



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 15 JUNE 2021
SAND MARTIN HOUSE, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Hiller (Vice Chairman), S Bond, Brown, Dowson, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, I Hussain, Jones, Sharp, Simons and Warren.

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Group Lead Development Management Place and Economy
Louise Simmonds, Development Management Team Leader
Carry Murphy, Principal Development Management Officer
Jez Tuttle, Senior Highways Engineer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Harper and Cllr Andrew Bond. Cllr Simons and Cllr Sandra Bond were in attendance as substitutes.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Simons declared an interest in item 5.3 - 21/00150/HHFUL - Pond House, The Park, Wisbech Road, Thorney by virtue of being a Ward Councillor for Thorney.

Councillor Amjad Iqbal declared an interest in item 5.3 - 21/00150/HHFUL - Pond House, The Park, Wisbech Road, Thorney by virtue of knowing the applicants family but had not had any involvement in the application.

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

There were no declarations of interest received to address the committee as a Ward Councillor.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON:

4.1 23 MARCH 2021:

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4.2 13 APRIL 2021:

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

4.3 20 APRIL 2021:

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

5. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

5.1 21/00287/R3FUL - Land at Bishops Road, Eastgate, Peterborough

The Committee received a report, which sought:

1) Full planning permission for the erection of a three storey building for research and development use associated with the University of Peterborough, known as Phase 2. This would be sited to the rear of the recently permitted and implemented Phase 1 planning permission, on the former Wirrina car park site. The proposal also includes associated car parking, works, infrastructure and landscaping; and

2) Outline planning permission with access and scale sought, and all other matters (appearance, landscaping and layout) reserved, for the construction of a decked car park for up to 180 additional vehicles (up to 380 in total), on the current Peterborough Regional Pool car park site. This also includes the creation of a new vehicular access off Bishops Road, and closure of the existing Regional Pool car park access, with associated works, infrastructure and landscaping.

It was noted that the scheme has been amended from that which was originally submitted, to move the location of the proposed car park from the public open space within the red line boundary known as Bishops Park, to the Regional Pool car park. Whilst retained within the red line boundary, no development is proposed on Bishops Park.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and update report.

Manjeave Singh, on behalf of the agents, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Anglian Ruskin University Peterborough (ARUP) was a joint collaboration driven by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA), Peterborough City Council and the Anglian Ruskin University. This was a new £30 million university which was set to open in 2022. It was deemed to provide higher educational facilities to the city. This was hoped to improve skills and knowledge within the city and drive up aspirations for young people in the region.
- The aim of the university was to work with employers as co-creators in developing curriculum led by employer and student demand.
- The first teaching building for the university was granted planning permission in November 2020, which was the first phase of the building off Bishops road, with construction of the building having already commenced.
- Courses were to be delivered by means of campus based lessons, in work training, distance learning and apprenticeships.
- The application in front of committee was for the next stage of the development, which comprised of a manufacturing and research skills centre. The development was to create a low carbon hub for research and development in Peterborough

and enhance the geographical position as a global leader with knowledge and innovation.

- This development would integrate with the first phase building and create a campus hub feel.
- A local organisation called Photocentric, was proposed to be the anchor tenant, which specialised in photo polymer which involved hardening of materials using light.
- The applicant, agents and officers had listened to the concerns of local residents to create an application that would bring benefits to the city.

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

- The original application sought for a decked car park on the bishops park site, which was public open space. Following significant public opposition this was revised. The current application sought up to 180 additional parking spaces on top of the 200 that currently existed within the regional pool car park. Officers commented that the only way the additional spaces could be achieved within the confines of the land was for the parking to be decked to a maximum height of 13.3m. Members were informed that the final application may not want the full 180 additional spaces, however a minimum of 123 additional spaces would be required to meet the demands of the phase two building.
- It was confirmed that the car parking was to be built on the existing regional pool site.
- There had been a level of controversy around the car parking elements of the plans, however it seemed that people had been listened to and that the open space was to be protected.
- This was a welcome application and a university was much needed within the city.
- With this now being proposed on a brownfield site and no objections from Historic England there was no grounds for refusal.
- Application replicates the space of the car parking that was in place and did not interfere with the open space.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officer recommendation and **GRANT** the application with the correction to condition C6 of the full planning permission, as set out in the Update Report. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimous) 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 proposal represents the next phase of the development of the University of Peterborough and would be sited on land which is in line with the vision for the Riverside North Policy Area. As such, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies LP4 and LP51 of the Local Plan (2019);
- the application scheme would result in enhanced educational offer associated with the newly created University of Peterborough, which should be afforded great weight in decision-making, in accordance with paragraph 94 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- the proposed design is considered to be of high quality that would enhance the site and its wider surroundings, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would ensure that the significance of nearby designated heritage assets are preserved and accordingly, the proposal is in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- no harm to any buried heritage assets of key importance would result, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- the proposal would not result in a severe impact to the capacity of the surrounding public highway network, safe access would be afforded to all users, and adequate parking provision would be made to meet the demands arising from the Phase 2 development, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- drainage from the site would be adequately managed such that no increased flood risk either on- or off-site would result, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 155 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019);
- an unacceptable level of harm would not result to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable impact to species of principal importance and would secure overall biodiversity gain, in accordance with Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 98 and 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD (2019);
- the proposal would ensure that trees of key amenity value to the surrounding area are protected, and that overall enhancement to the landscape quality of the area is secured, in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to human health or controlled waters through contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019); and
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the air quality of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

5.2 21/00229/REM - Land East Of, Aqua Drive, Hampton Water, Peterborough

The Committee received a report, which sought reserved matters consent relating to the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of a three form of

entry primary school with nursery with associated outdoor-sports areas, infrastructure, access, parking and landscaping works pursuant to outline permission reference 16/02017/OUT.

The school building will be located at the south east part of the site and is predominantly two 82 3 storeys in height. It will be constructed in a mixture of brick and timber and coloured panelling. To the north of this there will be a large area intended for soft and hard play. This includes a MultiUse Games Area (MUGA) which then leads on to playing fields intended for year round use.

Staff and visitor car/ motor cycling parking as well as drop off/ pick up area located in the southern part of the site. This provision has been increased and amended plans submitted. Cycle and scooter parking is provided at other locations within the site.

The site will utilise one access point for vehicles off Aqua Drive and three pedestrian access points from both Aqua Drive and Hartland Ave. There will be a one-way system through the car park, comprising an 'in' access point and 'out' egress point.

The proposals have already been subject to a formal screening for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), under planning reference 21/0002/SCREEN. It was determined that the development would not have significant environmental effects and as such an EIA was not required.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Kayleigh Dixon and Andrew McGarill, on behalf of the agents, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicants and agents were aware of a number of concerns raised by local residents especially on highways grounds. Members were reminded that the principle behind this site being allocated for a school had already been established.
- In terms of highways impacts and the number of trips that would likely occur had been assessed and were deemed acceptable. There had been concerns raised over the data contained within the transport impact assessment, however it was important to note that this was provided by the applicant for information purposes only to assist the highways with a separate study. It was not a validation requirement for the reserved matters part of the application. It was important to note that even though not a requirement, the report still deemed the traffic flow reasonable and adequate.
- The school was well designed and met technical specifications for school buildings. It provided adequate parking provision and was laid out to include sporting facilities and play areas.
- The applicants had worked proactively with the local authority throughout the planning process and other consultees as well as listening to local residents.
- The application was supported by the sustainable traffic plan which promoted sustainable travel initiatives. This was to be regularly monitored and reviewed by the school.

- In terms of having electrical vehicles to pick up pupils who lived outside the catchment area, this had not at this point been considered. The school was expecting there to be a small number of pupils from the wider catchment area but the majority would be within the catchment area. It was possible that the sustainable transport plan could include this further down the road.
- The purpose of the drop off was to prevent unnecessary parking on site. It was anticipated that 10 to 20% were going to be pupils from outside of the catchment area. It was noted that the drop off area was a high turnover of cars and this was deemed sufficient by the planning officers.

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

- Officers had discussed in detail with the applicant the number of car park spaces in the drop off area. The initial number suggested was eight, however following conversations this was increased to 30 with a one way system.
- The overall Hampton development was given planning permission in 2016, this contained provision for a number of houses including three schools. Any traffic relating to this proposal was packaged in the original traffic modelling. There were potentially four access points to Hampton East that was taken into planning consideration at the original planning stage.
- It was more secondary schools that held community events, this was due to them being larger in scale. The applicant for this application was not minded at the current time to open the school for community use. Officers had included a condition that the applicants would need to look at the possibility in the future of opening for community use.
- School drop off systems were quite complex and involved a high turnover of vehicles. With this application it was reasonable to expect three sets of 30 cars dropping off children within a 15-30 minutes timeframe.
- A lot of work on the construction of the school was done off site and then moved onto site when nearing completion phase. This also allowed the build programme to be shorter than normal.
- There were reservations over the car parking situation. Previous experience suggested that it took more than five minutes for people to drop off and leave the site again. There were circumstances where it was likely that parents would turn up before the gates opened in the afternoon.
- When the application was originally submitted this was proposed as a normal primary school. Officers approached the education authority regarding the possibility of a faith school and how this impacted on local residents. Two examples were used, one the Sacred Heart in Bretton and Thomas Moore in Eastfield. At both examples there were around 90% of pupils who lived within two miles of the school. This showed that officers were along the right lines with their analysis of the catchment area of the school position.
- The provision for 30 parking spaces in the drop off area was far greater than what was available at other schools. The fabrication proposed was appealing and would be a welcome asset to the Hampton area. In addition the construction being done off site would reduce the disruption to local residents.

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 and 2 abstentions) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers particularly in relation to

the treatment of the tree.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is 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 locating a school on this site was established by the granting of outline planning permission. The development will help meet the existing demand for school places arising from the development of Hampton and in the neighbouring areas. The proposal accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 94) and Policy LP05 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and approved masterplan.
- The traffic impacts of the development were assessed at the outline planning stage and found to be acceptable. The development will provide for a satisfactory level of parking and gives some opportunities for travel by bus, walking and cycling. The development will also be subject to a detailed Travel Plan and Parking Management Plan. As such the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The design of the new building is considered to be acceptable for the location. It is also not considered that there would be any unacceptable adverse impact upon neighbouring residents. The development is therefore considered to comply with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- New landscaping and biodiversity enhancement measures are proposed. The development will not have any unacceptable ecological impacts. The development therefore accords with Policies LP28 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Subject to a condition the site can be adequately drained in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

5.3

21/00150/HHFUL - Pond House, The Park, Wisbech Road, Thorney

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the construction of ground and first floor extensions to the front, rear and both sides of the property. The overall effect would be to completely remodel the entire appearance of the property. To the front (north) elevation, the proposal would extend at two storeys forwards by some 2.9 metres, with two small gable projections in addition (to 3.7 metres). The existing attached garage would also be extended upwards, to one and a half storeys in height. The rear elevation would be extended outwards at two storeys by some 3 metres, with two larger gable projections beyond this. Whilst the western side elevation would be extended by approximately 3.5 metres at two storeys.

The proposal also includes converting the existing garage into a habitable space.

It should be noted that the proposal has been amended from that which was originally submitted. The original application sought the construction a detached 4 berth garage, however this has now been removed from the proposal.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Dr Asad Qayyum (applicant) and Sajjad Panjwani (agent), addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The extension to the front and rear of the property was no more than three metres. To the side of the property the extension was only nominal.
 - With regards to the total length in elevation this was only to be increased by 4.4%. The total existing elevation was 21.46m. The proposed length came to around 22.6m. The height of the property was not to change with the extension.
 - The side elevation was to increase by around 27%, this included the 3m to the front and rear extension. The property sat on land totalling 3342 square metres. The total area of the property with the extension was to 294 square metres.
 - The proposed extension did not form a part of the conservation area, this was reserved for the bottom portion of the land on which the property sat.
 - The current property was out of character for the area, it was an old building and was in need of refurbishment. The applicant was keen for the proposal to be in keeping with the local area.
 - The family was growing and needed more space. The family enjoyed the location of the property and had adapted to the village's way of life. The current property was not in keeping with the culture and character of Thorney village.
 - The application being presented was mindful of the need to keep in character with other local properties.
 - At all times neighbours had been consulted and through this process the proposal to erect a garage was removed from the application following conversations with the neighbours.
 - In order to reduce the carbon footprint a conditional offer of planting 14 trees on site had been made.
 - The property was set behind a number of trees off Wisbech road and was set back 41m from the property. The property had its own garden space with a number of mature trees around it. People travelling by car would not have time to look at the property when driving.
 - The applicant was trying to improve the look of the property and attempt to create a property that was in keeping with the character of Thorney.
 - When the previous application was submitted it was purely to extend the property. This application took into account the culture and character of Thorney in terms of design. Every effort had been made to relate to the conservation area. The windows of the proposal had been set to give the property a more dated feel so as to keep in tune with the character of the area.
 - The property at No.1 The Park was 25m away from the garage and extension and would not impinge on their privacy. In terms of No. 53A Wisbech road the boundary was 21m away from the garage extension.
 - At the current time the windows at the front of the property already overlook neighbouring properties. In terms of the application the proposal was not going to be extended out too much further than what was already in place. The property was being extended outwards in order to meet the requirements

of keeping the property within the character of Thorney.

- There was no window facing No. 51A Wisbech road, it was difficult to see how there would be any loss of privacy to that property. The height of the building was not being increased and therefore would not impact No. 53A Wisbech road.
- The applicant followed comments and suggestions made when the previous application was refused to try and bring the property into keeping with the character of Thorney.

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

- There was an error in the second reason for refusal which needed to state No.51 Wisbech road and not No.53A Wisbech road.
- The Council had an adopted supplementary planning document, the Peterborough Design and Development in selected villages, which was adopted in 2011. Officers had noted that the application had failed to comply with section 4.7 of that document.
- There was no mention of windows overlooking the property or no substantial harm on privacy and amenity. The application site was a fair distance from No.53A Wisbech road. There was also no issues with plants or trees and the applicant had promised to plant more trees. The proposal was an improvement on what was currently there.
- When looking at the plans it was important to look at whether it was keeping within the character of the area or being overdeveloped. There was nothing stated that would seem to suggest these issues could be overcome.
- It was difficult to go against the officer's decision for refusal taking into account the conservation officers comments.
- The applicant and agent had given sound explanations as to why the proposal had been set out in such a way. The application was an improvement on the current site. The applicant had taken the conservation area into account when drawing up the plans. The applicant had also shown why he wished to increase the size of the property. The design was good and was in keeping with the local area. It was not conceivable people would be looking at the property when driving past on Wisbech road as people should be keeping their eyes on the road.
- The applicant needed to liaise further with planning officers to overcome any concerns with the proposal.
- The property needed to be looked at with regards to the property as it needed updating, however more could be done to keep the property in within the character of Thorney.

RESOLVED:

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 and 1 abstentions) 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.

R1: The proposal by virtue of its design, size, scale and mass, fails to respect, reflect or be subservient to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to represent poor design through the creation of a dwelling which appears contrived, unduly dominant and obtrusive. Given the prominent siting of the application site, the proposal would be readily visible from the public realm and this would therefore heighten the harm arising from the design. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Thorney Conservation Area, such that less than substantial harm would result. It is not considered that the public benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm, and therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 193 and 196 of the NPPF, and the Thorney-specific policies of the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011).

R 2: The proposal, by virtue of its siting, layout and design, would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants. The proposal would result in an unacceptable degree of direct overlooking to the garden and primary habitable rooms of No.1 The Park, and would result in undue overbearing and dominance to the garden and primary habitable rooms of No.51 Wisbech Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

CHAIRMAN
N
1:30 – 4.30PM