

**RECORD OF OUTCOMES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 19 OCTOBER 2021
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, BITTERN WAY, PETERBOROUGH**

5. STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered and endorsed the updated Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) to Cabinet, prior to Cabinet considering whether to formally adopt the updated document. The Committee **RESOLVED** (9 For, 1 Abstention) to **ENDORSE** the Statement of Community Involvement.

AGREED ACTION

The Committee endorsed the report and agreed that the wording in relation to approval of smaller planning applications would be amended to state Ward Councillor instead of District Councillor.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Peterborough City Council (PCC) were required, by regulations, to review their SCI every five years, from the date of adoption. Adoption of the SCI would ensure that PCC continued to satisfy the regulations regarding SCIs.

6 PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

6.1 21/00477/FUL - 17 CROWLAND ROAD

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (7 For, 2 Against, 1 Abstention) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been:

- In the interest of neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- In the interest of the current and future occupier amenity of 17 Crowland Road, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- In the interest of neighbour amenity and highway safety, in accordance with Policies LP13 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

6.2 21/00832/HHFUL 40 WESTWOOD PARK ROAD

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (9 For, 1 Abstention) to **REFUSE** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

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 proposed development, by virtue of its siting, height, scale and orientation of the single storey rear extension, would result in an unacceptably overbearing impact to the adjacent residential dwelling of No.42 Westwood Park Road. The proposal would result in significant overbearing impact to the immediate outdoor seating area and main habitable spaces located to the rear of the property such that unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupants would result. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

6.3 21/00335/FUL - NEWPORT FARM, NEWPORT WAY, UFFORD, STAMFORD

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 application site was situated within the open countryside outside the settlement boundary, however, there had been a legitimate fall-back position which had a realistic prospect of being implemented. The proposed scheme was considered to be an improvement in design terms, whilst sitting within the original mass and scale of the agricultural building. As such, the overall design quality was considered to be a betterment compared to the development which had already been permitted on the site under Class Q prior approval. This benefit was considered to outweigh the conflict with Policy LP2 and the Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011), and was accepted in this instance;
- The application site was not considered to be in an isolated location and accorded with paragraph 80 of the NPPF(2021);
- The proposed dwelling would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, and would provide satisfactory amenity for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the biodiversity value of the site, and would accord with Policies LP28 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The development would make provision for dealing with known and unsuspected

contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);

- There were no Highway safety concerns and parking could be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).