

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 2020  
VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE**

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chairman), Casey (Vice Chairman), Rush, Brown, Hiller, Hussain, Amjad Iqbal, Jamil, Hogg and Bond.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead  
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer  
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor  
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer

**15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jones and Warren. Councillor Jamil was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Jones.

**16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

**17. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS WARD COUNCILLOR**

There were no declarations to speak as Ward Councillor.

**18. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MEETING HELD ON 30 JUNE 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2020 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**19. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**19.1 20/00480/FUL - 21 THE VILLIAGE ORTON LONGUEVILLE PETERBOROUGH PE2 7DP**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to erect a detached dwelling and detached garage to be located within the side garden of the existing dwelling at 21 The Village.

The proposed dwelling measured approximately 15.2 metres in width by 10.1 metres in depth. A dual-pitched roof was proposed. The proposed ridge measured approximately seven point eight metres in height from ground level. The proposed eaves measured

three point seven metres in height from ground level. The proposed ridge lines to the rear projection measured seven metres in height from ground level.

The proposed eaves to the rear projection would measure four point seven metres in height from ground level. The proposed detached garage would measure approximately six point five metres in width by six point five metres in depth.

A dual-pitched roof was proposed. The proposed ridge line would measure four point five metres in height from ground level. The proposed eaves measured two point five metres in height from ground level.

Amendments had been sought from the original plans submitted following Officer's concerns that the proposal would have caused unacceptable harm to the amenity of adjacent neighbours at 21a The Village, to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Orton Longueville Conservation Area.

These revised plans had been consulted upon with adjacent neighbours and statutory consultees.

All other matters were reserved for future approval; however, no reserved matters applications had been submitted since the determination of 17/01104/OUT. This permission expired on 1 September 2020.

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report. Highway concerns raised by the parish council were addressed and condition 13 had been removed. The applicant also requested that condition eight in relation to boundary treatment be removed, but there was insufficient detail provided in relation to the placement of fencing and hedges to do so. There was a further late representation received from 21a The Village, in relation to construction traffic, however the issues raised had been covered by a condition within the report. The officer's recommendation was to Grant the application.

Mr Richard Smith, the applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The height of the garage should be 4.5 metres on the latest drawing and clarification was sought from the planning officer.
- Although the proposal had been submitted three times the final revised version was acceptable to the conservation officer.
- There were no highways issue preventing the proposal.
- There had been only been one objector to the proposal and that was at 21a The Village. This objection had been made from the start of the outline planning application process.
- Matrix had submitted three objections and only one was in relation to the revised application in relation to the location of the proposed garage and the view from a Dormer window. The conservation and case officers supported the location of the garage.
- Matrix Planning had also suggested a condition be imposed in relation to the driveway access for 21 in that the first part of access for 21a should be restricted, however there would be no change to the current access arrangements and would impact in the privacy of 21a, as it does not do currently.
- Matrix Planning had suggested removal of permitted development rights on the west elevation of the proposal for number 21. There was no side access for the property at 21a on the east and therefore any future permission for a window on the proposal would not impose any privacy loss for 21a as suggested.

- The conservation considered that the current proposal would preserve the Orton Longueville conservation area and was in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act, the Peterborough Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The applicant wished for conditions eight, hard and soft landscaping and condition 13 be removed. The officer had confirmed that condition 13 had been considered.
- The Chairman confirmed that all points raised had been dealt with by officers.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members were advised that condition eight needed to be retained within the planning permission, as the boundary treatment of the proposed site was too close to the conservation area and therefore, any change would need to be submitted separately.
- The conservation officer and case officer had no further issues with the proposal following the applicant's amendments. The Highways officer was also in agreement subject to conditions.
- A negative comment had been made by the conservation officer in relation to the Dormer window, however the planning officer felt that the other changes made to the proposed appearance of the dwelling had deemed the application satisfactory.
- Members commented that it was important to remember that the proposal was a reserve matters application and that the outline had already been approved. The initial objections had been overcome and the proposal was sound for officers subject to the treatment of garage door and Dormer window recommended by the conservation officer's recommendation, these should be looked at by the applicant closely.
- The neighbour's amenity loss was no longer an issue. In addition, the highways treatment was acceptable along with the hedge height requirements.
- The Ward Member had been approached by those objecting and supporting the application and felt that it was appropriate for the application to go through the Committee process. On that basis the Ward Member advised that he was happy to support the application.
- Some Members felt that the Dormer window was not a major issue.
- The building proposed appeared not to overlook the house at 21a The Village.
- Members were advised that they were being asked to approve the application in its entirety and either approve or refuse the application. If Members felt that there were issues with the Dormer window, the applicant could submit a non-material amendment to reduce the size and use the lead lining as recommended by the conservation officer, however this was not something that the Committee could condition.
- Members recommended to the applicant that they should explore the size of the Dormer window further and be mindful of the issues raised before its installation.

#### **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 and the removal of condition 13.

#### **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 development was acceptable.
- The character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Orton Longueville Conservation Area would not be adversely harmed by the proposed development, in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Acceptable parking and highway safety measures would be secured, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not cause adverse harm to the amenity of surrounding neighbours, in accordance with Policy LP17 (Part A) of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The impacts of the proposed development to surrounding neighbours would not cause unacceptable harm to their amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 (Part B) of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not adversely impact upon any protected trees, in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not adversely impact upon the drainage of the site, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local plan (2019).
- The proposed scheme would not disturb any significant buried heritage assets, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

#### **19.2 20/00729/FUL - CEDAR HOUSE SOMMER CLOSE THORNEY PETERBOROUGH**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to materially change the use of an area of agricultural land to a building contractor's yard and the change of use of some of the land to be used as an extended garden in connection with Cedar House.

The building contractor's yard would have an overall footprint of approximately 35 metres by 110 metres, and the garden extension would be triangular in shape, with a maximum depth of 11.5 metres by 110 metres in length.

Additionally, the application sought the erection of one point two metre high post and rail fencing, with hedging and trees, to demark the area of land proposed for the building contractor yard and garden extension, a substantial area of hardstanding, new vehicle access and the construction of a steel framed building, faced partially in steel profiled cladding and facing brickwork.

The previous, identical planning application (reference 20/00429/FUL) was withdrawn by the applicant before determination under delegated powers.

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report, which included a representation from a Ward Councillor, who was in support of the application. The officer's recommendation was for refusal.

Mr Nathan Proctor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicant had located to the village of Thorney approximately five years ago after purchasing what was known as Cedar House.
- The property was an old dilapidated house on the old A47.
- After purchasing, the applicant gained planning permission to demolish the old house and build a new one for his family home.

- The current company location had become difficult to travel to and the applicant wanted it located closer to where he lived.
- The company had employed local people and traded with local suppliers.
- The applicant and his sister were the directors and owners of Woodgate Developments Ltd.
- Woodgate Developments provided new housing in local authority areas, such as Peterborough City Council, South Holland, Fenland, West Norfolk.
- The business operated from two locations currently with a small office connected to the directors' parents' home.
- The new proposed facilities were needed to take the business further, as the existing facilities were not adequate.
- The applicant felt that the business being located close to home would be a massive advantage in the day to day operation of the company. If granted, the proposal would allow the company to employ additional staff.
- The proposed building would be at one end of the site and there would be limited screening. The access would be off Sommer Close, which was a good access.
- The plan was to keep the new proposed building in keeping with the existing Cedar House where possible.
- A good landscaping scheme was in place for the proposed scheme.
- The new facility would be accessed from the old A47, which had been more than adequate.
- The applicant had received support from the Ward Councillor and only neighbour at Sommer Barns.
- The reason the triangle area of land was proposed to be used to extend the garden had happened due to a boundary discrepancy with the farmland. The applicant was willing to remove this part of the proposal from the garden extension and would screen off the area.
- The field was currently used for agricultural use and owned by local farmers.
- The existing site was 15 miles away from the proposed site and other parts of the business were also in other locations.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members were advised that the land could only be used for agricultural use.
- Members were concerned about the application and as the land was open countryside. The field was currently farmed, and this should be protected.
- Members also raised concerns that if approved, the proposal could set a precedence for similar applications.
- Some Members felt that Peterborough would never have developed to its current status if permission had not been granted on similar parcels of land.
- Members felt sympathy for the applicant and could understand why he wanted to extend his own property to expand the business and protect his construction machinery, however the unit would not be for agricultural use.
- Members commented that a farmer could apply for planning permission for the use of agricultural machinery and then sub-let the building for the storage of construction machinery.
- Some Members were concerned about the portion of land proposed to extend the applicant's garden and if this was taken out of the proposal it may look more favourable.
- Members commented that building on agricultural land would always be a contentious issue, and therefore the Committee would be overlooking fundamental planning policy if the application was approved.
- The proposal size was only one percent of the surrounding agricultural field.

- Members also commented that it may be more sustainable if the proposal was for agricultural equipment and therefore the proposal should be refused.
- Members commented that the Committee was charged with protecting the environment and planning policy and to go against that would be unacceptable.
- There was not a strong enough case to go against the planning officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with the officers recommendation to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (9 for and 1 against) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

**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. It was considered that the harm arising from the development, in that the principle was wholly contrary to the policies and objectives of the adopted Local Plan, was not outweighed by the benefits of the development which would be primarily restricted to that of private commercial benefit for the Applicant.

**19.3 20/00782/HHFUL - 1 RECTORY LANE GLINTON PETERBOROUGH PE6 7LR**

The Committee received a report, which sought the benefit of planning permission for the erection of a single storey detached double garage with attached covered walkway, first floor extension and single storey rear extension with conversion of existing garage.

Amendments were made to the originally submitted plans in line with the recommendations made by the Council's Principal Conservation Officer. The Conservation Officer was of the view that the original linear design elongated the application dwelling which was already a linear building as existing. This was especially important due to the close proximity of the host dwelling to the highway and that it was the first dwelling on the east side of Rectory Lane, thus forming a prominent feature in views. Not least it was within the setting of listed buildings opposite and to the north-east, the Bluebell.

Given the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to the scale and dominant elongation of the property within the street scene, revised plans were submitted, which effectively detached the garage from the house by a short distance and set it back from the building line, creating some visual separation. It also lowered the roof pitch and introduced a more subservient material for its elevations, above a brick plinth which would match the host dwelling.

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report, which included a written representation submitted by a Parish Councillor. The Officer's recommendation was to grant the application.

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

- The Parish Council had not objected to the planning application and supported the Planning Officer's recommendation for approval. However, the only objection

from the Parish Council was to the installation of timber cladding as a finished material.

- There were no other timber clad properties in the vicinity, which also included the Bluebell Public House.
- The proposal was in contradiction to Council's own planning policy set out in the design in selected villages as outlined in the officer's report.
- The Parish Council urged the Committee to approve the application with the imposition of conditions in relation to C2 and C3, dependent on the materials being the same as what was installed on the existing building. This would conform with Glinton 10 in the planning policy document. The document stated that Brickwork and stonework should match the materials of the existing building.

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

- The Parish Council had objected to the materials proposed for the application. However, there had been lots of advice provided by the officer about materials that could be used, and the application was amended to conform with the requirements.
- The alteration to the house was needed due to the current size of rooms in the existing buildings. The extension was also required to provide larger area for health reasons of its residents.
- The Planning Committee had approved a similar application in the area on 31 July 2020, which would use the same cladding.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members were advised that the approved application heard on 31 July 2020 had timber cladding as one of the materials and was located on the garage on the other side of the green, however, every application should be considered on its own merit.
- The Conservations Officer's stated the reasons why timber cladding would be appropriate as it would be a softer material opposed to brick, which would face the listed building, the Bluebell Public House.
- Members were advised that Glinton policy 10 had stated that buildings should contain brick or stone, however the Conservation Officer's interpretation was that the outbuilding should use natural building material and blend in with the listed building. The Conservation Officer's recommendation was in the spirit of the conservation area for detached outbuilding requirements and therefore was acceptable.
- The Ward Councillor had no objection to the proposal and the application had followed the natural form of the village and the materials proposed for the detached garage was an excellent suggestion by the Conservation Officer, which had been endorsed by the Planning Officer.
- Members commended the applicant had sought guidance from the Planning team to create a robust application and there had been no reason to refuse it.

#### **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 impact of the proposal on the character of the area was considered to be in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings was considered on balance to be in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Chairman  
1:30pm –3:00pm