

# Public Document Pack



Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee  
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 5 July 2011

## **Members Present:**

Councillors – North (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chair), Casey, Harrington, Hiller, Lane, Martin, Stokes and Todd

## **Officers Present:**

Andrew Cundy, Area Manager, Development Management  
Nick Harding, Group Manager, Development Management  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor  
Alex Daynes, Senior Governance Officer

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

No apologies were received at the meeting.

Cllr Simons' apologies were subsequently received after the meeting.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Lane declared an interest in item 4.1 as he was acquainted with a member of the tennis club but declared that this would not affect his decision.

### **3. Minutes of the meetings held on 24 May and 7 June**

The minutes from the meetings held on 24 May and 7 June 2011 were approved as accurate records of the meetings.

### **4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

#### **4.1 11/00230/FUL - Peterborough Town and Sports Club, Bretton Gate, Bretton, Peterborough**

Planning permission was sought for two floodlit covered hard surfaced tennis courts at the Peterborough Town Sports Club. The tennis courts were to be contained (in the winter months) under a single skin transparent polythene removable dome cover, which measured approximately 36.5m x 33.5m x 9m in height. 10m high floodlights were proposed around the outside of the dome to allow for night time play. The proposed opening hours of the courts were 8am to 10pm Monday to Sunday, including bank/public holidays.

The location of the tennis courts on site had been amended during the course of the application. When the application was first submitted the courts were located at the south eastern corner of the site adjacent to the Westwood Farm industrial area and Wentworth Croft residential area. Following consultation, the proposed courts have been relocated to the north east part of the club site adjacent to the existing floodlit tennis courts and Bretton Gate Road.

The Planning Officer addressed the committee and advised Members that although this item was related to another planning development item on the agenda, it should be treated as a separate application. Officers had recommended the application for approval as the floodlights were next to existing floodlit areas and the nearest property, although 46 metres away, was separated from the site by a road and bands of trees.

Mr John Dadge, the agent for the developer, along with two of the applicants, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the committee included:

- Joint planning application from both the Lawn Tennis club and Peterborough Sports Club;
- The application was supported by the landowner;
- The application was supported by Sport England and the Lawn Tennis Association.

During debate, concern was raised regarding the proximity of the development to the existing cricket boundary and noted the concern of Sport England who had stated that 2.74 metres should be maintained between a cricket boundary and any structure or obstruction, for safety reasons.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application subject to an additional condition being added to ensure the structure is at least 2.74 metres from the cricket boundary and where the boundary might be realigned the minimum standards contained within Sport England's 'Natural Turf for Sport' (2011) with regard to minimum distances from stumps to boundary can still be met (as contained in the additional information provided).

**RESOLVED:** (9 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. Conditions 1 and 4 as detailed in the Committee report;
2. Insert new condition:

Prior to work commencing on site a further plan to scale of not less than 1:500 should be submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority, which indicates a minimum safety margin of 2.74 metres (3 yards) between the proposed floodlit tennis courts and the adjoining cricket boundary. This approved plan shall thereafter be implemented and maintained as such unless further written approval is obtained from the local planning authority. Any realignment to the cricket boundary required as a result of this requirement shall ensure that minimum standards contained within Sport England guidance 'Natural Turf for Sport' (2011) with regard to minimum distances from stumps to boundary can still be met.

**Reasons for decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

It was considered that the replacement tennis courts proposed could be considered as accessible and equivalent to those proposed to be lost by planning reference 11/00225/FUL. The siting and design of the tennis facilities proposed on this existing sports site was acceptable and on balance, the sky glow impact on the surrounding area would be acceptable as it was adjacent to the existing floodlit sports facilities and to ensure adequate standards regarding cricket pitch provision can still be met on this site.

The proposal was therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies CS18, CS14, CS16 of the Core Strategy, Policy LT3 of the Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005 and national policy guidance PPG17.

#### **4.2 11/00225/FUL - Peterborough City Lawn Tennis Club, Park Crescent, Peterborough, PE1 4DX**

Planning permission was sought for the construction of three detached properties on the site. Two properties would be positioned at the front of the site these would be two storey high 4 bedroom houses and the property positioned at the rear of the site would be a two storey high 3 bedroom coach house.

Two car parking spaces were proposed for each property, all car parking spaces were positioned at the rear of the site behind plots 1 and 2. One central combined vehicle and pedestrian access was proposed to serve the three properties from Park Crescent.

The site was the last remnants of a tennis club that has been on site for about 100 years. Part of the site was developed for housing in the 1970's, leaving a wooden clubhouse and four grass tennis courts which were the subject of this application. The courts were not currently in use, and had not been in use for a number of years. The site was currently laid grass, with the wooden clubhouse still in position, and was screened from Park Crescent by an approximately 2m high hedge and 1m high diaper work wooden fence.

The site fell within the Park Conservation Area and lay opposite Central Park. The adjoining houses were modern (having been built around 1970), although the overall character of the area reflected its history as an Arcadian Victorian/Edwardian residential area. The character of the surrounding area was generally one of large residential properties set within large plots, screened from the road with mature trees and hedges.

The Planning Officer addressed the committee and members were advised that the application was only refused previously due to the lack of adequate replacement tennis court provision. This application had slightly changed regarding the access points to the site and the size of some of the windows in the design. The planning officer advised that condition 14 should have stated that the driveway would continue at a 5m width for its length, not reduce to 4.5m wide after 10m. Both previous Inspector reports were tabled for members for the committee to see.

Councillor Shearman and Councillor Peach spoke as ward councillors, addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- that it was against the ethos of and policies for the conservation area;
- there was a shortage of open space in the ward;
- replacement facilities too far away;
- went against character of Park Crescent housing plots; and
- local views had been ignored when they should be considered more.

Mrs Anne Brosnan, Mr David Jervis and Mr Newell local residents addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the committee included:

- no tree survey had been conducted;
- replacement facilities were not accessible;
- negative impact on neighbouring properties; and

- frontage and colour of bricks would be out of character for the Crescent.

Mr John Dadge, the agent for the developer, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the committee included:

- application was approved for its design, layout and character;
- adjacent properties are quite modern;
- is delivering prestige homes in the city;
- car parking areas at the rear of the buildings;
- Sport England supports the replacement facilities.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee in response to points raised by the speakers and stated that the inspector had indicated that designs were previously acceptable by the inspector, no tree report was required as there were no trees on the site, a separate planning application would be required to change the houses to flats, exits on to highway reduced and the conservation area concerned more the development of existing buildings rather than development on empty plots.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED:** (9 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. Conditions 1 and 14 as detailed in the Committee report; and
2. Insert additional condition:

The dwellings shall not be occupied until the areas shown as parking and turning on the approved plan have been laid out on-site, and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles, in connection with the use of the dwellings. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plan, the parking spaces must be a minimum of 2.4m x 5m with 6m clear manoeuvring.

**Reasons for decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

The development was an unallocated site in a residential area which was appropriate for residential development, the density and design was appropriate and therefore it complied with policies H7, H15, and DA6 of the Peterborough Local Plan First Replacement 2005, and Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.

The proposal would maintain or preserve the character of the Conservation Area and therefore it complied with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy, and the Park Conservation Area Appraisal/Management Plan.

The level of overlooking and privacy was acceptable and therefore it complied with Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.

Adequate infrastructure would be provided including replacement tennis facilities and therefore it complied with Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and Policy LT3 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

#### **4.3 11/00695/FUL - St Theresa's House, Manor House Street, Peterborough, PE1 2TL**

Planning permission was sought for a change of use from a former day centre/night shelter for the homeless to an Undertakers (A1). The site would provide services associated with the direction of funeral and would include areas within the building for the arrangement/organisation of funerals, display area for funeral furniture/memorials, two chapels of rest, a memorial area, a preparation/storage area and a service room. The building would provide facilities for humanist/civil services or small gatherings of mourners where the deceased or their family do not wish to use conventional church, chapel or other religious based premises. The service room was approximately 63m<sup>2</sup> and could accommodate up to 35 people. No changes were proposed to the external appearance of the building other than general repair and redecoration. The building would be open to visiting members of the public Monday to Friday 8.00 a.m. – 5.30 p.m. and Saturday 8.00 a.m. – 12.30 p.m. Funerals would take place primarily on weekdays, although some religious denominations may require a Saturday or Sunday funeral. The building would be available for use by the undertakers on a 24 hour basis, dependent on the needs of the business i.e. the receiving of the recently deceased.

The Planning Officer addressed the committee and members were advised that the main considerations in the application were the impact on residents and the impact on the conservation area. Members were further advised that all parking on Manor House Street was restricted.

Mrs Janet Tasker and Mrs Margaret Randall, residents of Manor House Street, addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the committee included:

- Distress to residents seeing coffins and funeral processions on a regular basis;
- Parking concerns in the area would be exacerbated and therefore needed addressing;
- Night time arrivals with bodies;
- Double parking in the street would obstruct the hearses; and
- Homeless centre was preferable.

Mr G H Taylor, the agent for the developer, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the committee included:

- Undertakers would be discreet and keep the premises well maintained;
- Other non-residential properties already on the street;
- Only two funerals per day could be managed;
- Funerals would not start from that site;
- Could use soundproofing materials for the service rooms if required;
- A screen could be erected at the rear of the premises to better cover the deliver of bodies; and
- There was no audible reverse indicator on the hearse or service vans.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee in response to points raised by the speakers and stated that sound proofing could be conditioned into the application and condition 3 in the report could be amended to include a canopy in addition to a screen.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application subject to an additional condition to ensure soundproofing materials were used for the two internal chapels and condition 3 in the report being amended to reflect that instead of just a screen, a car port be erected which could be described as a solidly constructed

covered loading and unloading area details of which would be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

**RESOLVED:** (9 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. Conditions 1 and 8 as detailed in the Committee report; and
2. revised condition 3:
  - a) details of a covered loading and unloading area of solid construction shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority;
  - b) the covered loading and unloading area shall be built as approved and retained thereafter; and
  - c) a scheme of sound attenuation to the rooms uses as service rooms and chapels of rest shall implemented in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

**Reasons for decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The site is within an 'edge of centre' location which is considered appropriate for use as undertakers (A1); and the use would not impact on the viability and vitality of the city centre;
- The use would be sympathetic to the surrounding character and would not result in any detrimental impact on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- All activities associated with the use shall be undertaken inside the building and shall not be visible from any public view or from the adjoining neighbouring properties;
- The site is accessible by a choice of means of transport and the proposed use is unlikely to result in any adverse impact on the adjoining highway; and
- The proposal would bring the building back into beneficial use.

Hence the proposal accords with policies CBE11 and CC15 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005, policies CS13, CS14, CS15, CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and PPS4 and PPS5.

13.30 – 16.05  
Chairman