

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 12 JUNE 2018  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors, Brown, Shaz Nawaz, Amlad Iqbal, Jamil, Hiller, Bond, Coles and Warren

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Development Management Manager  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor  
Simon Ireland, Head of PCC Highways  
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer  
Carry Murphy, Planning Officer

**Others Present:** Lee Gordon, Weightmans Solicitors (Item 5.5 only)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Serluca, Stokes, Martin and Bull. Councillor Warren, Coles and Jamil attended as substitute.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Coles, declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 5.1, as he was a Governor at Jack Hunt Academy.

Councillor Hiller, 5.2, declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5.2 as he was involved in initial negotiations before the current application that was being proposed.

**3. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS WARD COUNCILLOR**

None were received.

**4. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 24 APRIL 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**5.1 18/00251/R3FUL - RECREATION GROUND, THORPE LEA ROAD, PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the creation of a sports pitch and running track, a mobile classroom, changing facilities

and WCs including perimeter fence and associated soft landscaping. The proposal also includes the installation of a temporary mobile building to include classroom, changing facilities and toilets, and the erection of 2.4 metre high weldmesh security fencing. It is also proposed for the existing goal posts present within the site to be relocated further to the east, still within the wider POS but outside the boundary of the proposed playing fields.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report. There had been 26 objections in the first round of consultations and 19 in the second round. Sport England had made representations in support of the application. The objections had focused on concern over crime and anti-social behaviour, loss of open public space, negative visual impact and increased levels of noise and disturbance. The Committee were informed that although the proposal represented a loss of open space, officers were satisfied under the adopting and emerging plan policy and criteria set out in paragraph 74 of the National Policy Framework, that the loss was acceptable in this instance. Members were informed that the school currently had no playing field on site and this use of land was closer than other alternatives. The facility would only be used by West Town Academy and generally in term times, this would therefore alleviate levels of noise and disturbance, occurring mainly during the day and at term time. In addition there was no lighting proposed for the playing fields.

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

- Originally became aware of the application whilst Chair of Thorpe Hall trust, at that time the Council decided to develop Thorpe Hall Meadows for housing and the Trust was informed at that stage that no further development would take place. The application in front of Committee was going against this assurance.
- A number of residents had strong objections to the proposed developments and were concerned over the loss of open space.
- There were alternative and suitable sites that could have been developed for this purpose, such as Angus Court.
- Angus Court playing field was already being used for the purposes outlined in the application. It would save time and cost for the school to use this site, it was already fenced and had road access.
- School children would not have to cross over major roads in order to use Angus Court fields, if the current proposal was accepted they would have to cross a busy and dangerous road.
- The application seemed to be more about the development of the site over the safety of children being able to access the site.
- As a Councillor the application was not wholly justified as there were other suitable sites in the area that can be used.

Harry Machin, Joan King and Jill Murdoch, Residents Association addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- After a wide consultation with residents, it was clear that although a number of people supported the application they were in the minority.
- The application site was well loved by local residents and appreciated by those who lived in the area.

- There was an error in the report, the distance from the school to the site was actually closer to 700m and not 300m as per the report.
- The route that would be taken by the school children to Angus Court playing fields was far less dangerous than the route they would have to take to the application site.
- There would be great loss to biodiversity, there had already been the loss of the developing wildflower meadow, adjacent to the site.
- Public space was deemed to be vital, this was laid out in CS18, LP23 and para 74 of the National Policy Framework. It could only be developed if there was such a great benefit to the area..
- Before making a decision the Committee needed to take account its own policy and national policy.
- A large and well facilitated playing field already existed at Angus Court which could be used. In addition the school had opportunity to develop a small field within its own school boundaries.
- If the need was so great, why could the school not continue to use its old field temporarily.
- School itself had not demonstrated its need sufficiently in order to depart from local and national planning policy.
- The application was not justified and this development would be a loss to local residents.
- There was a visual impact of the development as it would now block views of the cathedral.
- It was not clear how the proposed road crossing would work in principle.

Mark Woods, CEO, Cambridge Meridians Academy Trust, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The current provisions at the school site were Inadequate. There was a real need to have suitable facilities for the children.
- The school was in special measures when it was taken over. It was not safe to use the facilities that were already in place. It was the right time for the school to look at external options. There was a real risk that if things did not improve the school could be put back into special measures by Ofsted.
- With the upgrades to Thorpe road and the new pedestrian crossing there was now no concern over the safety of children using this road, especially as they would be supervised.
- The school has been in discussion with Council officers to ensure a cost effective solution was proposed that would benefit the school children as well as minimising nuisance to the local community.
- The school had worked closely with the Thorpe Gate Residents Association and had found that there had been more positivity from local residents than what had been presented.
- Students at the school did not have access to suitable playing fields and this situation had been going on for too long.
- The school would be happy to discuss the possibility of opening up the facilities to local residents, so that they could also take advantage of the playing facilities
- There was no intention of using the facilities out of school hours.
- There were no plans to block or restrict the proposed tarmac path.
- There was a possibility that a permanent structure would replace a temporary structure but there were no plans to go beyond the current proposed footprint.
- It was possible in the future that a number of other local schools could be invited to use the facilities.

- In terms of discussion there were three meetings to discuss issues raised by the Thorpe Gate Residents Association.
- A number of letters have been sent in that were positive and in support of the application.
- There were a number of educational benefits that sat alongside the development of the playing field.
- There had been at least three meetings with local residents to discuss their issues and address the rationale of using the site as a playing field.

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

- It was confirmed that the school site was in fact 700m from the site and not 300m as detailed in the report. However this did not impact the decision of Planning Officers. The proposal complied with the criteria in developing open space.
- Highways had not been consulted on this application, however when the application for the school itself came through there were no issues as the improvements made to Thorpe Lea Road allowed pedestrians to cross safely. They were confident that new traffic lights were suitable to use allowing school children to be escorted to the playing fields.
- The issue around the development of Angus Court was not a material consideration. The Committee needed to take into account the proposals in front of them.
- The School had made a strong case to have the playing field at the proposed site. There had been no objections raised by the Ward Councillors. There was a possibility for the facility to be open to members of the public to use once it had been developed.
- The benefits to the school were far greater than the current facilities that were in place.
- Once fence was to be built this would probably mesh into the background and wouldn't have a negative impact on the visual scenery.
- Good development in principle and would increase the physical activity of children and eventually to the wider community.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (9 in favour 1 abstention) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

#### **REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

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 represent improved sports education facilities for pupils of West Town Primary School which should be afforded great weight, in accordance with paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- Whilst the proposal would represent the loss of existing public open space (POS), it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable deficiency for the local area and mitigation may be secured through the provision of goal posts to the west

of the site, on an area of POS already being reverted to recreation space, in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), emerging Policy LP23 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) and paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);

- The proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy Cs16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version);
- No undue impact to the safety of the surrounding public highway network or its users would result, in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version);
- The proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to trees or landscape features of key amenity value to the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version);
- the proposal would not harm biodiversity within the site, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version);
- The proposal would not be at unacceptable risk from, or result in increased flood risk, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version); and
- The site would not be at risk from contamination such that it would pose a risk to human health or controlled waters, in accordance with Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

## **5.2 17/00823/FUL - FORMER PARCEL FORCE SITE, MASKEW AVENUE, NEW ENGLAND, PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application for the construction of 7 x A1 (non-food bulky goods) retail units (total 16,027 sq. m GIA), 2 x A3 (restaurant/cafe) units (total 557 sq. m GIA), car parking, servicing, new vehicle access and off-site highway improvements

The Planning Officer introduced the report and update report. There had been no objections raised by Ward Councillors and no residents had objected. The only representations made were from retailers outlining concerns over the impact to the City centre and the North Westgate Scheme. Although the land had been Identified for employment use, this development represented a loss to this use. There was a need for around 80ha of employment land but around 160ha had been identified across Peterborough, there was therefore no shortage of land identified for Employment use. The site would still offer the opportunity for employment both during construction and

once the site was fully operational. This was an out of centre development, it was therefore only acceptable to be developed if there no suitable sites in the City Centre. A retail consultant had confirmed the application was acceptable and that there were no other alternative city centre sites available for this scale of development.

Mary Davidson the agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The application had been well scrutinised since it was submitted. It was a positive and beneficial application for the site and the proposal would bring back active employment on the land..
- The units and restaurants would create in the region of 120 to 150 jobs on what was essentially land earmarked for employment use.
- There were going to be improvements made to the local highway infrastructure, most notably to Maskew Avenue itself.
- The overall CIL bill was going to be over £1 million.
- The scheme had been identified by Wren Kitchens who were also the developers of the land. They wanted to ensure that their destination was in keeping with other like-minded retailers.
- Some of the retailers identified as being interested in the site included, Baker and Stonehouse, Habitat, Better Bathrooms, Furniture Village, Loaf and Homesense. In addition the developers would also like to see an electrical operator and carpet store included in the scheme.
- Teh scheme was going to break the mould of the design of other retail parks. There were to be front elevations, nearly all glazed and finished to a high specification.

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

- Officers were happy with the city wide assessment and sequential test that had been carry out.
- There were an additional eight conditions relating to highway matters. It was impossible to know the exact length of time to get the highway matters resolved. There was lots of detail on how the partial signalisation on Bourges Boulevard would work, but that these had not been finalised. All highway matters would need to be addressed before work on the actual site could commence.
- The application was a positive for the local area as the site had been completely vacant for twelve years. There had been no objections from Ward Councillors or local residents.
- The creation of 120-150 jobs was a real positive. This had gone through the sequential test and passed the tests applied by the independent retail consultant. There were no other suitable sites locally.
- The site was to be heavily conditioned as to the use of the site, including no high street or clothing retailers.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application as per Officers recommendation. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimous) to **GRANT** the planning permission as per the officers recommendations.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

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 accords with relevant planning policy as discussed above, but specifically:

- a) Cannot be reasonable accommodated within the city centre or district centres within the short to medium term.
- b) Will not result in a significant material impact on the city centre or other district centres as a consequence of trade draw either individually or in conjunction with other recent or planned development.
- c) Would not result in a detrimental loss of employment land.
- d) Would not result in an unacceptable impact on the local and strategic road network or compromise highway safety.
- e) Is located on the edge of an existing retail park area, so there is likely to be linked trips to those other units.
- f) Provides an appropriate level of parking and gives opportunity for some travel by public transport, walking and cycling particularly due to its location.
- g) Can be controlled by condition in respect of design and layout, crime and disorder, infrastructure provision, transport, biodiversity, flood risk/ drainage and potential for contamination.
- h) Would not result in a detrimental impact on protected species or related habitat.
- i) Would represent investment and some employment creation within the City.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Peterborough Core Strategy Policies CS03, CS14, CS15, CS16, C21 and C22 as well as Peterborough Development Planning Policies DPD Policies PP02, PP03, PP09, PP12, PP13, PP16 and PP20.

### **5.3 18/00108/OUT - LAND TO THE REAR OF THE THORPE WOOD HOUSE, THORPE WOOD, PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking outline planning consent including the reserved matters relating to access, appearance, layout and scale, with landscaping only reserved to a later stage, for a 2/3 storey 100 bed residential care home (C2) in the form of two wings with a central communal area. The building would have a gross external area of 4198.8m<sup>2</sup>. The quantum of development would provide 1,708m<sup>2</sup> at ground floor, 1,708m<sup>2</sup> at first floor and 782.8m<sup>2</sup> at second floor. The south eastern wing would be 2 storey to a height of 10m. The south western wing would be 3 storey with a maximum height of 13.8m.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report and update report. The main consideration for this site was the material use and the loss of 0.9ha

of Employment use land. This site had been marketed on numerous occasions for office development but these had not come to fruition.

David Turnock the agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The pre-application process had started last March and had evolved ever since.
- The applicants and agents had been quite proud of the design.

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

- There was an increasing need for these types of facilities, especially where operators were struggling.
- The application looked well designed and the area welcomed care homes especially as the population was ageing.
- The site had been derelict for almost 20 years and something needed to be done to the site.
- There would also be a number of jobs created.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

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 site is an allocated employment site within the development plan but the applicant has demonstrated that despite extensive marketing of the site the B1 office use of the site has not achieved interest from prospective occupiers. The proposed use of the site as a C2 Care Home is therefore acceptable in accordance with para. 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework which stipulates that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.
- The loss of employment land is not considered detrimental to the likely long term supply of available employment land.
- The site can be satisfactorily accessed by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. The provision of car parking and cycle parking is considered to be acceptable therefore the proposal would not unduly impact upon the adjacent highway network.
- The appearance, layout and scale of the building is considered acceptable and will not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area or neighbour amenity.
- The proposal would not result in the loss of trees which provide a positive contribution to the area and adequate tree protection measures would be secured.
- Suitable ecological enhancements and protection measures will be secured by condition hence the development will not result in an unacceptable impact on the biodiversity of the site.



The development is therefore in accordance with Sections 1 (paragraph 22), Section 7, Section 10 and Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14, CS16, CS21, CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy, Policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy LP4 of the Proposed Submission version of the new Peterborough Local Plan.

#### **5.4 18/00503/FUL - 62 BAMBER STREET, MILLFIELD, PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking to change the use of the public open space to a private garden, as well as permission to construct a two metre high boundary wall to the south and west boundaries of the public open space. The proposed wall would connect to the existing wall on the west boundary, with the chamfered wall demolished to create an opening into the application site.

The Principal Development Management Officer updated the Committee on the proposal. National and Local policies do seek to protect public spaces and existing space should not be built on unless appropriate and could outweigh the benefits to this. This open space helped to break up the harsh visual impacts of the terraced houses.

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

- The National Planning Policy made it clear that if there was open space it should not be built on unless there were overwhelming arguments to do so.
- The proposal was to use the space as garden land. which would allow the applicant to build any structure upon this land, with planning permission.
- A condition could be placed on the application, however this would still be a loss of amenity to the area.
- If this was to be approved officers would look at placing TPO's on some of the trees that would be included in the application site.
- There was a worry that if this application was approved it would set a precedent for future applications to follow.
- Although there were occasions were an application to built on open space was beneficial it was rare and would have to be of wider benefit to the community.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

The proposed change of use, to serve as a private garden to No. 62 Bamber Street, would result in the loss of existing, useable public open space within the Central Ward

and to the specific locality of Bamber Street. The proposed use of the land is for private garden rather than public open space and the scheme proposes no alternative re-provision of the public open space within the surrounding area. In addition, no wider public benefit would be gained from the loss of the public open space to private residential garden. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and LP23 of the Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) DPD (2018).

The proposal, by nature of its size, scale and position would unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The enclosure of this land for additional garden for one of the adjacent residential plots would fail to respect the established layout character of surrounding residential plots and the linear garden forms associated with these neighbouring dwellings. The loss of this open area of green space would have an adverse visual impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policy DPD (2012) and Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (Submission Stage) DPD (2018).

## **5.5 09/01368/OUT - LAND TO THE NORTH OF NORMAN CROSS, LONDON ROAD, PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the development of an urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings; a District Centre (with up to 9200 square metres (99031 sq.ft) retail floor space) and two Neighbourhood Centres (with up to 2300 square metres (24758 sq.ft) retail floor space) comprising district/neighbourhood retail (A1-A5); community and health (C2, D1); leisure(D2); residential (C3) and commercial (B1) uses. Provision for education facilities (sites for three primary and one secondary school); sports and recreational facilities; a range of strategic open spaces including new landscaping, woodland and allotments; and cemetery provision. Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure; foul and surface water drainage networks (including suds and lakes)

The Development Management Manager outlined the report and any updates. The Committee were given a brief update on the history of the site, which was granted approval by the Committee in 2015. This application was part of the adopted and emerging local plan. All three land owners agreed to split the S016 agreement into three separate agreements, relating to their own portions. Under the terms of the agreement each landowner was required to deliver certain infrastructure on their own land and pay a set contribution per dwelling into a communal pot, for the delivery of site wide infrastructure, such as schools and roads. All three landowners had been fully engaged in getting the development up and running. All commercial points and negotiation had been successfully completed and two out of the three S106 agreements were ready for signing. If planning permission was granted the permission would be signed and agreed within a matter of weeks. Barretts did not want to sign their S106 agreement, there was a condition that would prevent them from

commencing work on their portion of the site until the S106 agreement was signed. A letter of comfort was sought from Barratts outlining that they were broadly happy with the S106 agreement, however this had not materialised. Barratt's had objected to the condition preventing them from starting work on their portion of the site until a S106 agreement had been signed. In addition the co-owners of the land were concerned that they would not have any right to make use of the infrastructure facilities and services after paying into the communal pot.

The addition of a condition was needed to protect the site and application from planning harm. The suggestion of a collaboration agreement from the co-owners sat outside normal planning process. The council was not planning to adopt this approach as it was deemed unreasonable. This application would be of great benefit to the City and would go towards the housing supply needed to deliver the local plan.

Peter Frampton on behalf of the co-owners of the Barratt land, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposed terms on the planning application that was recommended to be issued, did not make provision for the delivery of infrastructure to the Barrett land.
- The Barratt landowners were being asked to contribute around 17% of the overall infrastructure cost with no arrangement for the delivery of infrastructure to enable development on Barratt's land to be undertaken.
- A suggestion of a reasonable planning condition, would provide the Council with assurance through the condition that the delivery of the project would be achieved, prior to the commencement of the development.
- This condition was reasonable and necessary to achieve a comprehensively planned development in the wider public interest.
- There had been no suggestion from the land owner that a condition be imposed that the Council would have to approve or have sight of. This would only be a commercial consideration between the different land owners.
- Barratt's had been rebuffed by O&H to discuss the possibility of a collaborative arrangement.
- It was suggested that either a planning condition was imposed as per the letters from the representatives of the Barratt land or if the full infrastructure could be met with just the O&H and Marlborough contributions.
- The land owners were still of the view of participating in the development and were not objecting to the scale of the development, but were concerned over the perceived unfairness in the contributions that would have to be made.
- It was requested that the Committee grant the application with the additional condition or defer the decision until the necessary evidence showed that the obligations could be delivered, without a contribution from the Barratt land.

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

- The total contribution from Barratt land was just over 10 mil pound, if their land did not come forward the Council was still confident that the delivery of the other sites could still take place. There would likely be no need for a third

primary school and a reduction in the size of the secondary school to make up for the shortfall in contributions.

- The entering of a collaborative agreement or something similar was not something that the planning authority would look to enter into.
- The link between utilities and roads was something that would be looked at outside the planning spectrum.
- If the Committee did not grant the application this would go against the housing land supply. This application was part of the emerging local plan and going against this would jeopardise the five year land supply. It was important that the Planning inspector saw the site as deliverable and if not it could be dropped from the local plan.
- The granting of the application at this stage would be for 90% of the site as the Barratt's had not yet entered into the S106 agreement.
- If granted the planning permission would be for the whole site but that barrett could not develop their land until they signed the S106.
- There was no real scope for negotiating down the S106 agreement in the future.
- It was necessary that this site now needed to be developed and to start getting people to move into the area.
- This site would go a long way to dealing with housing and school place issues.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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 delegated to officers.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

Officers recommend that planning permission be granted subject to final signing of the O & H and Marlborough Section 106 Agreements and the imposition of a condition in respect of the Barratts land (restricting development on that land until a S106 Agreement has been entered into) and the attached conditions with authority delegated to the Director of Growth and Regeneration and the Head of Legal Services to complete the S106 and to issue the planning permission.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 4.45pm