



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 11 NOVEMBER 2015**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chair), Serluca (Vice Chair) Hiller, Stokes, Martin, Sylvester, Okonkowski, Harrington, Lane, and Casey

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Development Management Manager  
Theresa Nicholl, Development Manager  
Jim Daley, Principal Built Environment Officer (item 5.7)  
Gemma Wildman, Principal Strategic Planning Officer (item 6 and 7)  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highways)  
Hannah Vincent, Planning Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor North. Councillor Casey was in attendance as substitute.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Serluca declared that she had been approached by the applicant of item 5.2 '15/01086/R4FUL – Sports Ground, Fulbridge Road, Peterborough'. She was not, however, predetermined on the application. Councillor Serluca further declared that, as she was related to the applicant of item 5.6 '15/01452/HHFUL – 15 Queens Walk, Fletton, Peterborough', she would withdraw from the Committee for that item.

Councillor Casey declared that he had been approached by the applicant of item 5.1 '14/02021/R4FUL – Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Orton Longueville, Peterborough'. He was not, however, predetermined on the application.

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

No Member declarations of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor were received.

**4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 29 September 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2015 were approved as a correct record.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**5.1 14/02021/R4FUL – Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Orton Longueville, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the construction of all-weather training facility at Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Orton Longueville, including fencing and lighting.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

The Committee discussed the application and considered that, given the distance of the closest residence from the application site, there would not be any significant impact on amenity. It was suggested that the advanced flood light technology would create little light spillage and a proposed condition provided an avenue for any related complaints. The condition of the road was highlighted as a concern, however this did not form part of the application.

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**

Subject to the imposition of the attached 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 proposal would give rise to a considerable benefit to the wider community through the provision of an enhanced playing facility and the opportunity for usage throughout the year, in accordance with paragraphs 70 and 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- the all-weather pitch and associated facilities would not result in an unacceptable impact upon 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);
- whilst the proposal would result in some harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed Orton Hall, the public benefit arising from the development would outweigh this harm, in accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring residents, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal provides adequate on-site parking to meet the needs of the development and would not result in any harm to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposed AWP would not result in any unacceptably harmful impact to ecology present within and surrounding the site, in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal, subject to further details being provided, would ensure that surface water run-off is effectively managed and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011); and
- the proposal would not result in harm to undiscovered buried heritage assets, in accordance with paragraph 128 of 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).

## **5.2 15/01086/R4FUL – Sports Ground, Fulbridge Road, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the creation of a new external sports pitch at the Sports Ground, Fulbridge, Peterborough, with perimeter ball-stop fencing, floodlights, access and outdoor storage for maintenance equipment and onsite vehicular parking. This application had returned to Committee following a resolution of the Committee to grant planning permission, subject to an amendment to the hours of pitch use, and a further consultation response received from Sport England. The hours of use agreed by Committee on 13 October 2015 were:

- The use of the all-weather sports pitch hereby permitted shall not take place outside the following hours:  
Monday to Friday – 09:00 to 19:30  
Saturday / Sunday / Public or Bank Holidays – 10:00 to 19:00
- All external lighting within the site shall not be used outside the following hours:  
Monday to Friday – 09:00 to 20:00  
Saturday / Sunday / Public or Bank Holidays – 10:00 to 19:30

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

Councillor Smith, Werrington Neighbourhood Councillor, Councillor Davidson and Councillor Fower, Ward Councillors, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Committee previously recognised the impact on the amenity of surrounding residences and reduced the hours of operation accordingly.
- The Committee were urged to adhere to their original resolution.
- Concern was raised in relation to the potential for noise and light intrusions. It was suggested that a route be provided to allow residents to feed back.
- In relation to parking facilities, it was suggested that the Voyager Academy be the preferred option for coach parking.
- It was stated that the Committee should not yield to pressure placed on them by Sport England.

Steve Critchley addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Critchley represented the majority of local residents and objected to any increase in the hours of operation agreed by the Committee previously.
- An additional 9.5 hours a week, as suggested by Sport England, would have a significant detrimental effect on local residents.
- There were very few 3G pitches in the Peterborough area. This resulted in a low number of complaints being recorded in relation to them.
- The Ginton facility was surrounded by open farm land with a low amount of residential occupation. It was not comparable to the application currently before Committee.
- It was noted that Sport England had said they would not appeal and Mr Critchley asked that the Committee reaffirm their previous decision.

Wendy Newey, Peterborough and District Football League, and Tom Betts, Surfacing Standards, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- It was believed that the proposal would enhance sporting facilities for students and the local area.
- Mr Betts stated, on behalf of Scott Hudson, that it was essential that the facility remain open until 9:30pm to allow for full and proper access.
- Ms Newey advised that the facility would be run with the community, with a not

for profit Committee set up to support community involvement.

- The facility would be fully staffed with an office and classroom to deliver training.
- The Peterborough and District Football League was working closely with the Duke of Edinburgh programme to become an approved activity provider.
- Mr Betts commented that the Football League intended to be good neighbours, with good security, and visual and acoustic screening.
- Mr Newey confirmed that no visits had been made to the Ginton site, but it was understood to be of a similar nature.

The Planning Lawyer advised the Committee that the principle of development had been agreed at the Committee held on 13 October 2015. The matter currently before the Committee was solely in relation to the hours of operation.

The Committee discussed the application and suggested that comparisons made to facilities at Ginton and Northborough were misleading. The hours of operation agreed at the previous meeting arose from the high density of residences near the application site. As this situation had not altered, the Committee saw no reason to deviate from their previous decision.

In response to a question the Development Management Manager advised that within the proposal condition 7 required the applicant to demonstrate compliance following a reasonable compliant in relation to light intrusion.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation, but subject to the conditions as agreed at the Committee meeting held on 13 October 2015, minute reference 4.2. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions as agreed at the Committee meeting held on 13 October 2015, minute reference 4.2.

### **Reasons for the decision**

Subject to the imposition of the attached 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 proposal would give rise to a considerable benefit to the wider community through the provision of an enhanced playing facility and the opportunity for usage throughout the year, in accordance with paragraphs 70 and 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- the all-weather pitch and associated facilities would not result in an unacceptable impact upon 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 floodlighting would not result in any unacceptable light intrusion to neighbouring properties however it was acknowledged that some increased noise and disturbance would result to residents. It was considered that this harm was outweighed by the public benefit arising from the improved facilities on the site;
- the proposal provided adequate on-site parking to meet the needs of the development and would not result in any harm to the safety of the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- subject to appropriate mitigation the proposal would not result in any unacceptably harmful impact to ecology present within and surrounding the site,

in accordance with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);

- the proposal, subject to further details being provided, would ensure that surface water run-off was effectively managed and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- adequate archaeological evaluation has taken place to demonstrate that the proposal would not pose a risk to undiscovered buried heritage assets, in accordance with paragraph 128 of 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); and
- the proposal would not pose any unacceptable risk to established trees and shrubs surrounding the site, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

### **5.3 15/01202/FUL – Land to the East of Fountains Place, Eye, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the construction of 11 residential dwellings on land to the east of Fountains Place, Eye, Peterborough including associated garages and infrastructure.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Development Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

In response to a question the Development Manager clarified that the figure of 50 properties identified in the site allocations document for the site was indicative only. It was neither a maximum or a minimum figure.

The Committee suggested that the proposal was of a reasonable size and that the density levels of the development as a whole were acceptable. A Member of the Committee did express concern at an increase in size of 20%, which was thought to be significant.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The motion was carried nine voting in favour, one voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (nine voted in favour, one voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

Subject to the imposition of the attached 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:

- This was an allocated housing site within the Adopted Site Allocations DPD and lies within the village envelope of Eye which is designated as a Key Service Centre;
- The proposed access was at an appropriate standard to serve the development and parking provision would be provided in accordance with parking standards;
- The scale and design of the development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area;

- The development makes adequate provision for the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the properties;
- The development would not result in any adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing neighbouring dwellings.

Hence the proposal accorded with policies PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP14 and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012, policies CS02, CS8, CS10, CS13, CS14, CS16 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011, policies SA4 and SA5 of the Adopted Peterborough Site Allocations DPD 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **5.4 15/01235/FUL – 1650 Lincoln Road, Peterborough, PE6 7HH**

The planning application was for the provision of three new gas compressors and enclosures at 1650 Lincoln Road, Peterborough. The application also included a new vent stack, site office, administration and welfare buildings and associated infrastructure.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Development Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

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

- Councillor Holdich believed that the applicants should move further away from residences, rather than closer to them, as in this application.
- It was suggested that the development would be five decibels louder than at current, which would travel widely in the open countryside.
- It was questioned why the stack could not be located nearer the compressors to decrease the size of the site.
- Councillor Johnson advised that the Parish Council had no objection to the site expanding, however not as per the current proposals.
- The proposed design was considered to be abysmal for its rural location.
- The increase in noise would have an impact on the ability of local residents to sleep, particularly as many people slept with their windows open.
- Issue was taken with the prospect of removing the tree screening. It was believed that the proposal would offer a less than satisfactory outlook to those arriving to the city via Bourges Boulevard.
- Councillor Johnson queried why the removed screening could not be replaced by already matured trees.

Paul Emmett, Nigel Chalmers and Philip Smith, National Grid, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Peterborough was considered a key operational site and was due for an environmental upgrade.
- There was insufficient space on the current site and an extension to the east was most appropriate.
- Noise mitigation techniques would be employed, the most advanced of any National Grid site. As such, the noise emission of the proposed compressors would be lower than at current.
- The height of the Stack was a legal requirement and was required to be a certain distance away from the compressors. A sterile surrounding area was required for safety in the event of a fire.
- The removal of trees was required to maintain safety. New screening would be provided, however.

- A decision had been made to not include individual enclosures around the compressors, as such enclosures would be of a large scale due to safety restrictions. It was felt that the proposals were of a slender design, neutral colour and would allow light through.
- If cladded enclosures were to be erected around each of the proposed compressors, the scale of the development would multiply and would not be able to fit within the application site. Where three compressors were sited on the current proposal, approximately one would be able to fit with a cladded enclosure. National Grid would have to obtain additional land, possibly through compulsory purchase if it were to fully enclose the units.
- Mature trees could not be planted directly onto the landscaping mounds, as the trees would fail. A variety of other trees would be provided as screening. The exact height of the mounds would be determined under the landscaping condition, however was expected to be approximately 4 metres.
- The existing compressors worked at a level of 41 to 44 decibels. The new proposal would operate at 38 decibels.
- The new compressor would operate at a 2 decibels greater than background noise in the night time. Background noise was the quietest general level.
- The noise emitted would be similar to current in terms of tonality.
- The land to the east was considered optimum.

The Committee considered the application and highlighted that there was a definite need for an increase of utility services, as the city continued to expand. The matter of design was discussed and the Committee considered that the proposal was highly visible in the rural landscape, and was in stark contrast to its surroundings. It was suggested that the addition of an enclosure would improve the visual impact of the compressors. A Member of the Committee commented that there was nothing significantly wrong with design of the application.

The Planning Lawyer advised that the Committee was required to consider the application before it. It was not for the applicant to return with a proposal on land that was not available to them.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, contrary to officer recommendation, on the grounds that the visual appearance of the development was alien in the landscape, detrimental to the public realm and out of character with the surrounding area. The motion was carried seven voting in favour, three voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (seven voted in favour, three voted against) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

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

The proposed development, in particular the appearance of the three gas compressor units, constituted alien features within a predominantly rural landscape. As such the proposals harmed the visual appearance and character of the landscape setting and locality contrary to policies CS16 and CS20 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy and policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

#### **5.5 15/01388/FUL – 122A and 122B Padholme Road, Eastfield, Peterborough, PE1 5EN**

The planning application was for external wall insulation at 122A and 122B Padholme Road, Eastfield, Peterborough.

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 highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

The Committee considered the property to be in a prominent position on the street and that it possessed distinctive, original character which would be lost if the application were to be permitted. Further concern was raised that granting the application would set a precedent for similar proposals.

The Committee noted that, although the application had been referred by a Councillor, no Ward Councillors were in attendance to make representation to the Committee.

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

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

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

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given in the report.

### **5.6 15/01452/HHFUL – 15 Queens Walk, Fletton, Peterborough, PE2 9AN**

Councillor Serluca left the meeting at this point.

The planning application was for a first floor extensions to the rear of 15 Queens Walk, Fletton, Peterborough, with spiral staircase access. The application also sought to enlarge the window the east elevation with a juliet balcony.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. 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**

Subject to the imposition of the attached 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 proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the existing property or from the visual amenity of the surrounding area
- The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Hence the proposal accorded with policies PP2 and PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

### **5.7 Article 4 (1) Direction (Non-immediate) to Remove Permitted Development Rights of Specific Dwellings in the Ailsworth Village**

Councillor Serluca re-joined the meeting at this point.

The planning application was for an Article 4 (1) Directions (non-immediate) to remove permitted development rights for the installation of solar photovoltaic and thermal equipment at specific properties in the Ailsworth conservation area.

It was officer's recommendation that the Article 4 (1) Direction be made and served, and that authority be delegated to the Corporate Director for Growth and Regeneration to confirm the Directions as appropriate following public consultation. The Principal Built Environment Officer provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

The Committee thanked the officer for his report. It was believed that the addition of solar panels to the properties within the proposal, while not entirely restricted, should be subjected to additional consideration. The Committee noted that specific types of solar panels would likely be supported on a number of the properties mentioned.

The Principal Built Environment Officer advised such Directions were to be expected for a number of other areas in the future.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree to make and serve a non-immediate Article 4(1) Direction to remove permitted development rights for the installation of solar photovoltaic and thermal equipment in the Ailsworth Conservation Area and to give delegated authority to the Director for Growth and Regeneration to confirm the Directions as appropriate following public consultation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that:

- 1) The making and serving of non-immediate Directions under Article 4 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 to withdraw the 'permitted development' right of development within Part 14 Class A of the Order for the installation of solar photovoltaic and thermal equipment be approved to preserve the character and appearance of the Ailsworth conservation area; and
- 2) Authority be delegated to the Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration to confirm those Directions as appropriate following public consultation.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The properties listed in the proposal for Article 4 Directions were considered to have the potential to result in significant impact on the Ailsworth Conservation Area by way of unrestricted installation of photovoltaic (solar/thermal) panels, by virtue of their location, prominence and visibility in longer views within the locality. It was considered that making the installation of such equipment at certain prominent properties the subject of planning control through the use of Article 4 Directions was in the interests of the proper planning of the area.

## **6. Peterborough Statement of Community Involvement**

The Committee received a report which sought the Committee's views on the revised Statement of Community Involvement, which was to be presented to Cabinet on 14 December 2015 for approval. The Committee's views and comments would be taken into account and reported to Cabinet.

The Principal Strategic Planning Officer provided an overview of the report and raised the following points:

- The Statement of Community Involvement set out how the Council would

consult with the public on planning applications, local plans, neighbourhood plans, and others.

- The Statement was a statutory requirement and set out the minimum consultation necessary.
- The current Statement was adopted three years ago and required updating due to changes in legislation.

The Committee discussed the requirements for public consultation and the Principal Strategic Planning Officer advised this was currently a minimum of 21 days, and was not proposed for change. There was no maximum consultation level, as such, for larger applications additional consultation could be undertaken if it was considered to be appropriate.

The Committee further discussed the matter of referring applications to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee. It was advised, however, that this was a matter for the Constitution and not the Statement of Community Involvement.

It was noted that any further comments could be fed into the Cabinet report through the Principal Strategic Planning Officer or the Cabinet Member.

**RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted the report.

**7. Peterborough Preliminary Draft Local Plan**

The Committee received a report which sought the Committee's comments on the Preliminary Draft Local Plan before it was submitted to Cabinet on 14 December 2015 for approval for the purpose of public consultation in January 2016.

The Principal Strategic Planning Officer provided an overview of the report and raised the following points:

- The document would combine and replace the previous Core Strategy, Site Allocations, Planning Policies and City Centre DPD's.
- There had previously been discussion regarding the lack of available employment land.
- The report reflected the preliminary draft Local Plan, with public consultation due to take place between January and February 2016.

The Committee queried how the final decision on site allocations was reached. The Principal Strategic Planning Officer advised that the process consisted of several stages. Officers would rule out any obviously inappropriate sites, following submissions. Discussion would then be had with other relevant departments to form a recommendation to Committee.

The Principal Strategic Planning Officer explained that, as Peterborough had not met its previously high targets in terms of housing supply, an additional 20% buffer had been applied to the five year housing supply target. This meant that, under the National Planning Policy Framework, an application made outside the site allocations boundary could not be used as an automatic reason for refusal.

**RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted the report.

Chairman

1.30pm – 5:12pm