

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 29 JUNE
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Harper (Chairman), Hiller (Vice Chairman), A Bond, Brown, Dowson, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, I Hussain, Jones, Sharp, and Warren.

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead
Amanda McSherry, Development Management Team Manager
Louise Simmonds, Development Management Team Manager
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer

6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence were received.

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

Councillor Ishfaq Hussain declared a non-pecuniary interest on item 20/01070/FUL - 35 Westgate Peterborough PE1 1PZ in that he knew the applicant, however, would remain in the meeting and would not be predetermined when considering the item.

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

There were no declarations to speak as Ward Councillor.

9. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

9.1 20/01026/FUL - LAND SOUTH OF LOVERS LANE SUTTON TO NENE VALLEY RAILWAY STATION AT STIBBINGTON PETERBOROUGH

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the construction of a shared-use path, providing access for pedestrians and cyclists, from the village of Sutton to the Nene Valley Railway (NVR) station at Stibbington. The path would be accessed off Lovers Lane and would run to the west and south of the Menage and then follow the former railway line on the eastern side of the field. An earthwork ramp would take the path from the field level to the old railway level. The path would continue along the former railway line.

Revisions to the scheme and additional information included a Heritage Statement, Ecological Impact Assessment and Sequential Test Statement had been received since the application was submitted and a further re-consultation had been undertaken. A Listed Building application had also been submitted for the construction of new steps to Nene Valley viaduct ref. 20/01746/LBC which was also to be considered for determination by Members of the Planning Committee.

A small section of the application site fell within Huntingdon District Council (HDC) Authority and therefore an identical application had been submitted to HDC for consideration.

The Development Management Group Lead, introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Ward Councillor Elsey and Parish Councillor Mick Grange addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There was no objection against sustainable travel or walking in countryside, however, it needed to be made available in a measured and safe way.
- The Parish Council and the local community had been involved in the formulation of a detailed A47 upgrade scheme and a balanced approach had been adopted to provide a detailed and balanced plan for all parties. The application had been submitted in isolation of the ongoing A47 upgrade scheme and seemed to be biased in favour of one user type.
- There should be a cohesive and effective sustainable travel plan suitable for all users, which was not harmful to existing residents or the quality of the village and rural areas.
- The proposal had attracted significant interest in support and against and there should be an independent report commissioned to look at the best way forward and provide a holistic overview to the proposals rather than requesting Planning Committee to resolve the matter.
- The proposed A47 walking, cycling and horse-riding route would provide a far superior route for all non-motorised and disabled users. The A47 proposals had widespread support and would not harm or disrupt residents in the local area, whereas the application presented by Mr Nash would.
- There had been many near misses and incidents with horses and cyclist using the same area proposed for the footpath. The Ward Councillors mother was currently convalescing from a hip injury caused by cyclist riding inappropriately near her horse.
- The route was popular with ramblers and the proposed path would destroy the natural setting of the route.
- The character of Sutton was a quite rural community with no foot traffic. There were narrow lanes and no footpaths, and any increase of use would create highway concerns.
- There were many serious cyclists that travel at high speeds, which would not mix with ramblers and horses.
- A road safety audit should be carried out for Lovers Lane in relation to the use by cyclist verses pedestrians to ensure there was no risk to either user.
- The increase in use would create noise and disturbance for residents on weekends and summer evenings.
- An active strategy consultation was required before all options could be considered.

- There had been 79% of residents against the application and it was surprising that the highways needs of cyclists verses horse riders had not been considered to its full extent.
- The proposed A47 route had covered all options to provide suitable services and accessibility for all users. The A47 plans had also covered all the objectives outlined within the proposed pathway, which included connectivity to the green wheel and travel routes to the north for cyclists.
- Sutton was a unique village and was used by walkers with dogs and there were many horse riders that used the Lovers Lane route.
- There was a growing number of road cyclists and off-road cyclists using rural footpaths, which was not permitted.
- The application was contrary to LP2 and had not enhanced the character of the conservation area. In addition, the application had not met the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 41, 91 and 92 in dealing with areas of unique and special material considerations, nor was it a balance for enhancements for the whole community.
- The photos shown on the presentation had not captured the full access route from opposite the Nene way entrance which was dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The application proposed to install a hard tarmac footpath and dangerous cattle grid which was not required.
- The crossing was 800 millimetres wide which was not wide enough for a cyclist to walk beside a bike. If a rambler was approaching from a different direction, the route would be impossible to walk across.
- Tarmac was not suitable for the area and especially in the summer when it would be too hot for dogs to walk on.
- The area was prone to flooding and became impassable for weeks. There should be a sequential test carried out for the flooding in the area and the application be refused on the findings.
- A more balanced walking, horse riding and cycling proposal should be given consideration for the unique area of Sutton Village.
- The issue was that the new path would be made into a mode of transport purely for cyclists.
- The amenity for the current users of Sutton village would be detrimentally affected by the application, should it be approved, particularly for retired and elderly people.
- There had been a recent issue with cyclists using the route through the village of Sutton where there was a post box three metres from the apex to Lovers Lane and a cyclist was travelling too fast and fell off. This issue was a risk to both cyclists and pedestrians.
- The suggestion that a tarmac surface would enhance the area was not appropriate especially in the summer for dogs and horses. Currently the grass path was cooling, however Tarmac would become too slippery for horses' shoes and hot for dogs' paws. In addition, over time the surface would wear.
- There would be no objection if a softer surface had been suggested. Tarmac was a cheaper option, however there had been no thought to public safety in considering the proposed material.
- The proposed A47 route was perfectly acceptable and had been designed to bypass most of the traffic out of Sutton village and would direct users to the top of the area to connect to the Nene Park and Wansford.
- If the application was rejected and the A47 was approved, it would not mean that the cyclist could not use the Sutton village routes, however the softer surface would deter cyclists away from the village.

- There was a community group to discuss the A47 route with Highways England and there had been a campaign to ensure cyclists were provided for.
- The cattle grid proposal within the application was a safety issue for horses.
- There were small groups of cyclists using the route through Sutton village which acted overly aggressively to the point of forcing pedestrians onto the grass verges.
- Sutton villagers were extremely passionate about the proposals to install the tarmac surface and was opposed to the application.

Mr Simon Scriven, objector, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There would be an increased risk to all users of Sutton village if the application was approved. This had included significant safety risks on the single lane roads with no pavements. There was a blind junction on Lovers Lane and all users currently had to take care when approaching.
- There had been mention in the report about a condition, which required visibility splays at the junction on Lovers Lane, however the provision would be impossible to implement. The photo provided during the presentation had not shown that there was a stone wall at the church yard and a stone wall at a listed cottage, however, there was no room to install the suggested visibility splays proposed.
- It was predicted that there would be no increased cyclists use when the proposed path was installed, however the evaluation should have explored what the worse outcome to risk would be rather than hoping for the best.
- The report had suggested that there would be a minimal risk to horse riders and there had been a reliance on scientific evidence. However, the statement and scientific evidence would not apply to a village with single track roads, where there were no pavements and blind junctions, as these were not national characteristics.
- There was an obvious risk to horse riders if a cattle grid was installed as this would pose a death sentence for a horse if it became spooked and bolted.
- Installation of a gate instead of the proposed catted grid would present a safer option, as horse riders and cyclists would be required to dismount.
- The proposed new route down the old railway would not be accessible by horse riders and non-motorised users as suggested by the applicant.
- The policy criteria had not been taken seriously and condition 14 about signage would need to be much stronger.
- With the A47 route proposal underway, the application added no value and could therefore not be justified.
- A further independent report as suggested by the councillor representative should be considered to provide a solution.
- It was preferred that the cattle grid should be refused.
- All fields that held cattle was currently gated.

Andrew Nash and Andrew MacDermott, the applicant and supporter addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Peterborough Cycle West (PCW) was a voluntary group that had been trying to increase the safe cycle routes to the people of Peterborough. There had been a lack of cycle routes in the west of the City, which the group were trying to improve.
- Some cyclists had to cross very dangerous roads such as the A1, which had deterred them travelling to Wansford and the West. In addition, the only route to Wansford and the West for cyclists was along a dangerous part of the A47.

- The disused part of the railway line was part of a discussion to safeguard the land for future walking and cycling infrastructure as designated under the adopted Peterborough Local Plan LP15, and therefore it was appropriate for consideration for the application.
- The PCW intended to open part of the network to cyclists, which was supported by Nene Valley and Nene Park Trusts. This would connect with the Nene Park and rural estate and the Nene Valley Railway, and all parties were in favour of the proposals as landowners.
- The proposed route would also allow networks for other pedestrians and there had been considerable support for this and from Northants.
- The proposed route would be more accessible to users over the winter periods and would only be inaccessible during the flooding period.
- The proposal would connect many villages across the A1 such as Stibbington.
- The proposed route was complementary to the East Northants and Highways England A47 network development plans and PCW fully supported the proposals to link the greenway route between Sutton roundabout and Wansford village, as it would provide safer access to the west and northwest into the Rutland and Leicestershire areas.
- The proposed route would attract many types of cyclists from families to leisure due to the type of barriers proposed, whereas the proposed A47 route would attract road cyclists or any riders wishing to get to Wansford and beyond in the quickest and shortest time.
- If the application was approved, it would not prompt Highways England to cancel their A47 improvement proposals.
- The proposal would reduce road traffic and promote health lifestyles, which was in line with the Council's own objectives.
- The proposal would be financed by outside governing bodies and the maintenance of the route would be the responsibility of the landowners.
- The ecological assessment had been developed to mitigate any harm to landscape and wildlife.
- Appropriate signage could help prevent accidents occurring for cyclists and horse riders in order to mitigate the concerns raised.
- The risks of cyclist straying onto the footpaths should not happen as there would be adequate map and route signage, which had not existed currently.
- The proposal would be a valuable and cost-effective addition to the local cycling network.
- The proposal was in line with the Council's objective to safeguard a sustainable travel network and the maintenance costs would not be a drain on the City.
- The tarmac surface proposed for the footpath was more durable and less prone to damage. In addition, it was known that part of the path often flooded and a less durable surface would be washed away. It had stated within the Council's LP19 and 20 policy that tarmac should be used where possible, however, there had been suggestions in relation to mixing the proposed tarmac material with gravel. In addition, further discussions could be held with Sutton Parish Council in relation to the material to be used.
- A gate had been considered; however, it was easier for cyclist to install cattle grids. Furthermore, consideration had been given by the applicant in relation to a gate, however, there could be noise disturbance issue as a result of using this option.
- The applicant would not want the proposed tarmac path to be kept in bad condition and the maintenance to mitigate this risk had been included in the plans going forward.

- The visibility splays would be installed at the bottom of Lovers Lane. The applicant would ensure there would be an appropriate level of signage installed.
- The proposed cattle grids were only 10 cm apart and the likelihood of this being a danger to horses was not considered a risk. There were many routes for horses to go. The applicant had a duty to ensure safety for all users and would not want to neglect them.

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

- Members were advised that highway? safety on Lovers Lane would be covered by the imposition of a condition for visibility splays and it was not within the applicants remit to control or change as there were third party landowners to consider.
- Members commented that there was a risk of creating a busy cycle route through the village of Sutton. In addition, Members raised concerns about the single carriage road through Sutton village and questioned where pedestrians would seek refuge if forced off the single-track road by cyclists.
- Members also commented that although it had been suggested that an incident as a result of the installation of the proposed route was unlikely, horses may go on the cattle grid, which would be a huge risk, and this would be an issue waiting to happen.
- There was an existing pathway and bridleway, and it would not be appropriate to make this into tarmac path
- Members raised concerns about the use of cattle grids.
- The path would not be in keeping with the rural setting and there was a risk that road bikes could also be attracted to the route which could lead to further dangers.
- The bridge was quite narrow and not fit for use as applied for.
- The forthcoming Northants and Highways England A47 route proposed was perceived to be much safer and quicker route and therefore, the current application was of no value.
- The Nene Park Trust had considerable experience in similar matters, however, the application needed to be improved before it could be considered for approval.
- Members also commented that the application could cause harm to the environment and amenity of residents. In addition, the cattle grid would cause damage to horses and other animals in the area.
- Members also commented that Peterborough City Council aimed to promote a carbon natural City for the future, however there was a safety concern with the aspect of the application.
- There were many scenarios that could happen in terms of public safety if the proposed application was approved, and NPT could not control all of these.
- The tarmac pathway was designed for speed and convenience.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against the officers recommendation to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (9 For, 2 Abstentions) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Members agreed that the application was contrary to planning policy as follows:

1. The amenity of the residents of the village of Sutton would be unacceptably impacted, therefore, the proposal was contrary to LP17.

2. The proposal would be unacceptable to the landscape of Sutton village, specifically in relation to the installation of tarmac material proposed, which was alien to the landscape. Therefore, the proposal was contrary to LP16 and LP19.

9.2 20/01746/LBC - PLANNING APPLICATION NENE VALLEY RAILWAY BRIDGE SUTTON PETERBOROUGH

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to approve the construction of a new set of steps to the existing bridge structure. The new steps would be wider and longer than the existing steps to allow easier access for cyclists and pedestrians and would include two resting places and a wheeling channel for bicycles. The steps would have lattice work and balustrade to match the existing and would be painted 'Signal Grey'.

Members considered this application at the same time as the application for 20/01026/Ful - Land South Of Lovers Lane Sutton To Nene Valley Railway Station At Stibbington Peterborough.

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.

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:

- It was considered that the work would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the listed building and would accord with section 66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and would be in accordance with Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Heritage considerations) (2019).

9.3 20/01070/FUL - 35 WESTGATE PETERBOROUGH PE1 1PZ

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the subdivision of ground floor retail shop and associated alterations to form six Class E(a) retail units and taxi cab office (sui generis), change of 67 DCCORPT_2018-04-04 2 use of second floor to restaurant (Class E(b)) and associated external alterations.

The taxi cab office would be for the benefit of a private hire taxi company. The proposed shop front alterations comprised of the installation of four new pedestrian openings serving a Cab Booking Office, retail units and the upper floors, as well as the installation of transom and stall risers.

A smooth white render finish was also proposed for the upper floors on the front elevation, facing Westgate, and the installation of an external extraction flue to the rear elevation. The original application submitted, sought to extend the proposed restaurant on the top floor to form a shisha lounge and storage area. However, further to reviewing this element of the proposal, it was noted that number three Westgate to the east had extant consent to convert the upper floors from office to residential, and would have imposed an unacceptably adverse impact on these future occupiers. As such, the first floor extension, forming shisha lounge and storage had been omitted from the proposal.

The Group Lead for Development Management introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Councillor Jamil, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included

- The application was called in to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee as the Ward Councillor was not satisfied of the taxi element.
- The proposal for the private hire taxi cab office had not been suggested for the right location. Furthermore, an application for proposals to allow a mobile sandwich shop within the Hackney Carriage rank would not be permitted.
- The biggest issue with the proposals had included the private hire taxi service, as there had already been a Hackney Carriage rank service in operation outside the premises proposed and one at the bus station. There had also been a private taxi booking office located a few hundred yards down the road. Therefore, the Westgate area was already overserved with taxi services.
- Hackney Taxi Carriage drivers were exploring the option of purchasing electric cars the proposed application would invite more diesel cars.
- There was limited available space between the Hackney Carriage bay to John Lewis's. There could be issues with private hire taxi's arriving early or customers arriving late and therefore, traffic could build up along that stretch of highway.
- The LA licensing team had stated that there was no identifiable benefit in introducing an additional taxi service, as the Westgate area was already served by existing services.
- The proposed element of the taxi business had been problematic and the enforcement in terms of controlling the private taxi pick up could cause a build up of conflict between private hire and Hackney Taxi Carriage operators.
- The application needed to be resubmitted with consideration to remove the private hire taxi cab element.
- It was felt that the area was overserved by taxi services and there had been no obvious reasons to the Ward Councillor as to why the applicant had believed there would be a business opportunity for such a service.
- The other taxi office had vehicles parked at the back of the office, a car would arrive quickly and transport the person to where they need to go. Additional activity would lead to a large volume of cars parking in the surrounding area of Westgate.

Mr Tahir Chaudary, objector, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There were three Hackney Carriage rank services in operation near the premises proposed. There had also been a private taxi booking office located a few hundred yards down the road. Although the Hackney service was not in competition with the private hire service, there were financial implications for the Hackney sector of the trade.
- There had been a financial impact on Hackney Carriage services due to the availability of private hire in operation, which had caused trade issues for the Hackney business with drivers leaving the trade.
- There was limited space for Hackney Carriages, and this would be impacted by the addition of a further taxi service.
- There were other offices in the City with very large parking spaces that could accommodate a private hire taxi service outside of the City. Customers would book

this service through a mobile phone application and the taxi would arrive when required

- The ranks were needed for the members of the public that were disabled, who want a more direct service rather than have to wait for a taxi to arrive.
- The Hackney Carriage operators would stop earning money and there was a danger of losing the Hackney Carriage service entirely, if the proposals were approved.
- Peterborough was striving for a green environment, but Hackney drivers would not be able to contribute, if their businesses were impacted by the loss of income due to the operation of too many private hire taxi companies in the area.
- There were 10% of electric Hackney Carriage vehicles in the last two years and this was a good investment, however, further investment could be impacted by approval of the proposal.
- The application should be refused as it was detrimental to the environment and public safety issues within the Westgate area. Furthermore, there had been many accidents on the junction close to the proposed premises, which was very congested at peak times of traffic.
- It had not made sense to allow a private hire taxi company to operate in that area.
- There had been a particular issue in the Westgate area where, night-time trade customers would try to get into the taxi that other customers had ordered. This had resulted in the Police being called and the private hire company needing to hire security at that office to mitigate the issues. Hackney Carriage drivers would be available to provide a service immediately, therefore moving the customer away efficiently, which limited the risk element of inappropriate behaviour by the passenger.

At this point Cllr brown left the room

Mr Attique Suleman, supporter addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The application would not be detrimental to the hackney trade as the applicant was aiming to work with the Hackney Carriage operators to provide the citizens of Peterborough with additional services.
- The proposed restaurant would provide amenities for the Westgate area and attract investments for the City.
- The concerns raised about safety, congestion and disabled users would be mitigated by providing a safe place to wait. Use of a mobile phone application, would also allow customers and their families to track the taxi order. In addition, the payment system available through the mobile application was contactless.
- The applicant was keen to work with the Hackney operators and encourage the use of technology for safe contactless payments. Some of the Hackney drivers had partnered up with mini cab drivers to provide a service and therefore, the application was not about competition or disadvantaging Hackney drivers in anyway.
- The proposal offered outside investment for the City, whilst providing safer services to the citizens of Peterborough.
- The private hire taxis could not park on the street and wait for customers, there had to be a booking made by a customer, otherwise there were licensing enforcement implications. Therefore, the booking office provided a location for the customer to book and wait from. Furthermore, the private taxis would be permitted

to collect their booked customer from the loading bays marked within the area and not in the Hackney Carriage rank.

- The mini cab drivers would be located in designated car parks near the City to wait for their bookings.
- The private hire taxi model offered a mobile phone application, which informed the customer when the taxi had arrived and what vehicle to get into. In some cases this provided a faster service than a Hackney Carriage operation.
- There were significant amounts of people requiring taxi travel than the Hackney Carriages were able to offer. The private hire service allowed customers to seek an alternative offer rather than the proposal presenting competition in the taxi service sector.
- There were also four parking bays for Hackney Carriages on Park Road and four outside the proposed site.
- There had been no current determination on how many electric vehicle options would be available, however, the applicant intended to explore and provide them in the future.
- There was a lot of potential for growth in Peterborough as there were a lot of restaurants looking to start up. Providing a taxi service for Peterborough had been a positive thing and for other retail and restaurant companies. Other taxi companies, such as Hackney Carriages needed to develop technology and adapt.
- The office needed to be located in the City Centre as there was a lot of trade to benefit from. The technology element came into play when the passenger would make electronic payments and their journey could be tracked.
- The current Hackney Carriage (HC) demonstration had been instigated by other companies both HC and private hire to deter new services and investment coming into Peterborough. In addition, taxi service delivery was changing, and market research showed that there were benefits of using the new technology and this could have contributed to the decline in use of HC hire vehicles.
- The applicant had explored the option of alternative sites, however it was felt that the proposed location in the City had provided a good business opportunity.
- There had been sufficient parking further down the road on Westgate and loading bays available for private hire vehicles to collect passengers, however, if sufficient space was unavailable, the passenger would need to wait in the office and the driver would find a different location in the surrounding streets.
- It had not been determined at this stage what type of restaurant would be in operation if the planning application was approved.
- The proposed taxi hire office would be completely accessible for disabled passengers and offer a range of appropriate cars. In addition, there was currently a HC waiting area for disabled customers if a vehicle was not in situ at one of the HC bays. The applicants service, would offer a range of services to disabled customers, including the use of HC vehicles.

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

- Members were advised that the potential temporary two-year licence condition would allow the LA to monitor any potential for crime as a result of the proposals and allow a period of time between allowing the business to commence operation and implement mitigation measures. The temporary consent could be a different amount of time if Members required.
- Members were advised that the application sought private hire taxi vehicles to pick up passengers in restricted parking areas.

- Members were advised that the collection of passengers was more efficient as the driver would be located elsewhere in the City, thus avoiding private hire vehicles waiting for long periods of time.
- Officers had considered the feasibility of the proposal rather than the specific needs of disabled passengers.
- Restaurant delivery services would use the double yellow or surrounding streets, however the application was for a restaurant and not take away service. If approved, the applicant could offer an ancillary takeaway service, however, this would be minor in comparison to the main restaurant business end.
- If the planning application was approved the applicant would be required to apply for a separate licence to operate as a private hire taxi office.
- There were other licensing regimes for the preparation, sale and delivery of hot food.
- Members commented that there were several people that waited for taxis during the night time trade and there had been a taxi Marshalls service in the City to mitigate any ASB issues if they arose, however, there were issues of vehicle congestion, intoxicated people as well as takeaway delivery services, which could increase ASB issues already being experienced in the area.
- Some Members commented that there had not appeared to be any evidence that the proposals would introduce electric vehicles and there was a potential for inviting more diesel vehicles, which would be less efficient than the HC taxi vehicles.
- There had been anti-social behaviour issues experienced at the current private hire taxi office located near to the proposed application and therefore, it was felt that the proposal was not the right location and could compound issues being experienced in the area.
- Some Members felt that the application had met all the planning criteria, however, there was no compelling need for another taxi hire service within the area.
- The night time economy been impacted during the Covid – 19 pandemic, however, there were opportunities for businesses and plenty of room for growth.
- Some Members felt that the current proposal needed to be redrafted taking into account the comments and concerns raised by Members and the applicant should resubmit the application with a more holistic perspective of the area and business surroundings.
- Members commented that there was full sympathy for the scheme, however, there was no reason the location of the proposed taxi office within the Westgate area was needed, despite the offer of technology to book a taxi. In addition, there were other private hire companies that had operated outside of the City Centre.
- Members commented that there was a risk of ASB from customers who might become confused about what taxi they were using since the HC service would be located outside the proposed private hire taxi office site.
- Members were advised that congestion was not a significant reason for refusal of the proposal.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officer recommendations and **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (4 For, 1 Against, 5 Abstentions) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The planning application was refused for the following reasons:

The proposed taxi booking office, which would bring additional people into the area late at night, would result in the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour in the vicinity of Westgate and thereby would not comprise a positive contribution to the character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

9.4 20/01707/R4FUL - NENE PARK ACADEMY, OUNDLE ROAD, PETERBOROUGH PE2 7EA

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to the construction of an air dome covered football pitch with associated two storey accommodation/facilities building. In addition, formalisation of existing gravel parking through hard surfacing was proposed alongside some land re-profiling and soft landscaping. The air dome would be of dimensions: 63 metres (length) by 45 metres (width) by 11.24 metres 85 DCCORPT_2018-04-04 2 (maximum height).

It would be finished largely in white polyester fabric membrane, albeit the north-western and north-eastern elevations would have the lower three metres finished in graduating green (from dark to light). The dome would contain a full-size third generation all-weather football pitch with floodlighting.

The accommodation block building would comprise of changing rooms and an office space at ground floor, with classrooms, meeting rooms and a parent/guest lounge at first floor. The building would be of dimensions: 38.8m (length) by 10m (width) by 6.87m (height).

The building was proposed to be of regular rectangular form, with a flat roof and would be sited to the west of the air dome. The proposed car park would be positioned to the west of the accommodation building whilst the soft landscaping would be to the north of the air dome, to create a treed screen to the structure. It was noted that the proposal originally included the demolition of a building on the site known as the Lakeside building. This however has already been demolished through the exercising of permitted development rights and has therefore been removed from this application.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Bob Symms, Paul Ingle and Mark Woods, the agent and the applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Peterborough United was a championship club with a category two academy and was associated with income that would generate growth to the City.
- The application was not just for Peterborough United Football club, but would benefit the Nene park Academy and the City.
- Consent already existed on the site for two artificial surface five a side pitches on exactly the same piece of land and gravel car park, the proposal was to provide a covering for the area.
- Other locations were considered for the proposal and would not impact on Orton Hall or conservation area.
- No existing grass pitches would be lost as a result of the proposal.
- Other designs were considered however, the air dome provided the least intrusive structure.
- The main structure was set back from the edges of Oundle Road as opposed to the two to three storey buildings by the site.

- There would be no light glow from the materials or noise levels the shape proposed for the building. The graduated patchwork colour scheme would provide a backdrop to the new planting scheme which would screen the dome and provide a valuable wildlife corridor to the site.
- No objections had been raised by the conservation, archaeological, wildlife or tree officers.
- Drainage issues had also been overcome.
- Sport England was in full support of the proposals.
- Concerns had been raised about the noise from the proposed sports facility however, there had been other sporting activities in progress at the neighbouring school until 10pm. In addition, the proposed pitches would have a 9pm curfew.
- Noise construction has also been raised as an issue, however the methods of construction for the proposed build would be quicker and quieter due to modern methods.
- The football club had provided services to the community such as support to the elderly, vaccination centre, food parcel deliveries to families during school closures, free summer holiday events, girl's scholarships, disability football and deaf children's sessions, to name a few. In addition, it would be disappointing not to be able to continue to serve the community and residents of Peterborough through the proposed opportunity.
- The site was in a very bad state of repair and there was a building that had caught fire on a regular basis.
- The proposal would serve the aspirations that the football club had for the area, especially for young people.
- There were young people that had trained at the Nene Park Academy that had moved onto a higher level. Attaining a category two status for the academy would provide a continuation of the football apprenticeship success.
- There was a lot of activity in the area that contributed to the noise levels to neighbours, therefore, it was felt that the Officer's recommendations were unbalanced and distorted for the current application.
- The proposed dome would be surrounded by plants and trees, which was intended to protect the neighbouring area. The benefit of such a facility would massively outweigh the challenges that may occur, such as noise, car parking and the appearance of the structure.
- The screening had been designed to protect nearby houses and would not be in view of them. The applicant had placed mitigation measures for the protection of noise to neighbours from the school.
- The dome would provide an all-weather sporting facility for the community.
- There had been parking, noise and drainage issues raised for the site; however, it was felt by the applicant that these issues had been addressed.
- Alternative locations were considered but were rejected as it would have caused an impact on the conservation area. The proposal's view impact for houses was unfortunate, however the window closest to the site would be screened by trees and there would be no right angle view from the nearby houses.
- The increase in traffic, could be over 50%, however, the impact of the two current Astro turf pitches which had planning permission, could cause the same impact. There would also be a nine o'clock curfew, however the rest of the site could operate until 10pm. This was because the existing sites were in situ before the surrounding houses were built.
- The current permission for two pitches and the proposal would provide a facility for community activities through the school and foundation in addition to the football academy and would provide an all-weather option.

- A category two status would help to retain young sporting talents, rather than them having moving to other football academies outside of the City to pursue their career.
- The two pitches were part of the current planning consent; however the new proposal would provide a covering for the pitches and captain academy status. In addition, the demolition of the current lakeside facility would provide a gravel car park, a better classroom and changing rooms for the football youth teams in an indoor space.
- People tend to lose interest in activities when the weather gets colder and darker, the proposal would help maintain interest.
- The applicant had aimed to provide better facilities for sporting activities.

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

- Members were advised that the current planning permission for the two grass pitches and gravel car park was granted as part of the Nene Park Academy development. The current Peterborough Football Academy should have been demolished in 2011 as part of the that planning permission and currently it there was planning breach of permissions. Sports England had no objection to the new proposals, however, there had been a difference in how the use would increase from an outdoor facility compared to indoors.
- Members were advised that harm from the proposal outweighed the benefit, which was why the officers had recommended refusal. The traffic would increase during the hours of seven to eight in the evening which would be a 50% increase in usage. In addition, the extra traffic would congregate nearer to the Longfield Gate properties with a circa of 26 cars, which would cause an unacceptable harm to neighbours as a result.
- Although there was already an impact from the current 98 vehicle movements, 26 additional vehicle movements would be an unacceptable impact.
- The two approved junior pitches would take up the green space being proposed for the dome; however, it was always anticipated that these pitches would not be installed due to financial compensation offered to install the pitches elsewhere in the locality and the formation of the Peterborough United Academy. Therefore comparing, the impact of the use of the two approved grass pitches would not be realistic.
- Members were advised that the existing gravel car park was located where the proposed air dome would be constructed. A demolished building would accommodate the proposed car park applied for and it was anticipated that visitors would use the access road, which immediately abutted the residents at Longfield Gate. Therefore, the traffic movements would cause additional noise disturbances for the neighbours.
- The traffic noise disturbance could last until after 9:15 in the evening for the Longfield Gate residents.
- The planning breach of two playing fields condition could not be complied with and discussions had been held with Sports England and PCC to resolve the issue. Furthermore, the discussions were on hold until the outcome of this planning application, however a financial compensation may need to be agreed to resolve the breach issue if the permission was not granted.
- Members commented that the City would benefit from a category two football training ground and attract growth.
- The Peterborough Academy had a good reputation in training young players.
- Some Members felt that there was a risk that residents of Longfield Gate could be looking out at a dome, and it could take decades for the tree screening to grow.

- The structure would look alien and in congress and not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- The proposed dome was a controversial shape; however, the negative comments from residents could reduce in the future and they may find it to be a positive facility to have.
- Peterborough lacked many sport facilities especially for football and more should be undertaken to entice the sport into the City. Furthermore, the football club would be offering support for the community and vulnerable people.
- Members commented that the applicant had demonstrated that the benefits of the proposal had outweighed the negative impact on the neighbours at Longfield Gate.
- There would be an amenity loss for residents, and on balance, the proposal would significantly benefit the community and for that reason, Members were minded to go against officer recommendations.
- Members commented that conditions should include that tree used for screening should be of a significant maturity to ensure that they were serious about their commitment to mitigate the impact to neighbouring properties.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against the officer recommendation and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (10 For, 1 Against, 0 Abstentions) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable under:

Local Plan policies LP16 and LP17 as the loss of amenity had not warranted the refusal of the planning application.

9.5 21/00170/FUL - 42 SHERBORNE ROAD DOGSTHORPE PETERBOROUGH PE1 4RJ

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the proposed conversion of the dwelling into 2 flats, the erection of a fence and gate, and associated alterations.

The proposal would also result in the removal of the existing garage to the rear and installation of two five metre by two point five metre parking spaces on existing concrete hardstanding. The proposal was revised to provide an entrance to the ground floor flat on the side elevation fronting the public highway.

Planning permission 18/01202/HHFUL approved a single storey side, two storey rear extensions and dropped kerb. The current proposal application had not proposed to extend the property but had made use of the extensions previously approved, which were not yet complete, within the proposal. The structure of the single storey side and two storey rear extensions was currently in place, however, works were currently required to complete the development.

The Group Lead for Development Management introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- Members commented that the highways team had placed the relevant safety measures for the three parking spaces.
- Members had not felt that there would be any issues with neighbours in relation to highways issues, despite the reasons why the application was called in.
- Some Members felt that there had been some concerns raised about a house of multiple occupation, car parking and the junction close to the proposed development, which appeared dangerous.
- Members felt that the applicant had provided good plans for the bedroom and the highway issues raised had been dealt with.
- The rearrangement of the accommodation would not impact occupants of the existing flats.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (10 For, 1 Against, 0 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:

- It was not considered the character and appearance of the surrounding area would not be adversely impacted by the proposed conversion of the dwelling into 2 flats, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The existing levels of neighbour amenity of the adjacent properties would not be adversely impacted by the proposed development, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The adjacent public highway would not be adversely impacted by the development, and sufficient car parking is proposed in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Chairman
18:10pm