



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 29 NOVEMBER 2016**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Bull, Casey, Hiller, Stokes, Martin, Clark, and Ash

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Development Management Manager  
Matt Thomson, Senior Development Management Officer  
Amanda Nauth, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highways)  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Jane Webb, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bond and Sylvester.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Hiller, in relation to agenda item 5.1 'St Theresa's House, Manor House Street, Peterborough, PE1 2TL' wished it to be noted that comments had been made by the local MP that the Committee was predetermined on this application. This was considered to be unfounded, and it was further noted that no formal complaint as such had been lodged.

No declarations of interest were received.

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

No Members' declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillors were received.

**4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 27 September 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2016 were approved as a correct record.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**5.1 16/01496/FUL – St Theresa's House, Manor House Street, Peterborough, PE1 2TL**

The Committee was presented with an application for the conversion of St Theresa's House, Manor House Street, into 12 bedsitting rooms.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Carole Aldous and Margaret Randall, local residents, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- It was considered that this application would double the number of cars using the access road.
- This was a new application. It was felt, therefore, that the past use of the site was not relevant.
- Objection was made on planning rules grounds.
- The site had a long established history of parking issues and parking services had been approach in relation to the problem.
- The parking crisis would be exacerbated by the introduction of a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO).
- The close vicinity of the site to the city centre and high demand forced people, it was claimed, to park elsewhere.
- Residents frequently complained to the Council about the parking situation.
- An increase in the intensification of use of the site as living space would bring the parking problem to crisis level.

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

- A perceived sticking point of the application had been how the potential parking problems could be overcome.
- The applicant wished to alleviate the concerns of local residents in this regard.
- It was considered that the introduction of HMO's to an area were not generally welcomed.
- The building was of local importance, and this was acknowledged by the applicant as a key factor in the proposals.
- Adequate parking and waste storage would be provided.
- The applicant wished to improve the area with a development that was considered necessary, not cause detriment.
- The historic façade of the building would be cleaned and conserved as best as possible.
- It was considered by the agent that although the bedrooms would each have access to their own bathroom, they would share a kitchen and were, as such, HMO's.

In response to questions from the Committee the Development Management Manager clarified that as the proposals comprised separate bathrooms, that they were considered bedsits rather than an HMO. Whether the proposals were an HMO or not was not a material planning consideration.

The Council's parking standards required one space per bedroom, with visitor parking required at a discretionary level. The two visitor spaces provided within the application had been judged by officers as acceptable.

The Development Management Manager advised the Committee that confirmation had been received from Parking Services that no permits would be provided to new residents or visitors. The width of the access was considered to be sub-standard, however was within the existing development.

The Principal Engineer (Highways) advised that, with the provision of controlled access arrangements the Highways Authority did not object to the application. It was further explained that such arrangements would comprise an access barrier at one end to ensure that two cars would not enter the access road at the same time. Sufficient space had been identified to allow for one car to wait off the highway ahead of the access gate. The provision of such arrangements were not included within the recommendation, however, could be added should the Committee wish.

In response to a question the Principal Engineer (Highways) confirmed that no traffic incidents had been recorded on the site.

The Committee were further advised that, although the application was substantially the same that had been previously considered and refused, the current application benefited from a greater level of parking availability, due to the change of use of a neighbouring property. As such, the Council's parking standards had been met.

The Committee discussed the application and acknowledged the depth of feeling among local residents. Members were reassured that the locally listed characteristics of the building would remain. The poor standing of the current access point was noted, however as this was part of the existing scheme, no alteration to this could be required. The parking provisions were acceptable as adhering to the Council's parking policy. It was requested that officers monitor the situation with the access.

The Committee considered that the site was currently available for use as a funeral parlour and could hold up to 35 people and staff.

It was suggested that a condition be included within any permission granted that an access barrier system be installed to help regulate access.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation with an additional condition securing an access barrier system for entry and egress. The motion was carried seven voting in favour, and two voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (seven voted in favour and two voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to:

- 1) The conditions set out in the Committee Report; and
- 2) An additional condition to secure the implementation of an access barrier system to regulate entry and egress from the rear car park.

**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 proposed development would go towards providing additional residential development within the City Centre by 2026, therefore the proposal accords with Policies CS1 and CS2 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- The proposed change of use and external alterations would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the locally listed building or street scene, and would preserve the setting of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposed change of use would not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and would ensure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, and therefore accords with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would not result in a highway safety hazard and sufficient car parking can be provided thereby according with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

## **5.2 Urgent Report – 15/01840/OUT – Land to the West of Uffington Road, Barnack, Stamford**

The Committee was presented with an application to withdraw the archaeology reason for refusal on an outline application for up to 80 residential dwellings and associated works on land to the west of Uffington Road, Barnack, Stamford.

This report was presented to the Committee as an urgent item, with the permission of the Chairman, as an expedient decision would ensure that cost would be less likely to be awarded against the Council as result of an appeal.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

In response to questions from the Committee the Development Management Manager clarified that an archaeological desk based assessment had been submitted and it had been concluded that any remains on the site would likely be of local or regional significance only. If the reason for refusal was maintained, it could be considered as unreasonable.

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

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that:

- 1) Reason for refusal R6 of application 15/01840/OUT be withdrawn and instead the archaeological investigation and mitigation be dealt with by way of a suitably worded planning condition; and
- 2) In the event that the applicants were not agreeable to addressing archaeology by way of condition authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to liaise with Counsel and take the most appropriate course of action in dealing with archaeology.

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

It was considered that the archaeological site investigation and any associated mitigation be dealt with by way of a suitably worded planning condition, and as such officers would not defend the archaeological reason for refusal R6 in their case at the Public Inquiry.

## **6. Planning Compliance Quarterly Report on Activity and Performance July to September 2016**

The Development Management Manager and the Compliance Team Leader presented a report to the Committee, which outlined the Planning Service's planning compliance performance and activity, and identified if there were any lessons to be learnt from the actions taken.

The Committee discussed the report and raised several key points:

- The Planning Contravention Notices at 66 St Mary's Avenue, Wittering and 52 Eastfield Road related to requests for information. These would allow the Council to identify the owners or occupiers of the property. They were not necessarily enforcement notices requiring action.
- On average, 30-40% of complaints received by the team were well founded.
- The Committee congratulated the team on their continued high performance.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee noted past performance and outcomes.

**Reasons for the decision:**

To help inform future decisions of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee and potentially reduce costs.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 2:52pm