



**RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 24 APRIL 2018**

**5.1 17/02443/REM - TRANCHE TC23, EAGLE WAY, HAMPTON CENTRE,
PETERBOROUGH**

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON 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 site lay within the Hampton Development area where outline planning permission had been granted for the township development and a Development Brief had been approved.
- This was a revised scheme to that previously approved. The principle of development was therefore acceptable.
- The proposal would provide a modern, attractive landmark development which would respect the surrounding character.
- The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and measures would be agreed with the developer to minimise any noise implications resulting from the construction.
- The proposal would provide a satisfactory level of accommodation for the further occupiers of the development.
- The proposal would provide appropriate parking provision for residents and staff and it was not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the adjacent highway.
- The development would be assessable.
- The proposal would not impact on the biodiversity of the lake and the landscaping would enhance the visual amenity of the area.
- The proposal would not result in flood risk outside of the site or for the future occupants of the development.

Hence the proposal accords with policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP16 and PP19 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS1 CS2, CS14, CS16, CS21 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, policy SA1 of the Adopted Peterborough Site Allocations DPD and sections 6, 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**5.2 17/01448/OUT - LAND TO THE WEST OF 85, WEST STREET, HELPSTON,
PETERBOROUGH**

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application as per Officers recommendation. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **REFUSE** the planning permission as per the Officers recommendations.

REASON 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 below:

- The application site was located outside the identified settlement boundary of the Limited Growth Village of Helpston, and was therefore within the open countryside. The proposal sought up to 45 number open market dwellings with only the policy requirement level of affordable housing provision as set out in Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011). The proposal would therefore fail to meet with the exception provisions contained within Policy CS1 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), which strictly controlled development within the open countryside, and was unacceptable in principle.
- The proposal would represent a form of development which was considerably denser than the established built form of the surrounding area and wider village. Furthermore, the submission failed to adequately consider the space required for the necessary public open space and drainage infrastructure, as well as considering the required ecology, tree and open countryside buffers which were essential. Accordingly, the proposal would result in a form of development which appeared wholly at odds, incongruous and unduly dominant to its surroundings and which caused unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and setting of the locality, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).
- The proposal failed to demonstrate that surface water run-off arising from the development could be adequately managed so as to not pose an unacceptable risk of flooding either on the site or elsewhere. Furthermore, the proposal failed to take account of historic incidents of flooding within the immediate locality and demonstrate that the proposal would not worsen such flood risks. On this basis, the proposal was contrary to Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Peterborough Flood Water Management SPD (2012).
- The application proposal failed to make provision for additional infrastructure and community facilities in terms of securing affordable housing, off-site highway works and public open space, which were necessary as a direct consequence of development. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (2010) and emerging Policy LP14 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

5.3 17/02464/FUL - LAND AT, GUILSBOROUGH ROAD, EYE GREEN, PETERBOROUGH

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 For, 1 Against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON 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 principle of residential development on the application site had already been established through the existing and emerging allocations within the Local Plan, and the granting of outline planning permission under application reference 14/00857/R4OUT, in accordance with Policy SA5.4 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP39.3 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-136 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the layout, density and design of the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-136 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the biodiversity interests in and near to the site could be adequately conserved, mitigation or compensated for, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and emerging Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- the proposal would provide adequate parking provision, safe access/connectivity and would not result in undue harm to the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight;
- the proposed layout would not give rise to unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants and would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- adequate management of surface and foul water would be secured to ensure no increased flood risk either on the site or elsewhere, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded limited weight at this time;
- the proposal would ensure that no undue harm resulted to potential undiscovered buried heritage assets, in accordance with Policy CS17 of

the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and emerging Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded limited weight at this time;

- financial and other contributions towards the infrastructure demands arising from the proposed development were to be secured, in accordance with Policy CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP14 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time; and
- any contaminants present within the site could be adequately remediated to ensure that no undue risk was posed to human health or controlled waters, in accordance with Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-136 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

5.4 17/01707/WCMM - PODE HOLE QUARRY, THE CAUSEWAY, THORNEY, PETERBOROUGH

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

- The NPPF states that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. The principle of development has already been established and the proposed amendments are in accordance with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS24, CS25, CS33 and CS35.
- The update to the Environmental Statement accompanying the application was considered to be comprehensive and meets the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Regulations 2017. Detailed topic areas have been assessed / considered and the proposal would not advance mineral operations closer to any residential properties or other sensitive receptors than currently approved. There would be no additional land take, and thus no additional disturbance to habitats, vegetation or archaeological features.
- Comments of consultees have been taken into account, and there were no additional issues to be considered than for the original application. Suitable, and where appropriate updated conditions would be attached addressing all the issues previously raised and which were still relevant. The amenity of neighbours had been taken into account (although no objections had been received), and given that the site falls within a designated Minerals Consultation Area and in all other respects the proposal was acceptable, there was no reason not to approve the application in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.
- Consideration had been given to the interaction of the proposals with

those set out in application 16/02447/MMFUL for an extension to the west of the existing site, and it was considered that appropriate control could be exercised over both applications for them to be considered for approval.

5.5 16/02447/MMFUL - PODE HOLE QUARRY, THE CAUSEWAY, THORNEY, PETERBOROUGH

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

- The NPPF states that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. The application has been considered in light of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan, the NPPF and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance.
- The principle of development was in accordance with policy SSP M2 of the SSP which allocated the site for sand and gravel extraction. The proposal also includes the restoration of the site through the importation of inert waste. The site was not allocated for inert fill but the proposal complies with policies CS18 and CS25 of the Core Strategy with regards to managing waste outside allocated areas due to the requirements to restore high grade agricultural land, and, as the applicant had also highlighted the limited availability of inert fill capacity coming forward at the strategic Block Fen / Langwood Fen allocated site (policy CS20), it was accepted that there may be a requirement to divert inert fill in the plan area to other available sites. The retention of the stocking and processing area, and the concrete batching plant represent a sustainable method of maximising the use of the existing site and the facilities were considered to be co-located complimentary to the quarrying and landfill activities and accord with policies CS18 and CS41 of the Core Strategy.
- An Environmental Statement, including the additional information requested and provided, accompanies the application which was considered comprehensive and meets the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017.
- Detailed topic areas had been assessed and considered;- With regard to landscape and visual impact, the proposal was in compliance with policies CS24, CS33 and CS34. Nature conservation, ecology, geodiversity, including the impacts on protected species and habitats, had been carefully considered and were in accordance with policies CS25, CS34 and CS35. Issues of noise and dust had been considered and were in accordance with policy CS34. Soils and agriculture, including the retention and re-use of high grade agricultural soils, and the balance of the proposed restoration between agricultural and ecological aims, had been carefully considered and were in compliance with policies CS25 and CS38. Cultural heritage, including archaeology, the historic environment and notably the adjacent Bar Pasture Scheduled Monument, had been assessed and were in accordance with policy CS36. The impact on water

resources and the water environment had been assessed and the proposal was in compliance with policy CS39. Transport, including the proposed Willow Hall Lane crossing point, had been carefully considered and was in compliance with policy CS32.

- Cumulative impacts with the neighbouring quarries at Pasture House Farm, Willow Hall Farm and Pode Hole had also been taken into account.
- Comments of consultees had been taken into account and suitable conditions attached to address any issues raised. The comments of the neighbours and other respondents, both for and against the proposals, had also been taken into account, and the positive and negative aspects of the proposal weighed in the balance. Further, given that the majority of the site was allocated for sand and gravel extraction and in all other respects the proposal was acceptable, there was no reason not to approve the application in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.
- Consideration had been given to the interaction of the proposals with those set out in application 17/01707/WCMM for amendments to the sequence of phasing and restoration of the existing site, and it was considered that appropriate control could be exercised over both applications for them to be considered for approval.