



**RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON TUESDAY, 11 JUNE 2019**

**5.1 19/00168/FUL - THE FENMAN WHITTLESEY ROAD STANGROUND
PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **DEFER** the item for further information in relation to the pollution impact which was **DEFEATED** (4 For, 5 Against). A second motion was proposed and seconded to go against officers recommendation and **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (5 For, 4 Against and 1 Abstention) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

- The nursery was located near to a petrol filling station and to a road junction which was very busy during peak periods with slow and standing traffic and consequently it was considered that the children attending the facility were likely to be subject to a lower air quality (than would be experienced away from such sources) to the detriment of their health and wellbeing. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to Policy LP17: Amenity Provision in the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (version pending adoption at Council in July 2019) and the objective of para 91 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The nursery would result in additional vehicular traffic to and from the site and would pass through the junction of Whittlesey Road and Coneygree Road. This junction carried already high volumes of traffic (especially at peak period) and was complicated in terms of traffic movements by virtue of the entrance/exit points related to the petrol filling station. It was considered that the additional movements would add to the congestion and vehicle safety at the junction. The proposal was therefore contrary to policy LP13: Transport in the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (version pending adoption at Council in July 2019) and Policy PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.
- The nursery would result in a significant number of movements of vehicles and people in the car park which had been immediately adjacent to residential development. The resultant noise and disturbance to the residence would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupants and therefore would be contrary to Policy LP17: Amenity Provision in the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (version pending adoption at Council in July 2019) and Policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

5.2 18/01307/FUL - CLUB HOUSE BRETTON PARK FLAXLAND BRETTON

The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

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 weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposed spectator stand and associated parking area would result in the loss of an area of tennis courts, however it would go towards improving an existing and established rugby club facility, therefore the proposed development would accord with Policies CS19 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP14 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012), LP23 of the emerging Peterborough Plan (2019) and Paragraph 97 of the NPPF (2019);
- The proposed spectator stand and associated parking area would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the area, or unknown buried archaeology, and would accord with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposed spectator stand and associated parking area would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity and would accord with Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- There were no Highway safety concerns and parking could be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).
- The proposed development would not result in a net loss to the biodiversity value of the site, or have an unacceptable adverse impact on the adjoining County Wildlife Site, a satisfactory surface water drainage scheme for the site would be achieved and satisfactory safeguarding measures would be put in place to deal with uncovering unsuspected contaminated land, as such the proposal would accord with Policies CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP4 and PP20 of the Peterborough Policies DPD, Policies LP33 and 34 of the emerging Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 179 of the NPPF (2019).

5.3 18/02001/FUL - 3 GREEN LANE MILLFIELD PETERBOROUGH

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded go against officers recommendation and 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 Committee were satisfied that the queries raised at the meeting held on 2 April 2019 had been addressed through clarification provided by the agent, particularly in relation to the boundary lines and provision for parking.
- Parking within the area would be self-policed due to restrictions already in place.
- There would be less licenced premises operating in the area;
- The additional conditions were acceptable and included a review of opening hours, no external operation of power tools, only one car would be Ministry of Transport (MOT) tested at any one time, parking and turning areas would be kept available for said purposes at all time.

5.4 18/01875/FUL - 35A PETERBOROUGH ROAD CASTOR PETERBOROUGH PE5 7AX

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officers recommendation and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (10 For, 1

Against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Subject to the delegated conditions to officers the Committee felt that:

- The building was in need of improvements as it was in a poor condition.
- The Parish Council had no issues with the application.
- The building materials proposed seemed to be acceptable.
- There was a Neighbourhood Plan, which the applicant would need to adhere to.
- Although access to the road was not ideal, there were other properties that had used the same access, which the planning inspector had deemed acceptable at a recent appeal.
- The scheme was considered to be acceptable and there were other examples of two storey extensions in the area for which planning permission has been granted.

5.5 19/00408/HHFUL - 26 LEDBURY ROAD NETHERTON PETERBOROUGH PE3 9RH

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 For, 2 Against) to **REFUSE** as per the officers recommendation.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

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

- The proposed rear extension and residential annexe building would fail to respect the size, scale, and proportions of the host dwelling and plot, to the resulting detriment of the visual character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (2011), policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP16 of the Proposed (submission) Local Plan (2018).
- The proposed two storey rear extension would, by way of its depth, height, scale and close relationship to 24 Ledbury Road significantly restrict the outlook from the rear facing first floor bedroom window whilst having a detrimental adverse overbearing impact on the rear of that dwelling. Also, the relationship that the proposal would have with 28 Ledbury Road to the West would be harmful on the amenity through the significant loss of natural light afforded by the closest first floor bedroom window. Impact on both adjoining properties was further compounded with the significant length and height of the single storey element of the extension along the shared boundaries. The proposed developments were therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy, policies PP02 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Proposed (submission) Local Plan (2018).
- The proposed detached outbuilding at the bottom of the rear garden to provide annexe accommodation for the main house No.26 Ledbury Road would by virtue of its location, design, size and scale, be capable of providing self-contained residential accommodation and was therefore tantamount to creation of a separate independent dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal was considered to be contrary to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy

PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policies LP16 and LP34 of the Proposed (submission) Local Plan (2018).