

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON TUESDAY, 21 MARCH 2023, COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN
HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

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

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead
Molly Hood, Senior Development Management Officer
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Nick Greaves, Highway Development & Drainage Manager

40. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jamil and Andrew Bond. Councillor Bi and Sandra Bond were in attendance as substitutes.

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

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

Councillor Rush declared to speak as Ward Councillor in relation to agenda item 21/01002/OUT - Land At Horsey Bridge Whittlesey Road Stanground Peterborough

The Committee agreed to agenda item 4.2 CAS15A/0001/22 - Land To The East Of Tolmers Leicester Road Thornhaugh Peterborough to be considered first.

43. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

**43.1 CAS15A/0001/22 - LAND TO THE EAST OF TOLMERS LEICESTER ROAD
THORNHAUGH PETERBOROUGH**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to consider whether or not to register the land subject of this application as a Village Green. The application seeking Village Green status was by Mr Martin Witherington relating to land off Leicester Road, Thornhaugh. Peterborough City Council was the Commons Registration Authority under the Commons Act 2006 which administered the Registers of Common Land and Town or Village Greens. Under Section 15 of the 2006 Act, the City Council was able to register new land as a Town or Village Green upon application. This had not been a planning application where the policies of the Local Plan or NPPF were applicable. Members were not to consider whether the site was suitable for a village green in planning terms but to confirm whether the landowner had demonstrated compliance with the legal requirements set out in the Commons Act 2006

The planning officer introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report.

The Applicant, Mr Martin Witherington addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The previous owner agreed to donate the land to the applicant and current owner.
- The Thornhaugh/Wittering circular footpath runs to the north of the site.

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

- Members commended the Applicant for his public-spirited work.
- Members were in support of the application.

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 application.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The onus had been on the Applicant to show, by their submissions and supporting evidence that, on the balance of probabilities, all of the statutory criteria under Section 15 of the Commons Act 2006 had been met in this case. The evidence illustrated the land was within the ownership of the applicant and no additional consents were required. The Applicant had demonstrated the statutory criteria with Section 15(8) of The Commons Act 2006 has been met.

The Committee agreed to extend the speaking time to 10 minutes for the applicant and objectors for the next item.

43.2 **21/01002/OUT - LAND AT HORSEY BRIDGE WHITTLESEY ROAD STANGROUND PETERBOROUGH**

The Committee received a report relating to an outline application which proposed a new business park which comprised of Uses Classes E, B2 and B8. Only the principle of development and its means of access were for consideration under this application, with all other matters being reserved for future consideration. The sole means of vehicular access would be via a new priority junction on the A605 towards the eastern end of the site, with the existing crane depot access rerouted through the site and its existing access closed.

A footway/cycleway was proposed to run through the site in a broadly EastWest direction. The application proposed up to 15,236sqm of employment space.

The illustrative site layout plan (which was not for approval at this time) showed this arranged in 20 individual buildings ranging in size from 265sqm to 2,000sqm, aimed at the Small/Medium Enterprise business sector, for which the agent considered there to be a high level of demand.

A landscape planting strip was illustrated along the north-western site boundary intended to provide a buffer to the adjacent houses, whilst the central portion of the site, to the north of the Scheduled Monument and outside the red line of the application site would also

remain free from development for the protection of archaeological remains. New tree planting had been illustrated along much, though not all, of the northern side of the A605.

Whilst scale and design were not matters for consideration at this time, the applicant had confirmed that the proposed buildings would be restricted to eaves heights of between 6m and 10.5m. The application was accompanied by sections through the site to show how this height and scale of development would sit within the surrounding landscape.

At this point Cllr Bi left the meeting 2:02pm and returned 2:08pm

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report, which included:

An amended recommendation that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, the decision would need to be referred to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Consultation)(England) Direction 2021. This was as a result of the amount of ancillary office space proposed which could exceed 5,000sqm and that the site was outside a town centre.

Upon receipt of any such referral, the Secretary of State had a 21-day period in which to decide whether or not to call in the application under Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). If the Secretary of State had not called-in the application within that period, the Local Planning Authority might proceed to determine the application.

Amended conditions included:

- C12 to take on board considerations in relation to the water table as a result of landscaping
- C13 landscaping management plan
- C41 sequential site testing

The Committee agreed to extend the speaking time to 10 minutes for the applicant and objectors for the next item.

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

- The Ward Councillor spoke on behalf of the residents of Stanground, of which many were against the application.
- Whilst it was recognised that job creation and economic development was important for the area, this provision needed to be constructed in the right place in the city.
- The site was located in the Peterborough Fens Landscape Character area, with views across the Nene Washes, Flag Fen basin, Must Farm site and Horsey Toll Fort and was therefore rich with archaeological significance.
- The site had not been included on the Local Plan for allocation.
- The recent Historic England trenching exercise had uncovered significant waterlogged buried archaeological remains between Horsey Hill and Stanground, such as well-preserved wooden posts that had dated back to the bronze age and late iron age. The piles needed to construct the proposal would likely cut through the water bearing soils which could impact the ground water flow or levels.
- Historic England had raised concerns against the application on heritage grounds.

- It had not been demonstrated by the Applicant that the buried remains could be preserved underground in situ.
- Planting of trees and screening would affect the hydrology of the site and potentially result in the drying out of the buried archaeological remains. This issue had not met the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 194 and 195.
- Once the remains were buried underneath the proposed building, they would be lost forever and could not be excavated for inspection to ensure that they had remained intact.
- The tree officer was against the application on arboriculture and landscape grounds. The application was contrary to LP16, 17, 27 and the landscape proposed would certainly contribute to the desiccation of the soil to the preservation area.
- The application was objected to by the Council's archaeologists on the grounds that the proposal would not preserve the buried archaeological remains.
- The development would attract additional traffic to the area.
- The Eddison report had recognised the traffic issues in the Cardia junctions leading onto the Whittlesey Road, however, they had stated that it was not possible for the developer to improve existing issues.
- The review of available employment land in Peterborough was conducted by Eddison Storey and Barker, the Agent on behalf of Barnack Estates, and therefore, it was felt that the report was a biased one.
- There was employment land available at the Greyhound site, 12,000sqm, Oxney Road 22,000m and Newlands near the A1 with 230,000sqm should be given consideration before any alternative employment land was allocated. Furthermore, it was felt that there had been sufficient employment land within the city to accommodate the proposal.
- The A605 was already a busy road and concerns were raised that it could not withstand any further traffic, particularly when the North Bank Road was closed due to flooding. There were visually impaired bends on the road and it was questioned whether the road survey had been conducted sufficiently.
- It was queried whether consent been given by the landowner to conduct further assessments to access the site.
- The fact that the land had been previously identified for a regional freight interchange had not longer carried any weight.
- The site had been covered by minerals and safeguarded for clay, sand and gravel extraction. This fact seemed to have been ignored.
- The site had specific historic significance and therefore had not been allocated in the Local Plan. It was also too close to nearby residential properties and a precedent could be set for other developers if the application was approved.
- There had been significant objection raised against the proposal to the land, which had not been allocated within the LP in relation to the hydrology impact of rooting, tree officer objection, middle level objection, archaeology concerns and Historic England to name but a few.

Mr Richardson, and Mr Hodson objectors, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The site would be covered by materials such as tarmac, concrete and piles which would cover the archaeological buried remains that would be lost for all time if the proposal as approved, with no chance of reversal. There had been so many more archaeological remains to be discovered by Historic England, a further 99%.

- A drawing produced to show that the archaeology would be saved gave a false impression and the only option would be to conduct a thorough dig of the whole site.
- Once the site was covered there would be no way to assess whether the archaeological remains had become decayed due to water loss, not even if conducted by the Durham Miners. Therefore, the site was unique and considered a valuable asset to Peterborough.
- It was felt that Highways conclusion was somewhat confusing as the proposed exit road had been situated along an old, abandoned junction on the A605. The abandoned entrance had been disused due to its unsafe exit towards Peterborough.
- There had also been concerns raised with traffic congestion ever apparent on the A605 due to the North Bank closures, therefore it was felt that the proposal would exacerbate the current traffic issues.
- The peace and quiet of the site would be subject to continuous construction vehicle noises, similar to that suffered with the Horsey Bridge works. It was feared that the noise concerns would continue over night and the nearby residents would be deprived of sleep.
- The light that could be illuminated from the proposed site would impact residents and confuse day and night periods. Currently the site was pitch black and therefore not an issue for residents to sleep.
- The proposal would not sit on existing land levels and would affect the views and loss of the World War II hurricane hanger.
- Historic England objected to the tree planting, however the Tree Officer had stated that the screening proposed was adequate. Both opinions were correct, however, it was felt that the only solution was to allow no development.
- The City of Peterborough had too much to lose by approving the development, such as the early history, bronze and roman archaeological remains and therefore planning permission should be refused.
- There were over 100 available commercial buildings in Peterborough at present.
- Mr Hodson, the speaker, was a Planning Surveyor and Chartered Consultant, who lived in Whittlesey.
- Concerns were raised about the Highways comments made in relation to the A605 being capable of traffic.
- The A605 was already surcharged.
- The objectors house faced the front of the A605 and when the North Bank was flooded the traffic had been nose-to-tail congested.
- The estate road connection was bent and should be straight and should accommodate this type of access to assist long artic lorries to exit. Furthermore, installation of a roundabout could provide a more desirable solution.
- There had been lots of lorries causing issues in nearby industrial developments such as from Saxon Pit, the old London Brick site. Negotiations had taken place with three of the owners, which resulted in the lorries only travelling into the sites from the west. This would provide a solution for the current traffic congestion issues, which should be considered by the Council and Applicant in reserve matters.
- The objector would not be in support of the application even if the traffic suggestions were implemented, due to the facts raised by others in relation to the available employment land in Peterborough.
- The proposed access was near a drop kerb and therefore in the wrong place, which could be dangerous. This would be exacerbated by the temporary closure of the

North Bank Road and to instal a junction in that location would cause a real vehicle traffic issues.

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

- Barnack Estates was an employment ownership trust which operated similar to John Lewis, and specialised in high quality small, medium size enterprise (SME) sized business accommodation.
- The land proposed for development was not located on a green belt site.
- The application was submitted in May 2021 following months of work conducted on the proposals and with supporting information prior to and following pre application discussions held in 2020.
- There were over 200 objections from residents, and further information required by the technical consultees, which had not been unusual for a scheme of this size.
- In the past two years the Applicant had liaised consulted and altered the scheme and had recognised the input from Ward Councillors and residents, officers and their consultees.
- The site was a pre allocation site for a Railfreight terminal within the previous Local Plan (LP).
- The Current LP was out of date and due to be reviewed in 2036, however due to the lack of allocated employment land, it would be reviewed earlier.
- The employment land review, the recent 2022 update and review of GEA availability, had shown that very little land was underdeveloped or not subject to a current planning application.
- The Applicant had such a positive reputation and the business units constructed in Yaxley had already been acquired by SMEs before they were built. This also demonstrated the high demand for employment sites.
- The Red Brick Farm development had been delayed, which added to the pressure of lack of employment sites.
- There was a long lead in time for employment sites even when they had been allocated for development.
- If consent was granted it would be late this year before the proposal was completed with reserve matters and therefore, the first business occupants could accommodate units for 2024. This demonstrated that a pipeline of sustainable employment sites was needed in Peterborough. Furthermore, it was important to provide employment units to meet the demand.
- The Government advice and planning law was that applications should be determined in line with the LP to allocate employment land unless material considerations suggested otherwise.
- The entrance proposed had been moved to the eastern site to protect neighbouring amenity. In addition, the application had been adjusted to protect residents from too much light, traffic management and reverse beep noises from trucks.
- Traffic surveys had been undertaken to assess hard evidence of the traffic capacity.
- The Ponders Bridge construction had been completed, which had improved vehicle traffic movement in the area.
- A right turn lane would be installed into the middle of the road outside the entrance to alleviate any congestion on the road from vehicles travelling into Peterborough.
- Highway Officers had agreed the design of the road and cycleway.

- There was a comprehensive landscape strategy, which had been included alongside Whittlesey Road to screen the building and improve the view for neighbours.
- The applicant had invested over £100,000 on archaeological investigations to date and would be required to invest a further £500,000 going forward to preserve it as part of the development.
- The root of the ditch would be undeveloped, which would highlight the significance of the fort and its setting. There were rows of posts that were believed to be part of ancient walkways across the site. The design of the proposal would avoid any impact on the posts found and the drainage strategy would maintain a high-water table to preserve them.
- Condition 3 concerned a phased plan to preserve the posts and any issues could be assessed before the site was built.
- Archeology would be protected by conditions 15, 16 and 17. Therefore the buried posts would be protected.
- The master plan was illustrative only and the application at this stage was only an outline plan.
- Officers' concerns had been addressed and agreed subject to the imposition of strict conditions and a section 106 agreement.
- There would be sustainable interventions such as energy water consumptions, PV panels and electric vehicle charging points to be implemented by conditions 18 and 29.
- There would be a section 106 agreement applied to the wider Greenwheel route.
- The proposal would create 62 construction jobs, followed by 412 permanent jobs when the development had been completed and occupied. Furthermore, there would be a £15.7m investment into the local economy during construction followed by £21.8m each year following occupation of the development. In addition, the development would generate £13.8m in employee wages and income to the Council from annual business rates. Therefore, the proposal had demonstrated that a significant contribution to the economy would be generated if the application was approved.
- The Applicant had listened to and consulted on the archaeology and transport concerns and provided a sustainable development to provide employment opportunities for Peterborough.
- The hard evidence within the transport assessment plan was produced through the Trix Database, which calculated the traffic that would be created by the development. In addition, speed surveys were carried out to set the baseline of the current traffic volume, with any recent highway improvements undertaken. The specialists involved were experts in their field and therefore, would be very thorough in conclusion when undertaking assessments on road and junction capacity.
- The pipeline of deliverable employment sites mentioned in the objectors' address could not be relied on as they were either delayed, such as the A1 west site, and if current employment sites were going through the usual planning application process and being built, there would be little employment land allocation left until more sites were made available in the LP.
- The report on employment land review was commissioned by Barnack Estates and undertaken by Eddisons and Savills. The Employment Land review and update in 2022 had not mentioned the Horsey Bridge site as the intention was only to highlight to the Council that there was an issue with employment site allocation for the future and therefore, was the reason why the LP needed to be reviewed earlier.

- A review of the Local Plan was a lengthy process, which would take several years to complete before the proposed site to be included.
- The employment sites mentioned in the objector's address had been included within the review commissioned by Barnack Estates.
- The original economic land review had been submitted in May 2021 and updated in June 2022. The review was also updated to review the Gross External Area (GEAs). In addition, the Red Brick Farm development had progressed, and it was a constantly moving situation.
- The Huntingdonshire A1 west development had recently been withdrawn.
- It was uncertain as to whether the traffic issues highlighted on North Bank had been included within the traffic survey, however, the Highway Team been consulted with.
- The most important area reference made in relation to the proposal was in relation to archaeology. The area between Horsey Fort and the ditch, which travelled through the site, around the Fort and south of some cottages, was deemed the most important area. There were also ancient boardwalks that lay over the ditches however these formed the outer areas of the development that were not deemed most importance.

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 traffic on the proposed T junction layout was for quite a large site, with industrial units deemed appropriate by Highways Officers based on the evidence supplied by the applicant. Furthermore, the recent highway improvements near the T junction along the causeway had reduced vehicle speed limits from 60 to 40 miles per hour.
- Members were advised that if vehicles travelled from the west of the site, it should not cause a safety issue for pedestrians because of the junction alignment proposed by the Applicant.
- The traffic congestion issues raised had not concerned Highways officers as there were no accident clusters along that stretch of road. There was also good visibility with the access to the site as it had been located on a straight piece of road.
- Members were advised that the North Bank flooding incidents had not been included in transport assessment and traffic movement data as it was not appropriate to do because they were not normal conditions.
- Members were advised that the original access had been rejected by the Highway Officers, however, the new eastern access proposal was acceptable due to geometry and visibility.
- The Applicant's transport consultant used traffic surveys from 2015-2021 and the main survey was undertaken in October 2022 to understand the impact of the causeway to the east of the proposal. Traffic congestion issues had been a concern to Officers, however, the data received had alleviated that concern and the traffic movement had also shown to decrease in 2022. The trip generation, trip distribution and traffic growth had been considered robust. Therefore, the development no longer raised any concerns about road traffic congestion.
- There had been a significant amount of work carried out in relation to archaeology, which included a written scheme of investigation with the Council's archaeologist and Historic England about how the archaeological remains should be treated. Furthermore, eight trenches had been investigated few years ago. There would also be a great deal of work conducted before any building construction could take place. The area has become more waterlogged since the bronze age. In addition, conditions had been proposed for piling and drainage to ensure that the water table stayed stable to preserve the archaeological remains.

- The Applicant was well aware of the technical engineering requirements that would be in play to construct buildings on a site of such historic importance and therefore, was under no illusion that the construction would be a high cost build.
- The flooding of the North Bank through the winter had not been taken into account as it was not considered to be normal road conditions.
- Condition 30 could be adapted to ensure that the proposed bus stops would not cause vehicles to queue behind a bus, and to mitigate any issues to ease traffic flows
- Bus stops would be subject to change to a suitable location. The bus service in that area would operate an hourly rate and would be a request stop, and therefore, any delays would be of an acceptable level.
- The tree and shrub planting on the site and along the A605 would provide environmental benefits. Further benefits included in the sustainability strategy would link to the use of renewable energy sources such as water, installation of electric vehicle (EV) charging points, preservation of the archaeological which was also prevent further development around the site. The social benefits would also create local jobs for local people, enhanced footways and improvements to the Greenwheel.
- Any issues Members had with the road crossing on the central reservation at Horsey Toll junction could be conditioned such as speed limit restrictions. Furthermore, alternative locations could also be considered.
- Although the site was classed as agricultural land it had been graded at level three and was not as good a grade of farm land compared to other farmland in elsewhere in Peterborough. Members would want to take a balanced view over the creation of employment generation over land that was not of the best value for farming.
- The Pollution Team had not stated that there was an issue with pollution as a result of the proposed development, nor would one arise as a result of the approval.
- The Oxney Road employment land had been part of the Red Brick Farm development and in addition, the former Greyhound Stadium was part of Peterborough's existing employment land area. The recent review commissioned by the applicant had demonstrated that there was a shortage of employment land for a several reasons, such as existing buildings that had become out of date or no longer suitable for SMEs.
- Although the application had not been land allocated within the LP, each application should be considered on its own merits in relation to traffic implications or locations despite the LP requirement. However, land requirements and availability would change over time and therefore, other applications could be received that would dovetail into the LP review process.
- The site specifics were an important factor when considering a planning application. Sometimes, landowners and developers would see a development opportunity and submit applications before the LP review cycle had been completed, which had been a common occurrence. There were strict Government guidelines when considering premature planning applications and they cannot be refused solely on the fact that the land had not been included within the LP. Therefore, to refuse on this basis would not be appropriate.
- The Peterborough Landscape Assessment document was a description of different characteristics rather than the area as being of special importance.
- All the possible employment sites mentioned in the meeting had been allocated or had development permission approved or waiting on reserve matters, with the exception of Red Brick Farm which was awaiting development.
- There were a lot of larger employment units rather than SME units recently built in Peterborough and the Applicant's proposal would increase the availability of employment land.
- Some Members commented that the type of buildings required for SMEs were in short supply, with some coming onto the market in the form of subdivided big sheds, however, there was a supply issue.

- The site access and egress caused concern for some Members due to the proposed scale, and it was preferred that access be installed on the eastern side of the site.
- Members also raised concerns about the potential loss of the historic causeway and the opportunity to retrieve archaeological remains from the ground.
- Members commented that they would prefer to see the application presented at a future time to take on board the comments that had been made.
- Some Members were concerned about the location next to a residential site.
- The LP should be revised and the application should be put forward once the review had been completed.
- The Applicant stated that they had considered and addressed the 200 objections received, however, how would they be able to stop lorries beeping, light pollution and noise, which would be difficult to cover by a condition.
- The allocation of employment land review had been conducted by Eddisons, however, was paid for by Barnack Estate, the Applicant.
- Members felt that there had been sufficient employment land available in Peterborough to necessitate the proposed site.
- The traffic issues raised in relation to North Bank had been very relevant and this was magnified by the fact that vehicles would need to use this stretch of road when the Thorney to Whittlesey road had become flooded.
- Some Members felt that there had been a need for an SME pipeline, however, in practice the major issues raised were in relation to archeologic and traffic issues.
- Although Barnack Estates had undertaken a great deal of work and were prepared to invest considerable funds to protect the archaeology, the application seemed far too soon and therefore, should be revisited once the LP had been reviewed.
- Some Members commented that the road that had been bypassed recently between Cardea and Amazon, which had alleviated a great deal of the traffic issues for the area.
- Some Members commented that Barnack Estates had provided assurance that the archaeology would be protected due to the planning and financial commitment dedicated to do so.
- There had been a demand for SMEs in Peterborough and sites like the one proposed would help develop business in Peterborough.
- Traffic was not a concern for some Members because of the changes made at the railway crossing. In addition, the junction out of the site had been used on similar designs particularly at the recent business development at Yaxley, which had not caused any issues.
- There appeared to be deficit of employment land availability for Peterborough for SMEs and the LP needed improvement.
- There had been conditions to mitigate any archaeology issues.
- There were conditions to mitigate residents' concerns about light pollution, which seemed to be satisfactorily addressed by the Applicant.
- Some Members felt that the benefits had outweighed the potential harm that may be caused by the development.
- Some Members were concerned that a precedent could be set if the proposal was approved. Furthermore, it was felt that the concerns raised within the Ward Councillor's representation had not been dealt with and that the applicant and Officers had not done enough to convince Members otherwise.
- Some Members felt that the economic growth benefits to create SMEs outweighed the adverse impacts mentioned in debate.
- The neighbourhood amenity concern related more to the construction rather than the proposed buildings operation.
- There had been nothing to disprove the Highway Team's view that the access and egress of site traffic would cause issues. Furthermore, the concerns raised in relation to the bus stops would be addressed later in the application stage.

- The Applicant had taken on board issues raised and would invest a significant amount of financial investment and landscape design to offset the archaeology issues.
- There was a concern raised about whether the potential investment could be lost if the application was to be considered after the Local Plan had been reviewed. Furthermore, the issues raised by some Members, were not enough to refuse the application.
- Some Members felt that a need had been demonstrated, however, on balance, the application should be thought about more before they felt comfortable approving the proposals, mainly due to the potential highways impact.
- Some Members felt that to go against the LP due to its lengthy process would set a precedent for other developers identifying other land that had not been included.
- It was felt that green field agricultural land should not be developed in the way proposed. Furthermore, that land was historical to Peterborough and within the same league as Flag Fen and Must Farm.
- Comments had been made by Officers that to place concrete over the historic fort would preserve it, however some Members were not sure if the installation of 500 plus piles would.
- Fenland District Council were not in favour of the Kings Delph and Peterborough parts of the settlements being joined by the proposed development.
- There were 400 construction jobs that could be created as a result of the proposal if approved.
- The road was problematic; especially in terms of flooding on the North Bank however, Members had been advised by Highways that the issue should not be considered. Furthermore, Members felt that the issues could not be ignored, particularly when there had been £5m invested to improve the road conditions in terms of vehicle traffic movement.
- The Peterborough Fen was included within Peterborough's landscape character area and Members felt that this should be protected as per the policy. If the proposed development was approved, the Kings Delph area and identity of the settlements and the landscape settings would be lost and therefore was contrary to LP 27.
- The Fen area was very dark, and this would be lost due to the proposed lighting that would illuminate from the proposed building despite the type intended to be used, therefore the important view of the landscape and vistas would not be protected as per LP27.
- The applicant had submitted proposals to included protected views of the Cathedral however, Members felt that this had not carried much weight.
- It was important to refer to the LP and respect it when planning proposals were considered.
- Members were advised that to reject a planning proposal based on setting a precedent would be difficult and that paragraphs 49 and 50 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had stated that fact. Therefore, if Members were minded to, they would need to consider these facts into their reason for refusal.
- Some Members commented that there had been many concerns raised in relation to why the proposal should be refused. However, it was felt that this was not a strong enough argument because it had been demonstrated on many occasions through questioning and debate that the LP was out of date and needed to be reviewed.
- Members commented that although it was apparent that the LP was out of date especially in terms of employment land, LP4 and LP27 and the considerations therein, demonstrated that the proposal should be refused.
- Members felt that it had not been proven that there was a lack of employment sites for Peterborough, which related to planning policy LP4 at sections a, b, c and d. In addition, there was no reason for deviation from the LP as employment land could

be developed in the city centre, through mixed used developments and the proposed land was in arable land.

- There had been sites throughout Peterborough in excess of 30,000 hectares of employment use.
- There would be an unacceptable impact to landscape and character of the area which was in relation to LP27.
- Some Members had issues with the views and vistas that would be impacted due to the archaeological heritage aspect and that particularly important land would become employment development and not arable land.
- An issue would also be present in terms of unacceptable impact on the neighbourhood amenity due to light pollution if the development was approved

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against the officer recommendation and **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 For, 2 Against, 1 Abstention) to **REFUSE** the application.

At this point the Committee took a 10-minute break.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

1. The applicant had failed to demonstrate that there was insufficient land within the city centre, elsewhere in the urban area (within General Employment Areas and Business Parks) or within urban extensions that was suitable for the proposed development leading to inappropriate development within the countryside, contrary to Policy LP2 and LP4 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
2. The applicant had failed to demonstrate that the visual and landscape impact of the proposed development would not cause harm to the Peterborough Fens landscape character area including to its special character, local distinctiveness, features of historical importance, and important views and vistas, contrary to Policy LP27 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

44. Quarterly Report

The Committee received a report, which outlined the appeal cases which covered the period from 1 October to 31 December 2022.

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

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

- There was an appeal in Maxey that had taken a lengthy period to resolve, however, a response was expected within the next few weeks.
- The Government was weighted in favour of telecoms prior approval applications being allowed.
- The outcome of the outbuilding appeal at Oundle Road with plans for a higher roof would be reported within the next appeals report.
- The Committee's general performance was high in terms of determining applications correctly, which was evident within the current quarterly report.

RESOLVED:

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

4.54PM
CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank