conclusion is solely based upon the intended occupants/use of the site, and not an unrestricted Class C3 use which would need to adhere to the Council's adopted minimum parking standards (7no. spaces would be required), it is necessary to impose a condition which limits the occupancy of the units. The Applicant has provided a detailed statement setting out the criteria which occupants must meet to qualify for the proposed housing, and a condition securing compliance with is considered to be sufficient to prevent unrestricted occupancy.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would provide safe and convenient access for all users, and would not pose an unacceptable danger to highway safety. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **e) Trees**

As detailed within Section 1 above, immediately adjacent to the site (within the curtilage of the neighbouring dwelling No.12A Back Lane) is a mature beech tree subject to formal protection by virtue of a Tree Preservation Order. Whilst the submitted Arboricultural Assessment is not accepted by the City Council's Tree Officer (owing to deficient assessment and commentary regarding the impact of the development), he has advised that the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to the long-term health of this tree. The proposed single storey building would be sited a sufficient distance to ensure no significant encroachment upon the root protection area results. Some facilitating pruning may be required and the Tree Officer considers that the principle of this is acceptable. A detailed scheme for this pruning would be required however this would need to be subject to a separate application for works to protected trees, an informative could be placed upon any permission to advise of this.

In addition, the proposal would likely result in the removal of the existing hardstanding on the site and replacement with new. This would be within the root protection area of the beech tree and the Tree Officer has requested that a detailed arboricultural method statement be conditioned to ensure that the works are carried out so as to not harm the roots of the tree.

Subject to the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in harm to or loss of a tree of key amenity value to the surrounding area. Accordingly the proposal is in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **f) Future occupant amenity**

Turning first to the internal space, it is considered that the proposal would provide adequate room for future occupants which is well-served by daylight and natural sunlight. Furthermore, each of the self-contained residential flats would be afforded adequate privacy, with an acceptable relationship between primary habitable windows and neighbouring dwellings.

The proposal would provide a small area of landscaped garden, situated between the main and single storey buildings proposed. It is acknowledged that this area would be relatively limited in its ability to offer meaningful outside space for occupants. Nonetheless, the area would provide an outside space for occupants to enjoy outside of their inside living accommodation, and would be usable for the drying of clothes etc. Accordingly, it is considered sufficient to meet the needs of the 6no. 1-bed flats proposed.

With regards to bin provision, it is noted that the Parish Council has raised objection to the lack of adequate bin space for occupants. However, the proposal includes an enclosed communal bin area as part of the single storey detached building and the City Council's Waste Team has confirmed that this is of sufficient size to accord with the Council's adopted waste management guidance (RECAP Waste Management SPD (2012)). The bin stores would be of sufficient size and are located within easy reach of both occupants and the waste collection crews.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **g) Archaeology**

The City Council's Archaeologist has advised that whilst the site is located within an area of known archaeological interest, given the known history of its land use and the anticipated degree of truncation and/or disturbance caused by the existing development, the archaeological potential of the site is deemed to be negligible. Accordingly, no archaeological evaluation is required.

## **6 Conclusions**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is 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 provide 6 no. 1-bed residential units for persons with a physical or learning disability for which there is a demand within Peterborough. This would result in a significant benefit to the wider community, in accordance with Policy PP8 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment proposed would not result in an unacceptable impact 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);
- the proposal would preserve, and to some degree enhance, the character and appearance of the Eye Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of key listed buildings contained therein, in accordance with Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- the proposal would result in some degree of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants of No.12 Back Lane however it is considered that this harm is outweighed by the public benefit arising from the provision of housing to meet the needs of persons with physical and learning disabilities;
- safe access would be made for all users of the site and the proposal would not pose an unacceptable danger to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in harm to or loss of the adjacent protected beech tree which is of key amenity value to the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- the archaeological potential of the site is deemed to be negligible.

## **7 Recommendation**

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

- Location Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)001 Revision B)
- Existing Site Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)002 Revision B)
- Block Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)003 Revision F)
- Proposed Site Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)010 Revision H)
- Massing Comparison Diagram (drawing number 16215(PL)085 Revision A)
- Ground Floor Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)100 Revision G)
- First Floor Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)101 Revision G)
- Second Floor Plan (drawing number 16215(PL)102 Revision D)
- Proposed Elevations 1 & 2 (drawing number 16215(PL)200 Revision G)
- Proposed Elevations 3, 4, 5 & 6 (drawing number 16215(PL)201 Revision F)
- Proposed Site Sections (drawing number 16215(PL)301 Revision C)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until samples/details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling (samples), including all render and cladding;
- Roofing (samples);
- Windows (details), including dormer window cheeks;
- Doors (details);
- Rainwater goods (details).

The samples/details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The samples shall be made available for inspection by the Local Planning Authority on-site. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 4 No development shall take place until details of the existing and proposed finished ground and building slab levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the surrounding area and to preserve the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no groundworks affecting the site levels take place without the details having first been approved.

C 5 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include, but not limited to:

- Hard surfacing materials for all parking and pedestrian circulation areas;
- Measures to delineate parking bays;
- Details of all boundary treatments; and
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting.

The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be carried out prior to first occupation of any residential unit and the approved soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following completion of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, preserving the amenity of neighbouring occupants and the amenity of future occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2, PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 6 Notwithstanding the submitted information, no development shall take place (including demolition, soil stripping, preconstruction delivery of equipment or materials, the creation of

site accesses, positioning of site huts) until a site specific method statement and associated plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include, but not limited to:

- Details of the area of any excavation within the Root Protection Area of the Beech protected by Tree Preservation Order 08/2000;
- Details of the work practices to minimise root severance e.g. hand digging; and
- Details of how root pruning (if required) will be undertaken.

The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details/plan.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no works take place on site (including demolition) which may harm the adjacent protected tree.

C 7 No development (including demolition) shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall include, but not limited to:

- Haulage routes to/from the site;
- Hours of working, including delivery times and contractor arrival/departure;
- A demolition method statement;
- Contractor parking;
- Areas for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of all delivery vehicles;
- Site welfare facilities (if applicable);
- Measures to control the emission of dust;
- Measures to control noise; and
- Wheel washing facilities, through which all construction vehicles visiting the site must pass before entering the public highway.

The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to preserve the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP3 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no demolition/construction works take place which may pose a harm.

C 8 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, the 2no. parking spaces shown on drawing number 16215(PL)010 Revision H 'Proposed Site Plan' shall be provided. Thereafter, those spaces shall solely be used for the parking of vehicles in connection with the use of the site in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 9 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, the bin storage area shown on drawing number 16215(PL)100 Revision G 'Ground Floor Plan' shall be provided and made available for use by occupants. Thereafter, that area shall be used solely for the storage of refused bins in connection with the use of the site in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C10 The residential units hereby permitted shall solely be used as supported living apartments with on-site support for those persons with a registered physical or learning disability, and for no other purpose within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: The site is not acceptable for unrestricted Class C3 residential units owing to a deficiency in parking provision which would pose a danger to highway safety, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C11 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 3 Class L of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the development hereby permitted shall be a residential dwelling within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) only.

Reason: The site is not capable of providing the necessary parking or access requirements for a small-scale house in multiple occupation, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C12 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 Class A of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions or external alterations shall be constructed/made to the single storey residential unit hereby permitted other than as those expressly authorised by any future planning permission.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of the area and neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

Copy to Cllrs Allen, Brown and Simons

This page is intentionally left blank