

# Public Document Pack



## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 23 APRIL 2013

**Members Present:** Councillors Serluca (Chairman), Casey (Vice Chairman), Hiller, Todd, Stokes, Shabbir, Lane and Harrington

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Group Manager Development Management  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Sarah Hann, Acting Senior Engineer (Development)  
Carrie Denness, Senior Solicitor  
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors North and Sylvester.

### 2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

### 3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 March 2013

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 March 2013 were approved as a true and accurate record.

### 4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

#### 5. 13/00417/FUL - Newark Court, 5-7 Newark Avenue, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough

The application site was approximately 0.47 hectares in area and comprised a vacant single storey building and associated car parking and access road. The building was previously used by 'Best Deal 4 Baby' providing opportunity for the exchange of unwanted baby items albeit this use was never permitted and the lawful use of the building was for B1 offices. In addition, part of the site area was formed by garden land associated with No.5 Newark Avenue, a residential dwelling.

The site was located within a predominantly residential area, with residential dwellings enclosing the site to the north, south and east. There was a variety of built form in the surrounding area, with a mix of size and style of dwellings along Newark Avenue, Eastfield Road and Derby Drive. To the north of the site was modern backland development, comprising 4 no. flats. To the south-west of the site was an established children's day nursery (Class D1).

The application sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and bungalow (No.5 Newark Avenue) and construction of a new two storey medical centre (Class D1) comprising:

- 8 no. consulting rooms;
- 3 no. treatment rooms;
- 2 no. Healthcare Assistant/Phlebotomy rooms;
- 4 no. rooms for District Nurses, Health Visitors and District Midwife;
- Ancillary office and staff accommodation; and

- Pharmacy (100 square metres of floor area)

The total gross internal floor area of the proposed surgery extended to 992.7 square metres. In addition, the proposal included improvement to the existing vehicular access, provision of 55 car parking spaces (28 of which resulted from the change of use of part of the garden associated with a dwelling) and associated landscaping. The proposed new accommodation would provide replacement facilities for four GP practices located in the surrounding areas - Welland, Dogsthorpe, Parnwell, Burghley Road/Church Walk.

The proposal had been amended following refusal at Committee of application reference 12/01429/FUL. This application was refused for the following reason:

*R1 The proposal provided a level of car parking on site which was less than that which was considered necessary to serve the scale of development, even taking into account the anticipated mode of transport of staff and customers visiting the site. Whilst some overspill parking could take place on street, such was the level of the shortfall in on site parking, that highway safety and the free flow of traffic on Newark Avenue was likely to be compromised. The proposal was therefore contrary to the provisions of Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) which sought to ensure that new development did not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network and provided appropriate and deliverable parking provision.*

The current application sought to address the above reason for refusal by increasing the level of parking proposed on site from 41 spaces to 55 (an increase of 14 spaces). In order to provide this increased parking provision, the demolition of the existing bungalow known as No.5 Newark Avenue was also included as part of the application proposal.

The Group Manager Development Management addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. It was advised that the previous concerns highlighted by the Committee had been addressed and the recommendation was to grant the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report where it was highlighted that there had been five additional letters of objection received and one letter of support received from Councillor Adrian Miners, a Dogsthorpe Ward Councillor. There was also a propose revision to Condition C15 in relation to the windows on the site.

Councillor Pam Kreling, Park Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted included:

- The demolition of the bungalow, to make way for additional car parking spaces, was a good step;
- There were concerns regarding noise levels and security issues, particularly in relation to the neighbouring properties;
- The highways network needed to be drastically improved;
- The proposal would have a significant impact on highways safety and had the potential to become an accident black spot;
- The traffic situation was already an issue; the proposal would only increase the traffic flow.

Councillor John Shearman, Park Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted included:

- The previous parking issue had been satisfactorily addressed;
- Since the last meeting, a number of concerns had been raised to Councillor Shearman by local residents, including overlooking of residential properties and

the potential increase in traffic.

Mr D Singh, a local resident, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted included:

- Mr Singh lived in a neighbouring property and felt extremely strongly about the proposal and the impact it would have on the surrounding area;
- The proposal was not a 'local facility', for those people who only lived locally, this was in contradiction to C14 of the Core Strategy;
- There would be an increase in traffic at the junctions during peak periods. The traffic was already a major concern;
- There were a number of schools in the area, hence a number of school children walking to and from school across the entrance to the proposal;
- The traffic issues in general needed to be further addressed;
- There were 55 proposed spaces on the site, this was akin to a small supermarket and was wholly unacceptable for the locale;
- The car park may be utilised by parents dropping off and picking up their children from school. How would this be prevented?
- Mr Singh's garden backed onto the car park, there would be an increase in noise, litter and general disturbance;
- The proposal would have a security impact on Mr Singh's property;
- There were more appropriate sites available for the proposal;
- There had been a number of accidents in the vicinity and Mr Singh had witnessed people being knocked off their bikes.

Mr Stuart Walker, the Consultant for the Applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted included:

- The previous application had been refused due to the lack of onsite parking. This had been remedied with the proposed demolition of the bungalow to make way for additional spaces;
- The practicalities around demolishing the bungalow would be addressed;
- There would be security fencing along Newark Avenue, CCTV provision and low level lighting. Further discussions could be held if these provisions were felt to be inadequate;
- The CCTV would cover the entire car park area;
- The practice would be responsible for managing traffic coming in and out of the site.

In response to points raised by the speakers, the Group Manager Development Management advised that with regards to the construction phase, in particular in relation to the demolition of the bungalow, Condition 9 as detailed in the committee report stated that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) was to be submitted prior to any construction on the site.

In relation to security concerns, the proposal allowed for 1.8 metre deep landscaping before the security fencing, this could be increased and he was happy to liaise with the local residents on this point.

Regarding the concerns raised in relation to overlooking, it was advised that the proposed principle elevation windows facing residential properties would be obscure glazed and would not open more than 30cm wide.

Members sought clarification from the Highways Officer as to the impact the proposal would have on the surrounding highways network and whether there could be any improvements made to mitigate against this impact. In response it was advised that there were no improvements that could be undertaken. Mini roundabouts had been discussed, however the imposition of such a roundabout would give priority access to the site, and this was not the desired outcome. Traffic modelling had been undertaken and it had been calculated that an

additional 30 vehicles would travel to and from the site during peak hours. This was not considered to be an unacceptable additional strain on the highways network.

Following questions and debate, it was commented that the Applicant had addressed the previous concerns expressed by the Committee. It was further commented that the Applicant's willingness to cooperate, and talk to neighbours about their concerns, was to be commended. The security measures proposed were of a high standard and overall the application was of a high standard. A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to the imposition of the conditions as detailed in the committee report, the revision to Condition C15 as per the update report and an informative stating that the Applicant would consult with the neighbours in relation to the boundary details, with Officers being given delegated authority to make any changes. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 1 voting against and 1 not voting.

**RESOLVED:** (6 for, 1 against, 1 not voting) to grant the application, as per Officer recommendation, subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C14 as detailed in the committee report;
2. The amended condition C15 relating to the windows on the site, as detailed in the update report;
3. An informative stating that the Applicant would further discuss boundary details with the neighbours and Officers being given delegated authority to make any requested changes.

#### **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 proposed medical centre would replace existing facilities which were no longer fit for purpose in an area centrally located to the catchment that would be served and the principle of development was therefore acceptable, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS6 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012);
- whilst the proposed pharmacy was located outside any identified local or district centre, the use complemented the proposed medical centre and would allow for shared trips by users, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- the proposed building would not appear unduly incongruous or result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any danger to highway safety and was accessible by a range of modes of transport, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- sufficient car parking was proposed to meet the demands generated by the development, in accordance with Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- no unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents would result from the proposed development, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in harm to or loss of unidentified archaeological assets, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough

- Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable loss of existing landscape features, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
  - the development made adequate contribution towards the infrastructure demands it would generate, in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

Chairman  
1.30pm - 3.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank