



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 16 DECEMBER 2014**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chair), Hiller, Martin, Sylvester, Ash, Harrington and Thacker

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Head of Development and Construction  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highway Control)  
Ruth Lea, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Serluca, Casey, North and Stokes. Councillor Thacker was in attendance as substitute.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor**

There were no declarations of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor.

**4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**4.1 14/01631/FUL – Herlington House, Benyon Grove, Orton Malborne, Peterborough**

The planning application was for construction of an office building and associated external works at Herlington House, Benyon Grove. The application also included alterations to windows and doors at Herlington House and associated external works (relating to the change of use to flats). The application had been deferred by the Committee at its meeting on 18 November 2014 in order to hear additional information on access for coaches and emergency vehicles, the suitability of the bus lane for coach access, and any alternative access.

The main considerations were:

- Principal of development
- Site History
- Access and Parking
- Design
- Impact on nearby residents
- Security
- Bin Store
- Sustainability
- Section 106

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- Tracking of a 12 metre coach within the site, as it currently was, had been undertaken and showed that the overhang of the bus would enter third party land.
- The site was not currently designed for coach access, and such use would not be recommended by the Council.
- Emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles would be able to access the site.
- The terms of the Traffic Regulation Order covering the bus stop lay-by meant that coaches could not legally stop there. The TRO could be modified, however, it would be unreasonable to expect the applicant to meet these costs.
- If the TRO were to be modified, coaches could use the Benyon Grove stop. This was 60 metres from the church. As coach trips occurred four times a year, this was considered to be reasonable.
- A number of standardised letters of support had been received as well as the notes from a meeting between the applicant and the church, at which meeting the church withdrew its objection to the application.

Bill Wilcock, resident, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Wilcock thanked the Committee for visiting the application site.
- The car park was used by numerous communities and was often busy, especially at weekends.

It was clarified that the church and representatives had met with the applicant, and had subsequently withdrawn its objection.

Neil Armstrong, Applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Armstrong thanked the Committee for convening the meeting.
- The applicant had met with the church and its representatives to look at the access to the site.
- It was determined that it was not practical for a coach to access the site as it was presently as the route prior to reaching the car park was narrower than the car park itself.
- It was agreed by the church and Ward Councillors that the application was satisfactory.
- A previous employee of the applicant had sought local opinion on the proposals, and how the application would benefit the area, resulting in additional support.

The Committee was pleased that the concerns raised by the church had been amicably resolved and was satisfied that the reasons for deferral had been addressed.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was considered acceptable for the following reasons:

- The proposal would not have any detrimental impact on neighbour amenity
- Adequate car and cycle parking would be provided for the proposed uses
- The proposed building had been designed to be in keeping with the character of the area
- The proposal included measures to improve the security of the area.

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and Policies PP2, PP3, PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Chairman  
9.30am – 9.47am