

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 12 APRIL 2016**

Members Present: Councillors Serluca (Chairman), Hiller, Martin, North, Okonkowski, Sylvester, Ash, Casey and Rush

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Head of Development and Construction
Jim Daley, Principal Built Environment Officer (Archaeology and Building Conservation)
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highways)
Hannah Edwards, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Amanda Nauth, Planning and Highways Lawyer (observing)
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harper, Stokes, Harrington, and Lane. Councillors Casey, North, and Ash were in attendance as substitutes.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Serluca, in relation to agenda item 5.1 'Land to the Rear of Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood, Peterborough', declared that she was acquainted with the applicant. She was not, however, predetermined.

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 8 March 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2016 were approved as a correct record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 15/01912/FUL – Land to the Rear of Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood, Peterborough

The planning application was for the erection of a two storey, 50 bed care home on land to the rear of Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood, to include landscaped gardens, parking and an electricity substation.

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 highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

Paul Ingle, agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicants supported the officers report and recommendations included within;
- When the initial vole survey had been undertaken, no water was present in the ditch. It was believed that now was a more appropriate time to take a vole survey,

- which would be carried out shortly should permission be granted;
- Triple glazing and acoustic vents would be utilised in the rooms closest to the roads; and
- Deference had been paid to the arboricultural advice received, and a natural bund was to be left around the trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that no objections had been raised from local residents or Ward Councillors. The land had been unused for 20 years, and the Committee considered that the proposal would provide benefit in the form of employment and a much needed facility.

In response to questions, the Principal Engineer (Highways) advised that concerns raised regarding vehicle overrun were in relation to private roads and private waste collection, therefore were a private matter for the applicant. Head of Development and Construction advised that if third parties were to park on the site without permission, the applicants could take action against them.

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

- The applicant had demonstrated that despite various planning approvals and extensive marketing of the development the land has remained vacant, development was therefore considered acceptable in accordance with Section 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework which stipulates that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of employment use where there was no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.
- The loss of employment land was not considered detrimental to the likely long term supply of available employment land. Employment land was currently under review and new sites would be put forward as part of the development plan making process.
- The design and layout of the building was considered acceptable and would not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area or neighbour amenity.
- The car parking provision was considered acceptable and a detailed travel plan and cycle parking would be secured by condition. The development would not therefore result in any adverse impact on highway safety.
- An updated Tree Report would be provided by condition. It was therefore considered that suitable tree protection measures and working practices will be followed throughout the construction phase hence the development will not result in an unacceptable impact on the landscape features of the site.
- Suitable ecological enhancements and protection measures would be secured by condition hence the development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the biodiversity of the site.

The development was therefore in accordance with Sections 1 (paragraph 22), Section 7, Section 10 and Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14, CS16, CS21, CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and Policies PP01, PP02, PP03, PP04, PP12, PP13, PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

5.2 Review of Article 4 Directions in Peterborough

Councillor Okonkowski left the meeting at this point.

The report outlined the review of the use of Article 4 Directions in Peterborough and explained what management was required. It was officer's recommendation that the review of Article 4 Directions in Peterborough be noted and that the deletion of the Article 4 Direction covering nos. 513-521 (odd) Lincoln Road be approved. The Principal Built Environment Officer provided an overview of the report and highlighted a number of key issues.

In response to questions from the Committee, Principal Built Environment Officer advised that some authorities had blanket Article 4 Directions. Peterborough City Council, however, focused mainly on specific dwellings within conservation areas. This allowed for local Parish Councils to assist in monitoring.

A motion was proposed and seconded to note the review of Article 4 Directions in Peterborough, and to approve the deletion of the Article 4 Direction covering nos. 513-521 (odd) Lincoln Road. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED (unanimous):

- 1) To note the review of Article 4 Directions in Peterborough; and
- 2) To approve the deletion of the Article 4 Direction covering nos. 513-521 (odd) Lincoln Road.

Reasons for the decision

The use of Article 4 Directions had been a successful heritage strategy. Peterborough had many Article 4 Direction Orders across urban and rural properties, predominantly in and for the benefit of conservation areas. The purpose of an Article 4 Direction was not to protect all old buildings in an area irrespective of their character or quality but to protect properties with unaltered characteristic elevations from unsympathetic change and retain an attractive street scene and preserve the character and appearance of our conservation areas. Most properties continue to retain the character and appearance for which they were considered worthy of protection.

Article 4 Directions was currently the most effective measure available to help the City Council fulfil its duty of care role in conservation areas. It had been demonstrated that they could have a positive effect when applied carefully and properly managed. Their use was promoted by English Heritage and in Government guidance.

Chairman
1.30pm – 2:07pm