

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 28 JUNE 2022
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Harper (Chairman), Hiller, Bi, S Bond, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal (Vice Chairman), Hussain, Sandford, Sharp, and Warren.

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Acting Head of Development Management
Phil Moore, Principal Planning Officer
Mike Osbourn, Principal Planning Officer
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Alex Woolnough, Principal Engineer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jamil, Andrew Bond and Hogg. Councillors Bi, Sandford and Sandra Bond were in attendance as substitute.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Sharp declared a non-pecuniary interest on agenda item 5.1 21/00633/Ful - Tranche Tc5 Eagle Way/Silver Hill Hampton Centre Peterborough. Councillor Sharp was a member on the Parish Council, however had not attended the meeting when the item was discussed.

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

There were no declarations of intention to speak made.

4. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 22 MARCH AND 12 APRIL 2022

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March and 12 April 2022, were agreed as a true and accurate record.

5. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

5.1 21/00633/FUL - TRANCHE TC5 EAGLE WAY/SILVER HILL HAMPTON CENTRE PETERBOROUGH

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to the erection of an 80-bed assisted living facility to cater for older people. The proposal was for a 'T-shaped', single building comprising 32 x 1-bed and 48 x 2-bed apartments, with ground floor communal facilities including a lounge, bistro, wellbeing room, treatment room, hair and beauty salon, reception, and office/staff space. The eastern "wing" of the building would be 4-storeys in

height, whilst the western "wing" would be 3.5 storeys closest to the 4-storey element, dropping down to 2.5 storeys on the land closest to the 23 DCCORPT_2018-04-042 north-west boundary, which it shared with existing residential development.

Vehicular access was proposed from Eagle Way / Silver Hill, with a separate in and out one-way arrangement. A total of 45 parking spaces were proposed to be located in front of the complex of buildings, as part of the scheme, including four accessible spaces to the front of the site and a "drop-off" point close to the building entrance. A garden area would be located to the rear (north) of the buildings, for the enjoyment of residents of the scheme. The proposal was for a 100% affordable housing scheme comprising a mixed tenure scheme of 60% shared ownership and 40% affordable rented units. An age criteria would also apply.

The Principal Planner introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- Anchor was the largest not for profit provider of affordable accommodation for the elderly.
- Research had shown that the provision of older care was to rise over 46 percent between 2021 – 2041. There had been a predicted increased need of 539 specialist housing units for older people in 2023, which included shared ownership within the Peterborough area.
- There were no shared ownership opportunities for older people in Peterborough, however, 53 percent of 65 plus year old households' owned homes in the lower price bracket. Due to their financial position most of the older people cohort would not be eligible for affordable homes with care and would also be unable to afford a property with care outright as well as ongoing care costs.
- Many people in this position would consider a move to a more suitable accommodation to fund their ongoing care needs. Shared ownership offered a route to achieve this.
- Peterborough Adult Social Care was consulted over the requirements to ensure that the proposed provision would be suitable for the area.
- The proposal would deliver high quality purpose built and fully affordable assisted housing for local older people across a mix of affordable or shared ownership tenures.
- The response to the application had been positive with parking highlighted as the only concern.
- The proposal would result in the loss of six on-street vehicle parking spaces due to access points. However, in response to this, the applicant had agreed to provide extra parking spaces on Silver Hill, and this had been proposed as a planning condition.
- There had been ample parking provision as highlighted in the two surveys completed by the applicant. There had been evidence on parking ratios for similar developments and this had been accepted by Highways Officers.
- The proposal would also release family sized properties back into the housing market.
- The proposal would present health benefits to combat loneliness, isolation and help the older residents avoid health events such as falls, which in turn would reduce pressure on the NHS.

- The proposal was an effective use of a vacant brownfield site highlighted for development.
- Employment for local people would be generated.
- The applicant had not anticipated issues with Tesco customers using the proposed site car park as the spaces would be allocated to residents. In addition, the parking data for the area had highlighted that there was free alternative on street parking spaces available.
- The age to facilitate residents was 60 years old with an average age of residents around 79 years old. There was a high probability that residents would not use a car as they would be able to access the surrounding facilities easily using a mobility scooter. In addition, residents of such facilities generally would not want the stress and expense of owning a vehicle and tended to sell them quite quickly once they occupied a unit.
- The Highways Team was provided with a vehicle parking survey and no issues were highlighted.
- Public consultation was held online as it was conducted during the Covid pandemic period. Invites were also sent out in the post to neighbouring properties and there had been an opportunity to submit feedback on the proposed development. In addition, there had been a facility provided on the website to submit comments and queries during the consultation.
- The consultation leaflet had reached a wider audience which included 165 local residents, Ward Councillors and the Parish Council and only six objections were received.
- The Ward Councillors had not been contacted separately, however, had received the standard consultation leaflet. There had been no specific feedback received from Ward Councillors.
- The first parking survey was conducted in May 2020 and the latest one was in May 2022. As per the Highways requirements, the surveys were conducted in the day and not in the bank holidays or school holiday periods.
- Waste collection or large delivery vehicles would be scheduled to access the single track point.
- There was a pull in area for Heavy Goods Vehicles which would be situated in front of the disability parking areas.

Jodie Ashton, Hampton Parish Clerk, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Parish Council's objection was based on the number of vehicle parking spaces provided for the number of units proposed.
- Hampton was a relatively new to Peterborough, which was approved under old planning regulations and this had restricted parking for those living and working in the area.
- The on-vehicle street parking survey conducted in 2022 demonstrated a maximum vehicle parking of 59 percent on Silver Hill and 46 percent of the wider surveyed area. Therefore, any underdeveloped parking for the area would cause additional issues to the existing vehicle parking problems.
- The introduction of proposed double yellow lines between the junctions of Stanton Square and Lakeview Way near Silver Hill would also increase vehicle parking issues for all.
- The Parish Council would be in support of the proposed development if the parking spaces could be increased to 56.

- If the minimum intake age was to increase to 70, the Parish Council believed that there would be a lower risk of parking issues, and this was because those over 60 were likely to be employed and therefore own a car.

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

- Members were advised that there had been an auto track on HGV movements included within the transport statement in the report, which demonstrated the egress and access for large vehicles.
- There were several comparable sites used for parking provision, and the applicant site would provide 0.5 spaces whereas similar sites had provided 0.7 spaces per dwelling. However, there had been sufficient provision included for on street parking should it be required.
- One comparator assisted living facility used for the parking survey was King Fisher Court in Stanground.
- Members commented that the allocation of land and the type of use applied for was compatible, due to ease in access. In addition, there would still be a parcel of land for use by Serpentine Centre if required.
- There had been no time limit for the allocation of land for the Serpentine Centre, however there had been a time limit for the outline of Hampton. An application had been received which was compatible for the parcel of land that had been left to go fallow.
- The landscaping had been included within the plan and conditions would be applied to finalise the detail.
- Members commended that highway and vehicle parking proposals.
- Members felt that under Policy LP13 the proposals had been a highly sustainable development as it would be close to Serpentine Green Shopping Centre.
- Condition 13 and 14 adequately covered the landscaping arrangements for the proposal.
- The consultation seemed extensive, and it was a good use of unused land, which Highways had no issues with.
- The issue of minimum age limit of residents had not concerned Members as there had been good access to the local shopping centre without the need to use a vehicle.
- Good consideration had been given to the streetscene.
- All issues raised had been dealt with officers.
- There had been no contravention against the local plan.
- Residents concerns over the parking were considered but the issues had been managed by the applicant and officers.

RESOLVED:

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

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, and the securing of the planning obligations through a legal agreement, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The application site, whilst partially located within an area of land allocated for Local Centre uses, would not unduly prejudice the delivery of appropriate levels of retail or other local centre facilities within Hampton, and so be in accordance with the principle objectives of Policies LP1, LP2, LP3, LP5, LP12 and LP35.1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); 40 DCCORPT_2018-04-04 19 - The proposed development would deliver housing for which there was a demonstrable need, to a standard that met the Local Authority's expectations, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed development would not constitute a highway safety hazard and it had been demonstrated that satisfactory on-site parking would be provided to serve future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The scheme would visually accord with the surrounding area and avoid harm to existing and future residents' amenity, and therefore would be in accordance, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed development would improve the landscape and biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policies LP16, LP17, LP28 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed development would not pose a risk of harm to any known heritage asset, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed development included appropriate measures for energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy, in accordance with Policy 31 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The development would make provision for surface water drainage and uncovering unsuspected contamination and would accord with Policies LP32 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan, and Paragraphs 183-185 of the NPPF (2021).

5.2 **22/00527/HHFUL - 4 MUSWELL ROAD WEST TOWN PETERBOROUGH PE3 9EF**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for a first-floor rear extension. The proposed extension would be sited above the existing flat roofed ground floor rear extension. To the north, it would protrude from the dwelling's main side elevation by 0.39m, then extend to the rear by 5.1m in depth. It would measure 7.09m in length in total and join back to the rear elevation of the dwelling at 4m. The proposed extension would add a disabled wet room, a disabled bedroom and a family WC at first floor level.

The Principal Planner introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- The applicant was suffering with a several medical conditions.
- The properties at numbers four and six Muswell Road were at an angle and therefore the proposal would not be overbearing.
- The applicant's mobility was impaired as well other medical issues.
- The applicant deserved some relief and dignity.
- There was an internal lift to the first floor and the Ward Councillor had advised the applicant to organise facilities on the ground floor. However, the applicant wanted the ability to use both places in his home.

- It had been thought that there was no medical evidence presented within the report due to one of the planning proposals being a joint application. Furthermore, one of the Planning Officers had visited the property recently and the applicant had used walking aides.

The meeting was adjourned for five minutes to invite the applicant into the room.

Mr Ifran Razaq, the applicant's representative addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The representative was the son of the applicant.
- The applicant had suffered an injury to the spine, and this had made him incontinent.
- The representative lived next door to the applicant and would provide care arrangements to make his life comfortable. In most cases, the representative would attend to his father during the night, therefore, a wet room would make life significantly better for the applicant and carer.
- The applicant had not been requested to provide medical evidence at the application stage of proceedings.

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 defined gap outlined within the report would relate to a three-metre gap between the property driveways.
- Most of properties along Muswell Road were uniform and in a straight line however, the properties at numbers four and six were out of line.
- It was for the Committee decide whether there was an unacceptable overbearing impact due to the curvature between numbers four and six Muswell Road.
- The bathroom outlined on page 54 of the report would be used for a disabled person, but there was an additional toilet which officers had deemed not for disabled use because it was served by a separate corridor and therefore would not be used by a disabled resident.
- There was only one objection received from a neighbouring retirement residential home and they felt that the development would cause disruption to them.
- Numbers 10 and 16 Muswell Road had a similar extensions and planning application had been accepted.
- There had been no objections from number six Muswell Road which belonged to the Son of the applicant.
- Members were advised that each case had to be considered on its merits.
- There was an extant permission for number six Muswell Road which could be carried out up to a three-year period. In addition, if the single application for number four Muswell Road was granted, the joint application for numbers four and six Muswell Road could also be undertaken.
- Members were advised that where there had been evidence of medical need submitted, it could be considered against the overbearing impact issue, and they could decide that the need outweighed the impact of overbearing.
- Members felt that there had been no overbearing impact to the neighbouring property. In addition, the neighbouring Son had wished for the proposal to be agreed.
- The applicant had presented a clear medical need at the meeting.
- Members felt that it had been disappointing that the applicant's medical needs had not been highlighted within the report.

- New residents to number six Muswell Road may feel that the proposed extension could be overbearing, however, Members felt that there was enough gap between four and six to mitigate that impact.
- LP16 had proved that the proposal was within the character of the area.
- The only objections had been received from a retirement home and the proposal was for domestic and not business use, which should not cause issues.
- Members felt that on balance, the need outweighed the issue of overbearing.
- The positioning of the property and rear garden would take the impact of the proposed extension.
- Members felt that the position of the houses and the rear garden had mitigated the impact.
- Members felt that the medical need evidence had not been provided to officers and therefore the officer recommendation was based on the information received. The evidence provided at Committee by the applicant's representative and Ward Councillor had presented an alternative on balanced proposal to be considered.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against the officer's recommendations and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers to include a standard completion time limit, approved plans, materials to match and obscure glazing to the side elevation window.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal:

1. Would not create an overbearing impact to number 6 Muswell Road; and
2. Was not contrary to LP17.

6. **PLANNING APPEALS QUARTERLY REPORT ON PERFORMANCE JANUARY TO MARCH 2022**

The Committee received a report in relation to appeals to planning applications received from January to March 2022. The Acting Head of Development Management introduced the report and stated that there had been eight appeals with two allowed and six were refused. The percentage allowed was 25 percent which was felt to be a good appeal rate.

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

- Members of the Planning Committee complimented the Officers on their work.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee noted the past outcomes and performance.

CHAIRMAN
15:13PM

This page is intentionally left blank