

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 6 JULY
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE PETERBOROUGH**

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

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead
Amanda McSherry, Development Management Team Leader
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Sarah Hann, Highways Engineer

10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ishfaq Hussain and Councillor Brown. Councillor Sainsbury and Councillor Rush were in attendance as substitutes.

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Iqbal declared an interested in item 4.3 as he knew was also the Ward Councillor that the application was in relation to, however he had not been involved with the application at any stage.

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

There were no representations from Councillors to speak as Ward Councillors.

13. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

13.1 21/00477/FUL - 17 Crowland Road Eye Peterborough PE6 7TP

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to for the erection of a large building at the rear of the site.

The building would be L shaped, with the main part of the building adjacent to the side boundary with No.19 measuring approximately 20.25m by 10.37m, with an eaves height of 3.5m and a total overall height of 4.35m. The smaller flat roof section of the proposal positioned along the rear boundary would measure approximately 7.6m x 3.6m x 2.6 in height.

The proposal would also result in the demolition of an existing smaller of the two outbuildings and the rear car port structure on site. 3 no. parking spaces and 1no. disabled parking space are also proposed as part of this application.

It is proposed that the building would comprise of a hobbies (classic cars) unit which has an area 65 sq. meters in the main part of the building, and a store and workshop unit which would measure 130 sq. meters in total. With an office, WC and reception area to serve the store and workshop unit has an area of 21 sq. meters. As such the total internal area of the building will be approximately 216 sq. meters.

For clarity, the proposed building consists of the following:

- The hobbies (classic cars) unit would be used by the resident of No.17 Crowland Road, Mr Godsland, to house his classic/vintage car collection and carry out any works to them. For the sake of clarity, the existing outbuilding on site proposed to be retained by this proposal, is also currently used to house the classic/vintage cars of Mr Godsland as well as allowing him to carry out any works to them.

- The proposed adjoining store, workshop, office, WC and reception areas within the building would be used by Mr Jarvis to carry out his window tinting business from the premises. Mr Jarvis runs his existing window tinting business from his residential property at No.30 Crowland Road, closeby on the opposite side of the road. He has stated that should the proposal be approved then Mr Jarvis would shut down the current window tinting business at No.30 Crowland Road (approved under planning ref 06/00552/FUL and 08/01088/FUL). The business operates from his garage building on site which measure 11.7m x 5m, total of 58.5sqm.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Kevin Rayner, objector, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The application being proposed would impact the quality of life for local residents and the rest of the family would be adversely affected by the application.
- Members were made aware that the family had relocated to the property due a number of personal incidents that had taken place at previous homes, most notably an accident whereby a vehicle had left the road and embedded itself within the walls of the property. Both the objector's wife and young son were trapped upstairs because of the accident. Due to this accident the objector's wife had been influenced by any loud bangs or noises, including the revving of vehicles.
- Back in 2016-17 the family moved into their current address (10 Green Road), believing that this was going to be the property they retired to.
- When purchasing the property, they were led to believe that planning permission was given for a bungalow on 17 Crowland Road.
- If the application was to be granted there would be an adverse impact on the quality of life, especially as this property was to be used for retiring into.
- Five of the eight rooms would be impacted by parking at this proposed development.

Mr Jarvis, applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- With regards to the objection at 12 Green Road, the worry with regards to noise from PSCC was not valid. The resident's son ran a bike tuning business and a metal fabrication business from the rear of the property. There were a number of vehicles that would have to drive by 12 Green Road, of which no complaints had

been made. The proposed workshop doors would be 21 metres away from the boundary of 12 Green Road and would not cause any nuisance.

- With regards to the premises at 10 Green Road this was 19 metres away from the proposed workshop doors and no noise would be heard from that distance.
- The applicant stressed that they wished to ensure friendly and open dialogue with neighbours. It was highlighted that the first application was withdrawn taking on board comments made regarding the health of one of the residents at 10 Green Road.
- Members were informed that the business fitted tinting to car windows which was by its nature a quiet trade. There were only four cars a day driving up to the premises for work to be completed. It was stressed that most of the work was completed on newer models of car that were quieter in nature.
- There had been no complaints made by neighbours living in close proximity to the current business location.
- The proposed location for the business had better access points than the current business location. There was more parking available which would cause less parking on Crowland Road.
- It was noted that 17 Crowland Road was always marked for commercial use.
- Currently the business was running out of a small garage, the current proposal would allow for more space to carry out the business and allow for some storage space on site. One of the units was to be retained by Mr Gosland for his use to restore classic vehicles. There had been numerous attempts made to find alternative sites however these had been unsuccessful.
- One of the advantages of the proposed site was to have more parking and prevent parking on Crowland Road.
- There was an existing commercial unit at the bottom of 19 Crowland Road, the existing garage being retained was originally a petrol station. The proposal did not interfere with any loss of amenity to local residents.
- To the left of the proposed site there was a large commercial unit and to the right was the existing commercial property, which was now a private resident. The proposal was smaller in comparison to other sites and wouldn't affect the character of the area.
- No complaints had been made by local residents over the past 20 years. There would only be three or four cars a day entering the premises.
- Members were informed that 30% of the business involved work on cars, another 30% was on commercial premises. The rest of the business was dealing with online trade. The current proposals would allow more storage space and the ability to do more trade online.
- The business traded five days a week, anyone who has a private business had to book an appointment, this ensured that the business was not overwhelmed and there were no excess vehicles on site. There would be no more than four vehicles a day on site being worked on.
- The proposal was for the land to be bought off Mr Gosland, if the plans were acceptable. The land where the business was proposed would then belong to the applicant. Mr Gosland would retain the land were his residential premises and workshop were situated.
- It was clarified that the classic cars were worked on by Mr Gosland. The applicant needed premises that could store vehicles overnight as they were expensive and needed to be locked away safely in case car dealerships could not collect the vehicles.

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

- Members were informed that currently on site there was a residential property. The existing outbuildings on the site had permission for classic car use. The person living in the residential property could use the outbuildings for hobby uses. There was no commercial use on the site.
- The outbuildings were of ancillary use to the house. The owner could use equipment to work on classic cars, however they would need to be mindful of noise pollution and this could be investigated if it became a nuisance.
- To the rear of the application site there was an existing commercial building which was given planning permission over 20 years ago. To the north and south of the site there were residential properties.
- There were a number of reasons which had been presented for grounds for refusal, however there had been a number of arguments made by the applicant for granted approval. It was important to take note that the premises currently had permission to work on and restore vehicles. The proposed business of tinting car windows was not likely to be noisy or cause much disruption to residents. It was unlikely that a new commercial unit would damage the character of the area.
- It was noted that the frequency of cars going past the residential properties would be minimal, especially as there were only four cars a day maximum.
- There were sympathies with the objector as this was in close proximity to the boundary of the proposed commercial unit.
- There was likely to be a large wall created down the side of 19 Crowland Road, linking the housing with the commercial unit. It would have an effect on 19 Crowland Road and their garden. There would be no gap between the residential properties and commercial units.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officer recommendation and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 For, 2 Against, 1 Abstention) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The application to be approved contrary to officer recommendation with conditions relating to time commencement, approved plans, hours and days of operation, materials, highways conditions, restriction on use, control of noise and personal permission. A unilateral undertaking to cease the use at 30 Crowland Road was also required.

13.2 20/01678/FUL - The Black House Farm Crowland Road Eye Peterborough

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to convert the agricultural building to serve as 2no. 2-bed holiday lets. Minor external works are also proposed, associated with the conversion. These predominantly relate to new or altered window and door openings, but also includes the removal of a lean-to element and closing up of a currently open side to the northern elevation facing into the courtyard.

It should be noted that re-consultation followed on this proposal after Officers noted that the private access road serving the site is not in the ownership of the Applicant. The Applicant amended the ownership certificate from Certificate A to Certificate B, and served the requisite notice upon all landowners.

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

John Johnston, objector, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- As owner of the access road rights had been given to the applicant of the proposed development to use the road. It was stated that the road was 270 metres long and 5 metres wide.
- The local highways authority was objecting to the proposals. There were no public footpaths serving the site and it was too dangerous to enter or leave the site by foot.
- These proposals ran against the Council's own planning policy documents, in these circumstances the application should be rejected and the highways objection needed to be upheld.
- It was noted that planning officers had stated that they did not get involved in private access matters, however in the presentations it was shown the scale of the size of the driveway with photos of vehicles using the access road.
- If there were two vans or lorries using the driveway it would not be possible for them to pass each other. It was unrealistic as per the officer's report to prevent vehicles from reversing down onto Crowland Road, which they would need to do in order to allow each other access.
- In order to protect utility services from being damaged at exactly 5m there were trees placed at this point to prevent vehicles from using more of the road and potentially damaging the utility services.
- Builders were currently on the application site and had been parking on the entrance way to the premises and had to be asked to move off the entrance to the property.
- There had been two incidents whereby cables and posts had been knocked over and damaged by large vehicles trying to manoeuvre down the access road.
- There were two entrances that were left open by Crowland Road and they swing round to the driveway, fuel deliveries were able to be made and there was space for them to turn around in the driveway.
- There was a right to the applicant to use the driveway however she did not own the driveway, this was owned by the objector.

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

- The Highways Authority confirmed that they were objecting to the proposal and had recommended refusal. Members were informed that the width of the road was not adequate. In addition, there was no vehicle-to-vehicle visibility displays.
- Planning officers had taken a subjective view on the access. Officers looked at the planning application as a whole, having regard to only two holiday lets being proposed and made a judgement that highways issues would not adversely impact the development.
- It was important to take into account the views and experience of the highways officers when objecting to planning proposals.
- The proposal included a long driveway of 270m. It was not suitable for more than one dwelling given the difficult nature of the driveway, however if the proposal was granted there could be one dwelling and two holiday lets.
- It was difficult to see how the driveway in question could handle the additional vehicle movements.

- It was noted that at the current time two dwellings currently used the access road and there was an argument that having two further holiday lets would not have much more of an impact.
- It was difficult to see many people using Crowland Road to walk down. However, it was also noted that there was still a possibility for people walking down the road at night and with no visibility there could be an issue.
- With more vehicles using the driveway it was possible that there could be more incidents of power lines being knocked over and causing disruption to a number of farms within the area.

RESOLVED:

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

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Refuse on the grounds that the proposal would result in the intensification of a substandard access onto Crowland Road of insufficient width and visibility that would be detrimental to highway safety contrary to policy LP13

13.3 21/00420/HHFUL - 12 And 14 Lime Tree Avenue Millfield Peterborough PE1 2NS

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for ground floor and first floor rear extensions, and attic conversions for both properties. In addition, on the existing rear projection, a single storey side extension is proposed for No. 12.

The first-floor rear extensions would measure 5.4m in depth and approximately 7.7 in width. This would be across the full width of both dwellings. There would be a pitched roof with a gable end measuring approximately 7.2m to the ridge and 5.2m to the eaves above ground level.

The ground floor rear extensions would measure 6m in depth and approximately 7.7m in width. This again would be across the full width of both dwellings. There would be a flat roof measuring 3m above ground level, with a roof lantern serving each property.

The proposed attic conversion would comprise of a rear facing box dormer extension measuring 3m in depth and 11.2m in width. The dormer would measure 2m in height and extend across both dwellings.

The single side storey extension on the rear projection of No. 12 only, would measure approximately 6.3m in length and 2m in width. It would have a monopitch roof measuring approximately 3.3m to the ridge height and 2.6m to the eaves height above ground level.

The external materials proposed are to match those of the existing dwellings.

The Development Management Team Leader 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:

- It was confirmed that the light going through the windows at number 16 Lime Tree Avenue would not be affected by the extension to number 14 Lime Tree Avenue.
- This application had come to committee as the applicant was a Councillor. The planning department had followed all processes and there were no issues with the proposed extensions.

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 in the development plan and specifically:

- It is not considered that the proposed extensions would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The surrounding neighbours' residential amenity would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed extensions, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). - The proposed extensions would not generate the need for any additional car parking spaces, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

13.4 21/00546/HHFUL - 1 Peakirk Road Deeping Gate Peterborough PE6 9AD

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for a single storey rear and side extension. The proposed extension would adjoin the existing rear elevation and measure approximately 9m in length and approximately 5.5m in width. It would have a hipped roof measuring 4.4m above ground level to the ridge and 2.45m to the eaves. The proposed extension would accommodate an en-suite bedroom and utility area.

It was proposed that the external materials would match those of the existing dwelling.

The Development Management Team Leader 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:

- Officers had based their objection on the loss of amenity to the property at number 5 Peakirk Road. The proposed extension was due south over the neighbouring property and would be overbearing to the residential amenity.
- There had been no objections made from number 5 Peakirk Road on this application.
- When looking at the proposal for the extension there was no over-looking to other properties and there had been no objections from any neighbouring properties. In addition, the parish council was supportive of the application.

- Although the extension was fairly close to the boundary line of the neighbouring property there were objections from any parties over this application and it was therefore difficult to recommend refusal.
- The planning officers had followed procedures and had formulated grounds of overbearing as the reason for refusal. With the hip roof this was not so much of an issue in terms of overbearing and it was therefore unlikely to cause issues with neighbour's amenity.

RESOLVED:

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

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Approved subject to the imposition of the conditions relating to time commencement, approved plans and materials.

13.5 21/00386/FUL - Land Adjacent To 415 Eastfield Road Eastfield Peterborough PE1 4RE

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to enlarge the curtilage of the dwelling into an area of public open space. The curtilage would extend 5.8m west, with a depth of 23 metres (133.4 square metres) and would be bounded by a 2.8m high fence and trellis.

As set out within the covering letter, it is understood that the Applicant has resided at the property for 20 years and seeks to enlarge his garden, to enable more space for family members to exercise and for the family pet. It is stated that the area of public open space is rarely used, except for occasional fly tipping.

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

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

- The applicant was unable to attend the meeting due to sickness. In addition, the agent was unable to attend to present to committee.
- The area in question had not been used by local residents to relax in. It was on a busy road and located next to a disused substation.
- The applicant was only going to increase his garden space by a small amount. There was still going to be a number of trees left on the open space.
- This was a known area for fly-tipping and using this space by the applicant was a better use of the land and could potentially stop some of the fly-tipping.
- The agent had commented that if the substation could be valued the applicants would potentially purchase that piece of land as well. However, this needed to be checked with planning officers over whether this was possible.
- It was important that disused pieces of land were repurposed. Even if the application was not granted this piece of land was still an area susceptible to anti-social behaviour.

- There was no evidence in the report that the applicant was using the piece of land to park their vehicle on the grass. Granting the application would give the resident more off-road parking.
- It was important to take each application on its merits. Not every piece of land could be lost from public use, however some spaces being left unused was causing more harm to the area.
- Opposite the application site there were no other properties, and it therefore did not affect any of the local residents' amenity.
- The applicant could potentially take on responsibility for maintaining the boundary of the extension to try and prevent any future fly-tipping. This needed to be checked with officers as to whether this was possible.

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

- It was not possible to ask the residents of the property to maintain the substation and any potential fly-tipping as this was not part of the application. In addition, the substation would need to be investigated to ascertain who owned the land occupied by the substation.
- If there were any future requests to turn public open space to private use it would need to be investigated by the estates team and a planning application would need to be submitted. There was a lack of public open space in East Ward and so officers were minded to refuse applications of this nature.
- It was clear to see the family wished to expand the garden for the families use. There was also a revenue benefit to the Council in selling this piece of land to private use. However, it was known that East Ward had a lack of open spaces, it was therefore vital to protect as much of this space as possible.
- There was no replacement of the open space in East Ward if this piece of land was sold into private use.
- The applicant already had a large garden that they could use for exercise.
- Moving the fence out a few metres would not make any difference to issues around fly-tipping.

RESOLVED:

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

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given.

Chairman
1.30pm – 4.30pm

This page is intentionally left blank