

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

20 JULY 2021 AT 1:30PM

- 1 Procedure for Speaking
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak
3. Briefing Update

UPDATE REPORT & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Procedural Notes

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs will not be more than five minutes unless the Committee decide on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.

The total time for speeches in respect of each of the following groups of speakers shall not exceed five minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

1. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 20 JULY 2021 AT 1:30 PM

LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item	Application	Name	Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant
4.1	21/00708/FUL - Cranmore House, Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough		
4.2	21/00641/HHFUL - 71 Elmfield Road Peterborough Pe1 4ha	Mr Rahul Amin	Applicant
4.3	21/00851/HHFUL - 32 Sallows Road, Peterborough, PE1 4EU	Cllr Shaz Nawaz Umar Anwar	Ward Councillor Applicant

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 20 July 2021

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1 .	21/00708/FUL	Cranmore House Thorney Road Eye Peterborough , Erection of 25 dwellings and garages, new access and public open space

1) A supporting statement was received by the Applicant's Planning Agent on Friday 16th July 2021. Below is a summary of that statement. The full statement can be found in the Appendix 1.

- The Officer's report provides a detailed description of the proposal and explains that it is consistent with the terms of your adopted development plan. Given the detail in the report and recommendation for approval, we intend to simply highlight the key aspects of the proposal.

- The proposal is for 25 new homes located on an allocated site within the adopted Local Plan and therefore forms a small but not insignificant part of the local housing supply. You will be aware that there have been unsuccessful attempts over the last 6 or 7 years by others to gain planning permission and commence development of the site.

- The scheme has been designed to address concerns associated with earlier application, relating primarily to noise. As explained in the officer's report, these concerns have been fully addressed.

- The design of the scheme has evolved through discussions with officers and consultees to ensure all issues previously raised during determination of the first application have been addressed.

- An earlier, identical application (planning application reference: 20/01089/FUL) was only refused on ecology grounds, given that the seasonable bat surveys were not completed in time. However, all other matters were agreed with officers as having been satisfactorily resolved.

- The application before you today (21/00708/FUL) is the same application as previous, but with the relevant ecology survey information provided, which demonstrates that there will be no impact on bats. The Wildlife Officer has confirmed that the additional ecology information is acceptable, and he has no objections to the scheme. Furthermore, the additional ecology information demonstrates that a biodiversity net gain benefit which can be achieved as a result of the proposed scheme and a financial contribution has been agreed to deliver the enhancements on the nearby Eye Green Local Nature Reserve.

- Your officer has confirmed that the scheme is now acceptable and complies with your relevant development plan policies. I therefore respectfully request that you agree with your officer's recommendation and approve the application.

2 .	21/00641/HHFUL	71 Elmfield Road Dogsthorpe Peterborough PE1 4HA , Proposed front porch and single storey rear extension
-----	----------------	---

1) An email was received from the Agent on 15/07/2021 as below:

With reference to the Agenda of the Planning Committee, please see below my comments in response, which I would like you to include in the Committee Report:

4.2 Elmfield Road Committee Report (page 43)

1. Description of the site and surroundings and summary of the proposal

The original scheme was revised two days after registration (27/4/21) to show the proposed extension 8.09m x 4.54m wide.

Contrary to the planning officer's foot note at the end of this category, we were not made aware of any planning concerns until 20 May 2021.

5. Assessment of the planning issues a) Design and character of the site and surrounding area

It is pertinent to reinforce that the planning officer '*considers that the proposal would be sympathetic to the design of the existing dwelling house, and that the site is large enough to accommodate the proposal*'.

As such, it is confusing that the planning officer recommends refusal.

In addition, may I ask you please to include the following bullet points:

- Mr & Mrs Amin love Peterborough, and the area they live in, and their children are settled and doing well in their school.
- Their house has 3 bedrooms, and Mr Amin uses one of them as a study/office as he now works permanently from home. As a result, their son and daughter, who are 8 and 9, share a bedroom which is not ideal as they are getting older, and so the family desperately needs to free up the third bedroom so the children can each have a bedroom of their own.
- The existing house doesn't have a ground floor toilet facility which excludes Mrs Amin's disabled mother from visiting, to enjoy the garden and to spend precious time with her family, as she is not able to climb the stairs to the bathroom. The proposal allows for a ground floor office, where the existing kitchen is, along with a ground floor toilet facility which is desperately needed.
- Mr & Mrs Amin have a large extended family and meal times are an important, and enjoyable part of their culture. The proposed extension is primarily for a functional kitchen, allowing easy mobility for Mrs Amin's mother, and a dining area overlooking their large, well-kept garden.
- Mr & Mrs Amin approached their adjoining neighbour prior to engaging their architect, outlining their proposal, who had no objections to the 8m length along the shared boundary.
- During the planning application process, having received the disappointing feedback from the planning officer, we considered various alternatives, including a loft conversion and a smaller kitchen extension. After an extensive feasibility study these alternatives proved not to be the way forward for us.
- Mr & Mrs Amin offered to reduce the length of the extension to 7.2metres, and to reduce the height to 2.7m to lessen the alleged impact on their neighbour, but this wasn't acceptable to the planning officer. To reduce the extension length even further would not create the kitchen and dining space crucial to their family's needs.
- Having spoken to their ward councillor, Councillor Yasin, she agreed that many extensions, similar to the proposal, and some far larger, have been built in the local area, and she suggested that Mr & Mrs Amin should ask for the committee's support at this meeting.
- Below are two examples of what has been approved recently close by to the application site:

73 Elmfield Road (located to the west of no. 71) has a garden equal in length to the application site and was granted permission in 2019 to build a two storey, plus a single storey extension, and a double garage sized outbuilding with a hipped roof all at the rear of their existing, already extended property.

53 Elmfield Road (with a smaller rear garden to that of the application site) was granted permission to build a 10-metre single storey extension with a hipped roof, along the boundary of the adjoining neighbour. This extension was in addition to an existing two storey extension.

Officer Comments

4.2.1 - As a point of clarity, an email was sent by the Agent on 29/04/2021 that the Applicant wished to revise the original plans, the revised plans were received by post on 10/05/2021. Officers visited the site on 18/05/2021 and raised concerns over the length of the original extension to the agent on 20/05/2021.

4.2.5 - To clarify the refusal reason is not over the design and character of the proposed extension, but the adverse level of impact on the neighbouring property at No.69 Elmfield Road by virtue of the height, size and scale of the proposed rear extension.

4.2.5 bullet points – The first six bullet points are not addressed as they do not raise any material considerations.

4.2.5 - Point 7 - The length of the original proposal was 7.2m, which Officers expressed concern over initially. Whilst the reduced height would offer some mitigation, but the length was also a factor which required reducing to ensure an overall reduction in the impact on No.69 Elmfield. Officers requested that the length of the proposal was reduced to 4m.

Finally, the two examples are addressed within the Committee report and the differences between the current application and the approved applications is noted within the Committee Report.

3 .	21/00851/HHFUL	32 Sallows Road Peterborough PE1 4EU , First floor side extension, construction of rear dormer and addition of 3 velux windows to front roof
-----	----------------	---

1) Emails were received from the Applicant on Friday 17th July with a number of photographs to support the proposed scheme, which are included in the Appendix 2.

Whilst officers accept that some of these photographs show similarities to the proposed scheme, Officers maintain that these further demonstrate the level of irreversible harm a two-storey extension would result on the application site and the extent to which the site and surrounding area would be impacted upon. Indeed, it is the harm resulting from these examples which the Inspector noted in determining the relevant appeal case provided, and in refusing was clear that such forms of development should not be repeated.

Officers note that some of the photographs are duplicates of the same site, as well as properties with side extensions where a side gap has been retained, which are not comparable to the application site at 32 Sallows Road.

The photographs of side extensions taken from Newark Avenue, Grange Road, Vere Road, Northfield Road and Padholme Road are not considered to be comparable to the application proposal as they do not relate to the immediate environs of the site and are not relevant to its context.

2) Additional representations

2no. Additional objections were received from No.24 Chain Close, who had previously commented and their objections set out in the main Committee Report. The objections are summarised as follows:

- Very little difference to the original Application Ref 21/00250/HHFUL
- The revised plans do not look professionally drawn and could result in future problems as to ambiguities in the construction
- The dormer windows at the back are still in the plans overlooking the privacy of neighbours to the rear
- The terrace effect this extension will create is surely not acceptable
- 7 potential bedrooms for this area surely excessive
- The parking situation must also be considered as this would probably mean extra vehicles having to find a place to park in the street