



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 9 JUNE 2015**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chair), Serluca (Vice-Chair), Hiller, North, Stokes, Harrington, Okonkowski, Lane and Shabbir

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Development Management Manager  
Jim Daley, Principal Built Environment Officer  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highway Control)  
Hannah Vincent, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Martin and Councillor Sylvester. Councillor Shabbir was in attendance as a substitute.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations for interest were received.

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

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

**4. Minutes of the Meetings held on:**

**4.1 7 April 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 April 2015 were approved as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

- 'Ian Allin, Ward Councillor' be altered to 'Ian Allin, Parish Councillor';
- 'Albert Road' and 'Albert Street' be altered to 'Oundle Road'; and
- 'village plan' be altered to 'Maxey Conservation Area plan'.

**4.2 21 April 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2015 were approved as a correct record.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**5.1 15/00479/HHFUL – 13 Allotment Lane, Castor, Peterborough, PE5 7AS**

The planning application was for the demolition of an existing garage at 13 Allotment Lane, Castor, and the erection of a single storey front extension and two storey front extension. The application was a resubmission.

The main considerations set out in the reports were:

- Policy Context
- Impact on Heritage Assets and Character and Appearance of the Area
- Neighbour Amenity

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- There was a mixture of architecture in the surrounding area, and listed buildings further down the lane.
- The proposals would result in 7 metre by 3.8 metre extension at ground floor, wider than the current garage, with the first floor 2 metres shorter.
- There had been no objections from the public, and the proposals had received support from both the Parish Council and Ward Councillor.
- It was considered by officers that the modern buildings in the area were not the prominent feature and that the proposals would make a significant difference to the street scene.
- It was believed that the proposed extension would dominate the area and change its character.
- It was advised that previous issues with impact on residential amenity had now been addressed within the proposal.
- Within the update report additional comments had been received from Castor Parish Council, in support of the application. Photographs had been submitted by the applicant of other comparable developments in the locality.

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

- The Councillor highlighted that the building opposite the application site had been development and had modified every aspect of the property.
- The area was characterised by a mixture of housing styles and sizes.
- No neighbour amenity would be effected, nor would there be any adverse impact on the conservation area.
- The applicant needed more room for their family and did not wish to move.
- Councillor Lamb confirmed that the Parish Council was in support of the application.

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

- The applicant did not want to detriment the character of the area.
- The application property was already different in style to the other dwellings in the surrounding locality. As such it was not believed that granting this application would set a precedent.
- It was suggested that the proposals would improve the area, which was 'hotchpotch' in character.
- The street scene was obscured from the west by trees and bushes and from the east by a wall.
- The applicant highlight the development at 10 Manor Farm Lane, which was believed to be of a similar nature to their proposal. It was suggested that there was no consistency in the approach to the two developments.

The Committee thanked the applicant for her address. During discussion the Committee raised several points, including the prospect of the first floor development extending beyond the line of the trees. Significant weight was attached the Parish Council support of the application, however the Committee did note that this was not the only relevant factor.

It was considered that, as the buildings in the area were all different in style, the proposal would not alter the character of the area. As the first floor did not extend as far

as the ground floor proposal, it was thought that it would not obstruct any view of the landscape beyond.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, contrary to officer recommendation, for the reason that, rather than being detrimental to the conservation area and residential amenity, the proposal would improve the area. The motion was carried seven voting in favour, two voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (seven voted in favour, two voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to appropriate conditions.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposals were not considered to be to the detriment of the conservation area, but were believed to improve the aesthetic of the surrounding area. There was not considered to be any loss of amenity for neighbouring properties.

### **5.2 15/00392/HHFUL – 29 Parliament Street, Millfield, Peterborough, PE1 2LS**

The planning application was a retrospective application for a front single storey extension to 29 Parliament Street, Millfield and the erection of a front boundary wall.

The main considerations set out in the reports were:

- Design, Layout and Neighbour Amenity
- Access and Parking
- Conditions

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted unconditionally.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The application was retrospective for a front extension, similar to a number of other dwellings on Parliament Street.
- The application had been previously refused by officers as the materials used in the extension did not match the main house. However, this refusal had been reconsidered and it was now considered that this was not a significant enough reason to refuse.

The Committee commented that the proposal fit well with the street scene.

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** unconditionally.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

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 front extension did not harm the character or appearance of the host building or street scene, and accorded with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and Policies PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The front extension did not harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and accorded with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and

## **6. Planning Compliance Quarterly Report on Activity & Performance January to March 2015**

The Committee received a report which outlined the Planning Service's planning compliance performance and activity which identified if there were any lessons to be learned from the actions taken. The aim was for the Committee to be kept informed of future decisions and potential to reduce costs.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the report and raised the following points:

- 138 complaints had been received, which was an increase of 29 from the last quarter.
- 147 complaints had been resolved, which was 3 less than the national average.
- The department had a 100% complaint acknowledgment rate, which was above the 80% target.
- 98% of site inspections were carried out within 7 days, which was above the target.
- There were no prosecution cases to report, however there had been one appeal against an enforcement case dismissed.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Planning and Highways Lawyer advised that the judge was not satisfied with the information presented in the RP Meats case. This was due to an issue surrounding the ownership of the land, which was unregistered.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted past performance and outcomes.

## **7. The Etton Conservation Area Appraisal**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the outcome of the public consultation on the Draft Etton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

It was officer's recommendation that the Committee notes the outcome of the public consultation on the Etton Conservation Appraisal, recommends that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing & Economic Development considers and approves the proposed conservation area boundary change and that the Committee supports the adoption of the of the Etton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Etton Conservation Area.

The Principal Built Environment Officer provided an overview of the report and raised the following points:

- All conservation areas were undergoing a review. The two before the Committee today were number 21 and 22 out of 29.
- The reviews were in order to keep the documents readable and to maintain a management plan.
- The appraisals outlined the character of an area, reviewed the boundaries of the conservation area and provided guidance.
- The Etton Conservation Area appraisal described the area's special character as its rural landscape.
- The public consultation had attracted a number of positive responses, with a few minor corrections. Comments were also made about the marquee at the

Golden Pheasant.

- The management plan outlined for more sympathetic traffic calming measures to be used, underground utility wires, tree planting and for the identification of buildings making a positive contribution.
- It was explained that the boundary of the conservation area was to be extended to include the fields to the south west of the village.

The Committee discussed the temporary marquees placed outside the Golden Pheasant. It was noted that if the Council determined not to renew temporary permission for these, a more permanent structure would be sought, which would be more in line with the current building. The traffic calming measures referenced in the report were questioned and the Principal Built Environment Officer advised that the option of closing the link between Etton and Maxey may be a future consideration.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee:

1. Noted the outcome of the public consultation on the Etton Conservation Area Appraisal;
2. Recommended that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing & Economic Development considers and approves the proposed conservation area boundary change; and
3. Supports the adoption of the Etton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Etton Conservation Area.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Adoption of the Etton Conservation Area Appraisal as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Area would:

- fulfil the Local Planning Authorities obligations under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to prepare and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas.
- provide specific Conservation Area advice which would be used as local design guidance and therefore assist in achieving the Council's aim of improved design standards and the delivery of a high quality planning service.
- have a positive impact on the enhancement of the Conservation Area by ensuring that new development in the historic environment is both appropriate to its context and of demonstrable quality.

## **8. The Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the outcome of the public consultation on the Draft Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

It was officer's recommendation that the Committee notes the outcome of the public consultation on the Sutton Conservation Appraisal, recommends that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing & Economic Development considers and approves the proposed conservation area boundary change and that the Committee supports the adoption of the of the Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Sutton Conservation Area.

The Principal Built Environment Officer provided an overview of the report and raised the following points:

- The area was characterised by its Anglo-Saxon history and rural setting.
- It was stated that approximately 45% of the buildings had been developed following the 1900's.
- The area was defined by its tranquil, cul-de-sac nature, its stone boundary and buildings, and its verges without curbs.
- The public consultation resulted in 6 representations, including the Parish Council.
- It was recommended to make a small modification to the boundary, to bring in to the Conservation Area the full curtilage of Manor Farm. The owner of the farm had not made comment on the proposals.
- It was further proposed to identify positive unlisted buildings, to repair dry stone walls, to introduce sympathetic street furniture and to introduce a scheme of long term tree planting.

The Committee thanked the officer for his comprehensive report and considered that the alteration of the Sutton Conservation Area boundary was a sensible approach.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee:

1. Noted the outcome of the public consultation on the Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal;
2. Recommended that the Cabinet Member for Growth, Planning, Housing & Economic Development considers and approves the proposed conservation area boundary change;
3. Supports the adoption of the Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Sutton Conservation Area.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Adoption of the Sutton Conservation Area Appraisal as the Council's planning guidance and strategy for the Area would:

- fulfil the Local Planning Authorities obligations under the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to prepare and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of Conservation Areas.
- provide specific Conservation Area advice which would be used as local design guidance and therefore assist in achieving the Council's aim of improved design standards and the delivery of a high quality planning service.
- have a positive impact on the enhancement of the Conservation Area by ensuring that new development in the historic environment is both appropriate to its context and of demonstrable quality.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 2.36pm