

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 1:30, ON
TUESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2021
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, PETERBOROUGH**

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

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Head of Planning Peterborough and Fenland
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Andrew Swaffer, Planning Solicitor
Matthew Fulcher, Legal Officer
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer
Alex Woolnough, Principal Highways Development Management Engineer

20. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ishfaq Hussain, Councillor Rush was in attendance as substitute. Apologies were also received from Councillor Andrew Bond.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

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

Councillor Jones declared to speak as Ward Councillor in relation to item 21/00806/HHFUL - 122 Newark Avenue, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough, PE1 4NS.

23. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 26 JUNE, 6 JULY AND 20 JULY 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 June, 6 July and 20 July 2021, were agreed as a true and accurate record.

24. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

24.1 21/00806/HHFUL - 122 NEWARK AVENUE, DOGSTHORPE, PETERBOROUGH, PE1 4NS

Members received a request from the Head of Planning Peterborough and Fenland to defer this item due to a request from the agent.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **DEFER** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **DEFER** the application.

At this point Cllr Jones left the Committee

24.2 **21/00806/HHFUL - 122 NEWARK AVENUE, DOGSTHORPE, PETERBOROUGH, PE1 4NS**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for a 'part-retrospective new boundary wall, new vehicular footpath crossing and hard paving to front garden'.

The boundary wall to which the application related had been constructed using a buff brick with red detailing. It was situated along the northern corner of the site; the wall stood at two metres in height, facing Rowan Avenue and the pedestrian footway which ran along the rear of the property. To facilitate the wall the Applicant had removed a large section of established hedge. A new pedestrian access door had also been formed. The scheme also proposed a new dropped kerb crossing and the formation of hard standing (block paving) to provide parking for two vehicles in the front garden. The existing garage at the rear of the site had been blocked in by the wall, which had removed the vehicle access to the site onto Rowan Avenue albeit the dropped kerb within the public highway

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report. The Officer recommendation was for **REFUSAL**.

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

- Any wall the applicant chose to build could be subject to vandalism. To date there had been no graffiti on the wall despite young people congregating in the area.
- There had been no objections from neighbours on Rowan Avenue over the design.
- Approval was recommended to avoid costs for the applicant and blank wall being vandalised.

Mr Phil Branston, The Agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Most of the properties in Dogsthorpe were comprised of red brick and some properties had been rendered and painted to try and brighten the area up.
- The wall was separate from Dogsthorpe Estate and was on the corner of Newark Avenue, where there had been a mixture of building designs.
- The scheme had been modified to meet the Highways Officer's recommendation.
- One recommendation received had been that the wall should be rendered and painted green which was not helpful.
- Peterborough was famous for its Fletton bricks.
- Aesthetics was in the eye of the beholder and there were some nice designs around Peterborough using similar methods, which the applicant had used. Therefore, a plain wall was considered uninteresting
- The bricks left over from the dilapidated wall was used in the construction.
- The applicant intended to block pave the front drive area to provide a nice crossing.
- The London Brick Company colour would fade after a period of time. In addition, the wall was capped at the top and it was believed that it would weather well over time.

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 dropped kerb was permitted development and the wall along the northern side was the only item for consideration.
- The wall at the front of the property could be constructed up to one metre in height and would not need consent. In addition, the wall constructed to the north side could also be one metre in height and could be constructed around to the front of the property. In addition, a two-metre wall set back from the highway by two metres would not need planning consent.
- Members commented that they had no issue with the construction and design of the wall and agreed with the agent. In addition, the wall had not offended any residents.
- The wall at the side could be carried around to the front.
- In addition, Members would prefer the wall to be capped as advised.
- Members commented that a fence could be constructed instead of a wall without any objection from officers.
- The northside wall was of an attractive design and had not been a negative impact to the character of the area. In addition, Members felt that the construction had not gone against policy.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officer recommendations and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) 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 having been:

1. Non-offensive and an attractive design to the character of the area.
2. The design and construction had not been in contravention of any planning policies.

CHAIRMAN
End -1.55pm

This page is intentionally left blank