

# Public Document Pack



## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 18 DECEMBER 2012

**Members Present:** Councillors Serluca (Chairman), Casey (Vice Chairman), North, Todd, Kreling, Shabbir, Martin, Harrington and Ash

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Group Manager, Development Management  
Lee Collins, Area Manager, Development Management (Item 5.1)  
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer (Item 5.1)  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Carrie Denness, Senior Solicitor  
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hiller, Stokes, Sylvester and Lane.

Councillors Kreling, Martin and Ash were in attendance as substitutes.

### 2. Declarations of Interests

Councillor Ash declared a personal, none prejudicial interest in item 5.1, in that one of the objectors against the application was known to him. He had not held any discussions with the individual relating to the application; therefore this would in no way affect his decision.

Councillor Casey declared that he had met a number of individuals who were in objection to item 5.1 but this would in no way affect his decision.

Councillor North declared a personal, prejudicial interest in item 5.1. He stated that he had been involved in numerous discussions relating to the site and that he would therefore not take part in debate, or vote on the item.

Councillor Martin declared that he had been approached by a number of local residents in relation to item 5.3, but this would in no way affect his decision.

Councillor Harrington declared a pecuniary interest in 5.5 in that he owned property in the area. He would therefore not take part in debate or vote on the item.

### 3. Members Declaration of Intention to make Representations as Ward Councillor

There were no declarations of intention from any Member to make representation as Ward Councillor.

### 4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 November 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2012 were approved as a true and accurate record subject to the following amendment:

Page 11, item 5.8, the voting to read "7 For and 1 Against" rather than "7 For and 1 Abstention".

## 5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

Councillor North left the meeting.

### 5.1 12/01334/WCPP – Variation of condition 5 of outline planning permission 09/01369/OUT to allow a higher building (not exceeding 35m) to be built on plot E2.1 to meet the requirements of an occupier. The first sentence of condition 5 would read - Building heights shall not exceed a maximum height of 15 m except on plot E7 where the maximum height shall not exceed 17 m and on plot E2.1 where the maximum height shall not exceed 35m

Tranche E2.1 was located within the Great Haddon employment area which was some 65 ha in size and had outline planning permission for B1 (business including offices), B2 (general industry) and B8 (warehouse and distribution) uses. The access road, which would serve the employment site and connect it to junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway, was located immediately to the east of tranche E2.1 along with bridleway number 1 which formed part of the Green Wheel network. On the other side of the road/bridleway and to the south of tranche E2.1 were other development tranches including the remainder of tranche E2. Further east some 545 metres from tranche E2.1 was Orton Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)/ Special Area of Conservation (SAC) a site of international ecological importance. Beyond this was the existing development of Hampton.

Further south, beyond the Great Haddon employment area, was the woodland of Chambers Dole and Two Pond Coppice. Beyond the woodland, were a number of existing properties on the Old Great North Road and the proposed Great Haddon core area (planning permission was being sought for up to 5350 houses with associated infrastructure including a district/local centre and schools). The settlement of Norman Cross lay to the south west of the core area along with a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The village of Yaxley lay to the south east on the A15. The villages of Stilton and Folksworth were located further to the south west on the western side of the A1(M) (accessed from junction 16).

To the west of the Great Haddon employment area was the Alwalton Hill employment area which also had planning permission for employment uses. Building heights were limited under this consent to a maximum of 15 metres. Immediately to the west/south west of tranche E2.1 within Alwalton Hill was an area of woodland.

To the north of both employment areas was the Fletton Parkway and beyond this the township of Orton. To the west beyond Alwalton Hill was the A1(M) on the other side of which was the village of Haddon. To the north west were the villages of Alwalton and Chesterton.

The surrounding residential areas of Hampton and Orton, the existing properties on the Old Great North Road and the proposed Great Haddon core area lay within the Peterborough Unitary area. The other villages referred to (Haddon, Stilton, Folksworth, Alwalton, Chesterton and Yaxley) lay within the area administered by Huntingdonshire District Council.

Initial works had commenced on both the Great Haddon and Alwalton Hill employment areas but at the time there were no buildings and the land generally remained within agricultural use.

The application sought approval for a variation to condition 5 of the outline planning permission for Great Haddon (reference 09/01369/OUT) which limited the height of the buildings to 15 metres (with the exception of plot 7 where a 17 metre high building was

allowed) to allow a building of up to 35 metres on tranche E2.1. This was the only alteration proposed to the previously approved scheme.

Permission for a taller building height was being sought to meet the requirements of a specific operator, Yearsleys. Yearsleys had a number of cold storage buildings around the country. If permitted the new store would be a regional facility. It had advised that a 35 metre high building was required in order to maximise efficiencies /economies of scale.

The original outline application for Great Haddon was supported by an Environmental Statement (ES) which had been resubmitted with this application. This application was also supported by a new ES which assessed the impact of a taller building on tranche E2.1 in the context of the conclusions of the original ES.

The Principal Development Management Officer and the Area Manager Development Management addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal.

The main issues for consideration were outlined including the principle of development, visual impacts, ecological and landscape impacts, impact upon neighbour amenity and traffic impacts. The recommendation was to grant the application subject to the imposition of conditions, an S106 agreement and the passing of an amended appropriate assessment.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. An additional condition was proposed detailing the breakdown of building heights on the site by ways of a percentage. Further comments had also been received from the Applicant explaining why permission was being sought for a 35 metre high building.

Comments had also been received from Councillor Sheila Scott, Ward Councillor, expressing concerns in relation to the proposal. These were also the views of Councillor David Seaton, Ward Councillor.

Mrs Olive Leonard, Mrs Olive Main and Mr Christopher Walford, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. In summary, the concerns highlighted included:

- The construction of up to two 35 metre high buildings would have a considerable visual impact upon the area;
- The application contravened Peterborough's own guidance on building heights;
- The buildings would be out of keeping with the surrounding area;
- The proposed building would be near to the attractive Green Wheel and would be located upon high land;
- If the application was approved, it would set precedent for future planning applications;
- There would be minimal job creation and no extra jobs would be created by having a taller building;
- There would be an increase in traffic congestion;
- The building would be viewable from all angles and from a considerable distance;
- The impact on the A605, including additional HGVs.

Mr David Shaw, Mr Harry Yearsley and Mr David Thompson addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary, the key points highlighted included:

- The Applicant had come to invest in Peterborough and aid the growth agenda;
- The building would not be the tallest in Peterborough;
- The reasons behind the proposed building height included land use and energy consumption;
- The building would be situated a long way from housing areas;
- Around 300 jobs would be created on the site;
- Extensive consultation had been undertaken on the proposals;
- There was only one other viable site in the city and this was set within a very flat landscape. The impact would therefore be much greater;
- The site needed to be located near to the A1(M);
- Making the building lower and longer, rather than taller, was down to the running costs, particularly electric usage;
- The imposition of solar panels could be a possibility in the future.

Members debated the application and highlighted a number of concerns in relation to the proposal. The building would have a significant visual impact upon the landscape and would be located in an attractive rural setting. However, it was noted that the application site had been sitting vacant for fifteen years and the potential for development would be of great benefit to the city, creating jobs and investment in a poor economic climate.

Following further comments both for and against the proposal, a motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application. The motion was carried by 5 votes, with 3 voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (5 For, 3 Against) to grant the application, as per Officer recommendation, subject to:

1. The satisfactory completion of a S106 Agreement;
2. The passing of an amended Appropriate Assessment;
3. The conditions numbered C1 to C34 as detailed in the committee report (to be renumbered C1 to C35 following inclusion of additional condition);
4. The additional condition, to be C6, as detailed in the update report, relating to building heights on the site (no more than 30% of the buildings on site to be 35 metres);
5. The informatives numbered 1 to 21; as detailed in the committee report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies. Specifically;

- The build out of the consented scheme for the site (under outline permission 09/01369/OUT) would result in a complete change to the character of the existing site and a development which, in view of the ground levels, could be seen from outside of the site. It was acknowledged that a 35 metre high building on plot E2.1 would be more visible than the consented 15 metre high building. However, this was an allocated employment site and the National Planning Policy Guidance placed strong emphasis upon supporting economic growth. Given that there were no areas of best landscape adjoining the site and it would result in unacceptable harm to the Schedule Ancient Monument to the south west or surrounding Conservation Areas the visual impact of the building was, on balance, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policies CS5, CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Core Strategy and policies PP1 and PP3 of the adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD;

- A 35 metre high building on plot E2.1 would not result in an additional adverse impact upon Orton Pit SSSI/SAC in terms of shading. Neither was it considered that the proposal would have any unacceptable adverse impact upon any other species. It would result in some additional shading of Alwalton Woodland but given that this was not a designated feature the impact was considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not result in any additional landscaping loss from that found to be acceptable under the outline planning permission. The development was, therefore, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework’;
- Although a number of residents would have some views of the taller building, as most would of the consented 15 metre high building, given the separation distances it was not considered that it would have any unacceptable overbearing impact upon them. Although the sun would set behind the building for 10-12 days a year around the equinoxes it was not considered that the impact upon the amenity of the properties within Hampton to the east would be unacceptable. The application did not result in any other changes in impact. The proposal was, therefore, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS16 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP3 of the adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD; and
- The application would not result in any other changes in impact in terms of traffic generation, flood risk or contamination, all of which were assessed under the outline planning application and the impacts found to be acceptable. This proposal therefore remained acceptable under policy CS14, CS16, and CS22 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

Councillor North re-joined the meeting.

## **5.2 12/01385/FUL – Construction of 5 bed detached dwelling and double garage. Land adjacent and to the South of 14 Lincoln Road, Glington, Peterborough**

The site was approximately 0.11 hectares and formed part of the garden area to no. 14 Lincoln Road and was located on the eastern side of Lincoln Road close to the southern edge to the village of Glington and within the Conservation Area boundary. The site contained a large two storey detached dwelling with triple garage to the side/front and had a single access off Lincoln Road leading to a courtyard area. The site was enclosed by mature trees to the western and southern boundaries and there were a number of trees within the site, several of which were protected under a Tree Preservation Order. The immediate context was comprised of detached dwellings of individual style and the site lay directly opposite the Arthur Mellows Village College School Playing Fields. Lincoln Road was the main route through the village and speed restrictions had been implemented in the form of ‘build outs’ which included the stretch of road to the site’s frontage.

The application sought consent for a two and a half storey dwelling with detached double garage. The proposed dwelling would be set within the grounds of, and to the south of, the existing dwelling, no.14 Lincoln Road. The dwelling would contain five bedrooms, with two shown to be located within the roof space. Overall the dwelling would also contain six bathrooms including en-suite rooms. Vehicular access would be gained from the access to the south which was shared with properties at nos. 10 and 12 and a pedestrian access would be provided through the western (front) boundary hedge.

The Group Manager, Development Management, addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. The main issues for consideration were highlighted and these included the impact on the character of the area, overdevelopment of the site, adverse affect on the retention and protection of both the trees and the hedge and the impact on the street scene. The recommendation was to grant the application subject to the signing of a legal agreement and the imposition of relevant conditions.

Planning permission had been approved for the site in 2009, however there had been no property built. The application before Members was therefore to renew the consent. The scheme differed from the previous scheme in a number of ways and these were outlined to the Committee.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report and it was highlighted that there had been further comments received from the Highways Officer in relation to the substandard shared access and also from the Landscape Officer, confirming that the original concerns sited against the application were still valid.

Councillor Diane Lamb, Ward Councillor, and Councillor Johnson, Parish Councillor addressed the Committee jointly. In summary the concerns highlighted included:

- The height, footprint and scale of development would impact on the character of the area;
- The Conservation Officer had stated that the proposal was excessive;
- The proposal would impact on the Conservation Area;
- The proposal was against Policy DA9 of the Peterborough Local Plan;
- The hedge frontage was protected;
- Objections to the scheme had been made by the Conservation Officer, the Landscape Officer and the Highways Officer.

Members debated the application and although concerns were highlighted relating to the access in and out of the site, and the comments made by the Conservation Officer, it was noted that the previous application had been approved by Officers and there had been no fundamental changes in Policy since the approval of the previous application.

A motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 3 voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (6 For, 3 Against) to grant the application, as per Officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C9 as detailed in the committee report.

**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 weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The site was located in a sustainable location within the village settlement boundary;
- The height, scale and design of the dwelling would not unduly impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and the site was of adequate size to accommodate the development;
- Safe and suitable highway access and parking could be provided;
- Protected trees and those which were worthy of retention could be suitably protected;
- There would be no significant detrimental impact on occupiers of adjoining dwellings; and
- The proposed dwelling would afford future occupiers a good standard of privacy, light and outdoor amenity space.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with Policies CS10, CS13, CS14, CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, Policies DA6, DA15, LNE9 and

T10 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005), Policies PP2, PP3 and PP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies Document, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD.

### **5.3 12/01430/R3FUL – Installation of security fence and gates, Heltwate School, Heltwate, Bretton, Peterborough**

The application site formed an area of landscaping in front of Heltwate Primary School, and was identified as such within the Peterborough Open Space Strategy (2010). The site was not suitable for play and was more of a landscaped area. To the north, east and south were high density residential and flats, with the Masonic Hall to the South-West. The site formed the centre of what was effectively a circulation route for the school, with parking and a drop off/pick up area to the west. The site was open with no boundary treatments. There were a number of healthy trees on site, none of which were protected by way of tree preservation orders.

The Applicant sought consent to erect a 2 metre high Paladin Classic fence and two gates, finished in green (RAL6005). This would incorporate the informal amenity space and pick up/drop off area into the school grounds.

The application had been made in order to ensure the safety and security of the school and its pupils with special needs.

The Group Manager, Development Management, addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. The Officer recommendation was to approve the application, with relevant conditions.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report and it was highlighted that Highways had requested the re-positioning of the gates on the site. This was due to the originally proposed gates being located on an adopted highway. An additional condition was therefore proposed in relation to this re-positioning and the provision of the relevant plans.

It was further highlighted that an additional letter of objection had been received against the application and a petition containing 46 signatures had been submitted.

Councillor Harrington left the meeting.

Ms Anita Fellowes and Mr Rowan Wilson, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted included:

- The residents owned the land in front of their properties up to the footpath and they were told that they could not erect fences or hedges etc.;
- If a fence was erected it would hem in the residential area and have a negative impact upon the streetscene;
- The imposition of fencing would make the school look like a prison;
- The proposals would increase the car parking issues in the area;
- The children at the school understood the dangers of the road;
- Would the gates be wide enough to let in emergency vehicles?
- The local residents of Ellindon did not want the fence.

Members debated the application and stated that the safety of the children at the school was paramount; however the need to fence off the grassed area in its entirety was unclear. The grassed area was used by the local residents and although owned by the school, could a compromise not be reached that would benefit all concerned.

Following further debate and questions to the Planning Officer, Members commented that in order to make an informed decision, it would be important to hear from the school the reasoning behind the proposal to fence off the grassed area. A motion was put forward and seconded to defer the application to a future meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (Unanimous) to defer the application.

**Reasons for the decision:**

To allow for a representative from the school to attend a future meeting and explain the reasoning behind the proposal to fence off the grassed area.

Councillor North left the meeting.

**5.4 12/01563/HHFUL - Construction of tree house (retrospective), Compass Barn, Main Street, Ufford, Stamford**

The site was to the south-east corner of the large rear garden area of Compass Barns, a converted complex of farm buildings and barns within the Ufford Conservation Area. The tree house lay directly adjacent to the Grade II listed White Hart Public House.

Retrospective permission was sought for the erection of a 'tree house' a garden room on a platform 3 metres above ground level with an overall height of 6.8 metres. A smaller satellite platform of 2.4 metres height was linked via a rope bridge to the east.

The Group Manager, Development Management, addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. The main issues for consideration were the impact of the proposal on the character of the Ufford Conservation Area and the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The recommendation was to refuse the application.

The application was a resubmission of a previous which had been refused due to the harm caused by the visual appearance of the tree house and its harm to neighbour amenity through overlooking. The revised application proposed to delete a window within the tree house and proposed the planting of a hedge to the site's eastern boundary.

Mr Scott Weavers-Wright, the Applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted included:

- The tree house was large, but it was only visible from one public vantage point, aside from the public house car park, this being a narrow gap from the main street;
- The view of the tree house was set between the context of existing trees and buildings;
- The tree house was not prominent as it was set far back from the street;
- There were no views for the tree house to invade;
- It was unfair to say that the tree house would set a precedent. All applications should be considered upon their own merits;
- The only neighbours affected would be the occupiers of Compass Cottage;
- The window facing east would be blocked in to mitigate against overlooking;
- Mature holly trees would be planted and no trees were planned for removal in the future.



Following questions, Members debated the application and stated that a lot of time, effort and money had been invested in the project in order to ensure it was in keeping with the village. Mature trees would be planted and a window was to be removed to prevent overlooking.

A motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application, subject to the imposition of conditions relating to a scheme of planting and the removal of a window to mitigate against overlooking of the neighbouring dwelling. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 1 abstaining.

**RESOLVED:** (6 For, 1 Abstention) to grant the application, contrary to Officer recommendation, subject to:

1. A condition stating that a scheme of planting be submitted for approval;
2. A condition stating that the east window, overlooking the neighbouring dwelling, is removed from the tree house.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The tree house had been built to a high specification and the Applicant had taken time and effort to ensure that it was in keeping with the village.

Councillor Shabbir left the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

Councillor Serluca addressed the meeting and stated that she was listed in the additional information report as speaking on the next item. As the meeting would have been declared inquorate had she done so, Councillor Serluca stated that she would not speak on the item and would remain in the Chair.

**5.5 12/01726/FUL – Installation of a temporary mobile home for occupation by managers of Peterborough Dairies, 3 John Wesley Road, Werrington, Peterborough, PE4 6ZP**

The application site was comprised of an area of open landscaped grassland within the curtilage of the industrial building currently occupied by Peterborough Dairies. The wider site was occupied by a large B2 General Industrial Unit which received deliveries of fresh milk for processing before being distributed to local businesses within Peterborough and the wider area. There was an associated car park immediately at the site entrance and a large area for the turning and manoeuvring of delivery vehicles to the rear. The application site was located within the identified Werrington General Employment Area and was accessed via the Werrington Parkway. The surrounding units were occupied by a variety of general industrial and storage/distribution businesses.

The application sought planning permission for the erection of temporary residential accommodation to allow the owners of Peterborough Dairies to live on the site of their business until it was established. The size of the temporary accommodation had been reduced following refusal by Members of application reference 12/00100/FUL. The current proposed accommodation was comprised of three no. bedrooms and requisite living space within a temporary structure of dimensions: 16 metres (length) x 6 metres (width) x 2.2 metres (height to ridge). The unit had been reduced in length only from the previously refused application scheme by a total of 3 metres.

The Group Manager, Development Management, addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. It was advised that the Officer recommendation for the

previous application, which had been heard and subsequently refused by the Committee, had been to refuse the scheme due to the size of the mobile. Therefore, due to the reduced size of the mobile, the Officer recommendation was now to grant the application for a three year temporary consent, with relevant conditions.

Mr David Shaw, the Agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The size of the unit had been reduced;
- The site was situated 75 metres from the railway line;
- Peterborough City Council had allocated in its Development Framework four sites which immediately adjoined the railway line;
- There were a considerable number of homes in Peterborough situated closer to the railway line than 75 metres;
- There were many homes in Peterborough that were adjoined by industrial sites;
- The application was for a temporary dwelling that was in accordance with national policy and it would assist with the development of a local business that would secure 30 jobs;
- Approving the temporary dwelling would not set a precedent;
- The only way of funding the business had been to release equity from the Applicant's own home;
- The development would not harm anyone and was a short term solution only;
- The mobile could be insulated and it would meet environmental health conditions.

Members debated the application and it was stated that the application would be a lone dwelling, based within a noisy situation and approving residential accommodation in an industrial area could set a precedent going forward. Ultimately, the health and wellbeing of the residents of the proposed application was of the utmost importance, and Members expressed concerns in relation to this.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application. The location of the proposal was not conducive with the placement of a residential property and furthermore the proximity of the location, in relation to the East Coast Main Line and the Royal Mail Depot, would mean that the occupiers would be subjected to a noisy environment. The motion was carried by 3 votes, 1 voting against and 2 abstaining.

**RESOLVED:** (3 For, 1 Against, 2 Abstentions) to refuse the application, contrary to Officer recommendation.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The site was located in a General Employment Area as identified in the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012). Policy SA11 of that DPD did not list residential as an acceptable use and Policy H7 (part b) of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005) did not permit residential use within defined Employment Areas. The principle was therefore unacceptable in accordance with these policies.

The nature of the location, particularly given its proximity to the East Coast Main Line and the Royal Mail depot meant that occupants of the proposal would be subject to a noisy environment which made it unsuitable for residential occupancy. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and Policy H7 (part f) of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005).

**5.6 12/01784/HHFUL – Construction of two storey extension to side and rear of existing dwelling and replacement of existing windows, 26 Heath Road, Helpston, Peterborough, PE6 7EG**

The application site was a semi-detached red brick dwelling with a mono-pitch porch to front, a lean to extension to rear and detached brick outbuilding to side. The rear amenity space was proportionate for the size of the dwelling and the plot had the capacity to cater for at least three off-street parking spaces.

The application site was not within the Helpston Conservation Area; however, it was within the settlement boundary as identified under Policy SA3 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012).

The Applicant sought consent to demolish the existing porch and rear extension, and erect a two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension. The roof space would also be converted to form a 5th bedroom, which included the installation of a roof light window.

The proposed extension would create an integral garage, dining room and kitchen and utility room at ground floor with two additional bedrooms at first floor.

The proposed single storey rear element would be 4.6 metres (deep) x 9.8 metres (wide) with a height of 2.3 metres to eaves and 3.9 metres to the highest point of the roof.

The two storey side and rear extension would have a maximum floor area of 7.3 metres x 5.8 metres and was proposed to stand at 5 metres to eaves and 7.6 metres to ridge.

The proposed extensions would utilise matching materials. The existing UPVC windows would be replaced with timber (opaque stained).

The consultation period was due to end on 23 December 2012.

The Group Manager, Development Management, addressed the Committee and outlined the main issues for consideration, those being the design and layout, neighbour amenity, protected species and access and parking. The Officer recommendation was to grant the application subject to the relevant conditions.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Comments had been received from Helpston Parish Council objecting to the application on a number of grounds. There had also been a letter submitted from the neighbouring dwelling, along with photographs illustrating how the proposal would affect their rear garden aspect.

A bat survey had also been requested by the Wildlife Officer and an Ecological Survey had been due for completion prior to the Committee meeting. The results of this survey would determine whether condition 3, detailed in the committee report, would remain in its current form or whether a bespoke condition should be attached advising of any required mitigation.

The Landscape Officer had advised that the yew tree located at the front of the site was worthy of note and a condition be attached with respect to providing details of protective fencing which should be retained throughout construction works.

Mrs Shackell, the adjoining neighbour, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. In summary the concerns highlighted included:

- It was a difficult situation for Mr and Mrs Shackell as they were friends with the Applicants;
- There had been no planning application notice put up along the road, therefore other neighbours had not been aware of the application;
- The proposed extension would be 1.8 metres larger than the neighbours extension;
- The extension would be detrimental to their rear garden views;
- The original roof design was preferred and the Applicant was in agreement with this also. The current design was too large and made the property look like a secondary house;
- If the extension to the back of the house (to be the kitchen/diner) was brought more into line with the neighbours extension, this would still be a considerable sized room;
- The extension would change the whole look of the house.

In response to comments made by the speaker, The Group Manager, Development Management, advised that a site notice was not required for a householder application and furthermore, in relation to the roof design, if Members were minded to grant the application the original roof could be reverted back to the pre-application version.

Mr Paul Hutchings, the Agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted included:

- A request for advice had been sought from the Planning Officers as part of the pre-application enquiry. A meeting had been held and the proposals were amended in accordance with that advice;
- It was not felt that the extension length was unreasonable even though it was slightly beyond permitted development.

The Legal Officer addressed the Committee and as a point of clarification stated that a 'right to a view' was not a material planning consideration and therefore could not be taken into account.

Members debated the application and stated that the design was in keeping with the area; however the roof should be reverted back to the pre-application version.

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to the roof design being reverted back to the pre-application version, no further representations being submitted during the consultation period, highlighting valid planning considerations and an additional condition relating to tree preservation during construction. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (Unanimous) to grant the application, as per Officer recommendation, subject to:

1. No objections being received that raised a material planning consideration that hadn't already been considered;
2. The roof scheme being reverted back to the pre-application version;
3. The conditions numbered C1 to C3 as detailed in the committee report (with condition 3 being removed in its entirety or amended accordingly dependent on the outcome of an Ecological Survey);
4. An additional condition relating to tree preservation during construction, as detailed in the update report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, 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 design of the extension would not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling or visual amenity of the street scene;
- The design of the extension would not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring amenity;
- The proposal would not result in a highway safety hazard and could accommodate sufficient off street parking;
- Subject to conditions the proposal would not impact on protected species.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (2011), Policy T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005), the NPPF (2012) and Policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP13 and PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD.

1.30pm – 5.12pm  
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank