

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 23 AUGUST 2022
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Amjad Iqbal (Vice-Chair), A Bond, Hiller, Jamil, Dennis Jones, Hogg, Hussain, Lane, Warren and Rangzeb

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Acting Head of Development Management
Asif Ali, Senior Development Management Officer
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Alex Woolnaugh, Principal Engineer

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harper, Rush and Sharp. Councillor Rangzeb and Councillor Lane were in attendance as substitute.

12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hiller declared that he was a director of Norse Property Services (NPS), the applicant of item 4.1, however he had not been involved in any of the planning considerations being brought to Committee.

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

There were no declarations of intention to speak made.

14. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

14.1 22/00442/R3FUL - Land To The South Of Bishops Road Peterborough PE1 5BW

The Committee received a report, which sought the benefit of planning permission for the construction of a temporary car park and associated works to serve the regional pool and enable the University of Peterborough development.

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

Richard Smith addressed the committee and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The University wanted to develop a temporary car park on open space, which was required to replace the 128 car park spaces that were on site. This would enable phase two of the University to commence.
- The location of the temporary car park had changed since the original application, this was due to the original proposal being in the way of plans for the second phase. The temporary arrangements were to last for five years maximum or until a permanent solution was found.
- Once the permanent solution was created it would open up the temporary car park space to biodiversity.
- The plans were aesthetically pleasing and had been sensitively designed to cause as least disruption to the open space as possible. There would be some trees and shrubs lost however this had been discussed with the landscaping officers and some new shrubs would be planted. Overall, this would provide a safer and secure car park.
- There were no additional traffic movements as these spaces were provided like for like with what was on site previously. The car park itself would be raised asphalt to reduce the possibility of flooding.
- An evaluation of the impact on archaeology had been carried and the need for the car park outweighed the archaeological impacts on the area.
- This proposal was consistent with the local plan and could be justified with the wider benefits it would bring. Once a permanent solution had been found the area could be reinstated to public open space.
- In terms of the application this was based on the phase two development and transport requirements. Members were reminded that this was a like for like replacement.
- The need for a temporary car park was identified in previous applications. This was done for when the University was operational and had been agreed by committee in 2021.
- This application had been prepared in accordance with what was agreed at committee in 2021. The information from that application informed the University's approach to the temporary car park.
- There was a condition for a five-year consent and this was what the council was applying for. This period of time allowed the University to assess the parking needs on site. There was a possibility that the permanent solution would not need as many spaces as previously thought.
- There was a condition to revert back to open space and there was an onus on the Council to do this.
- The application site was a small piece of land on open space. The open space was not the whole area being taken up. This was a small amount of open space, which still left a large amount for members of the public to use.
- The embankment masterplan was going to look at the wider embankment use. Members were reminded that this was just a solution in temporary form while decisions on the overall university masterplan were being drawn up.

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

- The figure of 128 car park spaces was part of the transport exercise that was accepted by the committee in 2021 and as part of the phase two application. The Council was not in a position to refuse the application on lack of transport statement as this was agreed in 2021.
- The Council needed to look at what was needed at the current time rather than rely on a transport statement that had previously been done. Car parks in the area were underutilised. It was therefore necessary to re-look at the number of spaces that were needed as this could be less than the 128 being asked for.

- The application sought to take away some open space provision. However, in terms of balancing this against the need of the university it was important to note the riverside policy allocated this land to the development of the university and accepted that some open space would be lost.
- Looking at the recent application that was a year ago this provided up to date figures. The evidence members needed to consider was the transport statement completed a year ago. This provided the least disruption to the progress of the university site and this would enable the phase two of the application to commence.
- There was a masterplan for the university campus and would be looked at in more detail, including what parking provision would be needed later.
- The university was trying to accommodate an evolving situation, this was only a small part in the process with various stages of project moving forward.
- The temporary period would start from the first use of the car park.
- The period was to give the university enough time to develop a strategy. It was expected that a permanent solution would be found in less than five years.
- It was clear to see the university was an evolving project and it would take time for the buildings to grow. The Council needed to work with the university to make sure the whole project was viable including what parking was needed.
- Although it was not ideal to lose open space it was acceptable since this was only a temporary permission.
- There was not enough convincing evidence to show the need for 128 spaces. In addition, there was no valid reason why a new study could be completed and a condition added to the original application with a new figure if required.
- It was clear that the space was well used by the public and this would take away the public's use of the space. The Council's parking strategy needed to be considered when looking at the overall use of the regional pool car park and others around the city these were often at less than half capacity.
- The university was actively encouraging staff and students to use sustainable transport methods, rather than driving.
- Officers had explained why the number of spaces had been agreed at 128 and that this was part of the application agreed by committee in 2021. The previous application was merely used as supporting evidence.
- The university was much needed for the city and this provision for car parking was within the designated area. There were understandable concerns over the loss of open space however this needed to be seen in the wider context of what was happening with the embankment.
- The key word in the application was that this was a temporary solution. This allowed time for the university to see how many spaces were needed once a permanent solution had been found. If this temporary solution was not implemented then local residents would have people parking outside their homes.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application subject to an amendment to condition 10. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 for, 2 against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to conditions.

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:

- The principle of development is considered to be in accordance with Policies LP4 and LP51 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and

- The impact of the proposal on the character of the area is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings is considered on balance to be in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The impact of the proposal on public highway safety is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The impact of the proposal on wildlife and biodiversity is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The impact of the proposal on trees is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

14.2 22/00668/WCPP - Land At Bishops Road Eastgate Peterborough

The Committee received a report, which sought Permission is sought to remove condition C6 relating to the full element (research and development building) of planning permission 21/00287/R3FUL. Condition C6 of the full element of 21/00287/R3FUL states the following:

No later than 12 calendar months following first use of the building hereby permitted, a car park of no less than 128 additional spaces above and beyond the existing Regional Pool car park capacity, subject to the outline element of this permission, shall be constructed and made available for use in accordance with the reserved matters secured under condition C1 of the outline permission.

Reason: To ensure that adequate city centre parking capacity is available to meet the demands generated by the development and prevent undue harm to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

The Development Management Officer 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:

- This recommendation allowed the University to continue building a car park, if needed, without being tied down to building a multi-deck car park.
- Members agreed with the recommendation and had no issue with what was being proposed.

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 conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

To ensure that adequate city centre parking capacity is available to meet the demands generated by the development and prevent undue harm to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Chair
1.30pm - 2.40pm

This page is intentionally left blank