



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 25 JANUARY,  
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, BITTERN WAY, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Hiller (Vice Chairman), A Bond, Brown, Dowson, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, M Hussain, I Hussain, Rush, Sharp and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Joanna Turnhum, Legal, Governance  
Alex Woolnaugh, Highways Engineer  
Jez Tuttle, Highways Officer  
Matt Thomson, Senior Developmental Management Officer  
Louise Simmonds, Development Management Team Manager  
Carry Murphy, Principal Development Management Officer

**41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Jones. Cllr Mahboob Hussain attended as substitute.

**42. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23 NOVEMBER 2021**

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

**43. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hiller declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5.2 by virtue of being a board member of the Peterborough Investment Partnership (PIP).

Councillor Brown declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5.3 by virtue of having made representations on the application as Ward Councillor.

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

There were no declarations of intention to make representation as Ward Councillor.

**45. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**45.1 21/01448/FUL - 35 Westgate, Peterborough, PE1 1PZ**

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for 'Subdivision of ground floor retail shop and associated alterations to form 6x Class E(a) retail units and taxi cab office (sui generis), change of use of second floor to restaurant (Class E(b)) and associated external alterations- Resubmission'.

The proposed shop front alterations comprise the installation of 3x new pedestrian openings serving a Cab Booking Office, retail units and the upper floors, as well as the installation of transom and stall risers. A smooth white render finish is also proposed for the upper floors on the front elevation, facing Westgate, and the installation of an external extraction flue to the rear elevation.

This resubmission has been accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, which commits to the following security measures:

- Security Marshals to be onsite Friday & Saturday 11pm till 4am
- Increased seating space within the taxi office
- Disability access and seating areas
- Disability double door access
- Online CCTV cameras to be positioned outside and inside
- Digital booking system

These measures have been put forward by the Applicant to try and address the previous reason for refusal.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report and highlighted the key points in the application. Members were also directed to the update report which contained a number of revised and additional conditions.

Members were informed that the appeal with regards to the first application was still being processed. If members were minded to grant the application as before the committee and the appeal was successful then the applicant could decide which approval to implement. If there was a refusal on both applications then the applicant would not be able to carry out their proposals.

Cllr Jamil, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- It was noted that the applicant had made a fresh application with some amendments to the original application. There was nothing against the applicant or the proposals with regards to the restaurants, however the proposed taxi office location would cause a number of issues in the area if it was to go ahead.
- There had been a number of objections raised to the proposal which showed that there was a general feeling that this was going to be an issue.
- There was already a taxi office up the road from this proposed location and it arguable whether another office was necessary.
- By having marshals and CCTV installed there was an assumption that trouble was going to happen in the area. It was also difficult to distinguish what the role of the marshals were in terms of what had been produced by the applicant.
- People who went into the taxi office late at night would not be able to distinguish between the different taxi companies that were operating in the area.
- Figures had shown 113 incidents of crime and 62 acts of crime in that specific street and surrounding areas. By agreeing to this application it would only add to the number of incidents that would occur.
- The Licensing Department at the Council had voiced their concerns over the application and members of the committee needed to give weight to their expertise.
- Located near the proposal was four disabled parking bays which were small, in addition the double yellow line space was limited. Local businesses did want taxis parking in and around these disabled bays.
- There were a number of environmental concerns around the application. By

having another taxi office this would cause cars to sit idle, increasing air pollution. In addition having a number of taxis would also increase noise pollution for any local residents.

- More people would now congregate on double yellow lines outside the taxi office, which in turn would create further issues around anti-social behaviour.
- The other taxi office was based on the opposite of the road to the proposal and would in fact not lead to people mingling on the same side of the road.
- By having marshals it would seem to suggest that the applicant was expecting trouble and that by having the marshals there they would be able sort out any issues before they occur.
- If there were 10 to 12 people waiting for taxis that would bring in a large number of vehicles and cause congestion on the street. This was not the right location for another taxi rank.

Amran Masood, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The taxi drivers currently located on Westgate strongly feel that extra measures being suggested by the applicant would not make any difference to the anti-social behaviour issues.
- CCTV operations already existed in the city centre, however there were still a high number of issues. In addition there were already a number of taxi marshals on site and this had not prevented issues from arising.
- As had already been stated another taxi office was located up the road and this had a number of issues associated with it.
- The booking office was already too busy for the area and caused a number of traffic congestion problems for taxis already using the ranks and for people waiting to get into taxis.
- The taxi company did not people having to wait for long periods of time to get a taxi as this attracted anti-social behaviour and caused a nuisance for local residents.
- Digital applications made it easier for people to book taxis without the need for lots of taxi offices in one location.
- If the application was approved it would set a precedent for any potential future applications for taxi office's in the area.
- The taxi rank was busy at certain points during the day and evening. There were pressure points at night when venues closed that led to a large number of people waiting for taxis.
- There were a number of parking issues at the current time and with another taxi office this would be exaggerated.
- With the advances of technology and people using an app to book a taxi there was no need for a taxi office to be located so close to other taxi offices.
- Members of the committee were reminded that the need for another taxi office was not a planning consideration.
- CCTV and marshals had not been successful in reducing the number and incidents of crime on Westgate and near Queensgate.

Mr Simon Machen, on behalf of the applicants, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal in front of committee was for six new shops, a restaurant and a taxi office/rank. This would actively promote the night time economy in the area and would necessitate the additional taxi office.
- The application had been assessed in detail with regards to the key planning issues. Officers had accepted the principle of development in planning terms.

- Many of the objections were based on competition grounds and this was not a matter for which committee could take into account.
- Although the Council's licensing team had raised objections based on their view that there was adequate taxi provision already in the city centre, this was not a reason to refuse the application.
- With regards to design and layout the officer had concluded that the proposal would improve the neglected building and would preserve the area and not harm the adjacent conservation area. The Conservation officer at the Council had raised no objections over the proposed design.
- Although there had been an increase in crime during the Covid pandemic this was partly down to lower levels of policing in the city centre.
- The police had stated that the majority of crime and anti-social behaviour had taken place in Queensgate or the bus station and not down Westgate. The police had not objected to the application subject to the permission being granted on a one year basis.
- The management regime would include security marshals, who would prevent any trouble from occurring, similar to door staff at pubs and clubs. Additional measures included CCTV cameras, digital booking systems and a larger space for the taxi office to be based at.
- Highways officers had raised no objections to the proposal subject to the granting of the temporary consent. If there were any issues with regards to illegal or improper parking this was a matter for the Council's parking enforcement team to deal with and was not a reason for refusing the application
- The Council's environmental officers had raised no objections to noise or air pollution with regards to the application.
- By granting the permission it would allow a neglected building to be used for the benefit of the city and create more jobs for local residents.
- The one-year temporary permission would allow officers and the police to monitor the crime and anti-social behaviour in the area and provide evidence as to whether this causes an increase with regards to those issues.
- It was not for the applicant to second guess the statistics held by the police in relation to anti-social behaviour. Members were informed that the police had identified that the majority of incidents had taken place in Queensgate and the bus station and not down Westgate. Since the original application was rejected the applicants had done all that they could to mitigate problems occurring.
- Planning officers had felt that the proposed measures around CCTV were acceptable in light of granting a one year temporary consent. The police had also agreed the proposed measures were acceptable.
- Most of the objections were focused around competition issues rather than planning issues.
- It was reiterated that the Council's highways officers had raised no objections to the proposals. Although there might potentially be a spike of activity in the evenings when pubs and clubs were shutting, this would be mitigated by a far lower level of cars driving into the city centre late at night.
- With regards to the digital booking system most people now do this via an app. The need for having a taxi office was not a planning consideration. There would always be people walking into the office needing a taxi.
- There was no car park provision set out in the proposal and there was no planning need for there to be any.
- Officers had set out in their report how the application would work in terms of the traffic flow. Not everyone who booked a taxi would get dropped off or collected from Westgate.

- The marshals were not there to pitch for business. Their primary purpose was to prevent a spike in anti-social behaviour.

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

- Members were informed that the taxi ranks had a certain capacity attached to them. If there was no more room for taxi's to park in their allocated bays they could use the loading bays that were nearby to drop off and pick up customers. With regards to the double yellow lines there were some marked up which prevented any vehicles from parking or using those areas.
- The Councils parking enforcement team had confirmed that private hire vehicles were not permitted to park in the hackney carriage ranks. They were however permitted to drop off and pick up from double yellow lines. This was also an enforcement matter and not a planning one.
- If there were any obstructions to free flowing traffic then if a taxi was causing this there would potentially be a road traffic offence and should be asked to move on by enforcement bodies. The taxis would need to find somewhere safe to drop and pick up customers.
- There was nothing for highways officers to believe there was a congestion issue on Westgate. It was also the highways officers' opinion that the proposal for a taxi office would not impact the traffic flow. There were enough loading bays for safe collection and drop-offs.
- Officers were of the view that if the application was not based in the city centre there would be no other logical place for it to be based as it would not generate a high enough degree of footfall.
- There had been some changes made to the proposal from the original application that was refused by the committee. Previous experience had shown that taxi ranks could be fraught places to work in, especially around busy periods when pubs and clubs were closing. The use of CCTV was not so much of a deterrent, it was better used to see who had committed a crime and bring them to justice. It was noted the extra measures the applicant had proposed but it was difficult to see how this would ultimately mitigate the issues around crime and anti-social behaviour that had already been raised.
- The use of a marshal was not going to solve any of the issues. The marshal's sole responsibility would be to get people into the correct taxis rather than prevent any anti-social behaviour.
- There was already an existing taxi office up the road and a further office would bring more people into an already congested part of the city centre, especially around closing time for pubs and clubs.
- Officers confirmed that the marshals purpose with regards to this application was similar to that of a doorman. They would be placed to ensure no trouble escalated, rather than trying to put customers into taxis.
- In terms of the application in front of the committee the main area of focus was around anti-social behaviour. The taxi office proposal included a large waiting area, which was to try and keep people in the vicinity while waiting for a taxi. This would also help prevent and possible incidents of crime. There was an understanding of the competition element for the drivers who were already on Westgate, however this was not a planning consideration.
- It was important to take into consideration the police report and the fact that they had raised an objection to the application if it was granted for a 12 month period. The applicant had done a lot to try and mitigate any potential acts of anti-social behaviour.

- All the planning committee could go was the report. The application would improve the local area and the applicant had done all they could to try and mitigate any potential issues of anti-social behaviour.
- In terms of the anti-social behaviour there were a number of cases that went unreported and therefore the figures given in the report did not in fact give a true reflection of the situation on Westgate. Although the change of use for the building was welcomed it did not need to include a taxi office. The applicant had not sufficiently addressed the concerns around anti-social behaviour. There were serious question marks over how effective CCTV and marshals would be when there were so many people waiting in close proximity. If a lot of people used apps to book taxis why was there a need for a taxi office, especially in the same location as two other offices. It was concerning that officers had not taken into account the licensing teams expertise and as a committee these objections needed to be given weight. The road was already busy with a number of lorries and pedestrians, a further taxi office would add far more traffic and congestion to this location.
- There was nothing in the report of from the police that another taxi office would add to the congestion in the area.
- As a minimum it was essential for a taxi company to have an office available for people to wait in for their taxi. There was a need to make it easier for people to come into the city centre.
- It was important for members to take into account that if the application was refused the applicant could appeal to the planning inspectorate and if successful costs could be awarded against the Council.
- The police did not have any objections and were in favour of granting a temporary permission so that they could evaluate the addition of another taxi office on Westgate.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 for, 4 against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions being delegated to officers.

#### **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 proposed change of use would go towards providing a diverse range of uses within the City Centre, and would not result in congregation of non-retail or non-restaurant uses. The proposal would therefore preserve the vitality and viability of the City Centre and Primary Shopping Frontage, and the proposal would accord with Policies LP6, LP12 and LP47 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed external alterations would enhance the setting and significance of the Conservation Area and adjacent locally listed building, and would not harm the character or appearance of the host building or immediate area, and would accord with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policies LP16, LP18 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed uses and external alterations 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);

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

#### **45.2 21/01908/R3FUL - Land Adjacent 35-59 Bridge Street, Peterborough,**

At this point Councillor Hiller stood down from the Committee as he had declared an interest in the item.

Members of the Committee unanimously agreed to appoint Councillor Amjad Iqbal as Chair for this item.

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the erection of three market gondolas to facilitate an outdoor market.

Each gondola would have a floor area of 3.6m x 6.4m and propose to stand at 3.5m to the highest point, finished in timber and coloured in Heritage Green. Each gondola would be capable of being occupied by up to 4x traders, with dedicated storage areas for goods and associated equipment. The gondolas would have retractable canopies for each unit, which would create 6sqm of covered space which could be opened up at the start of the day and retracted in the evening. Each unit would comprise 15.96sqm in total.

Loading and servicing could take place from Wentworth Street and Priestgate, which currently takes places for a number of other units along Bridge Street. Future occupiers would have access to fresh water and w/c facilities within an adjacent address on Bridge Street.

It was understood that traders would operate from the site at least 5x days a week.

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

David Turnock, on behalf of Peterborough Civic Society, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- In November the Civic Society withdrew their objection to the application to regenerate the city. It was important that the city centre had a market that it could be proud of and that this was based in the centre of the city. There was a need to create a vibrant market for local residents and to allow market traders to prosper.
- The real concern for the Civic Society was around the detail and design of the application. The market traders had been shown a design in December that they had approved of. However the design that was currently being proposed was different and was not as welcomed by the market traders.
- The Council needed to see how successful the 12 stalls were and how the proposed pop-up stalls would work in conjunction with the permanent ones. It was hoped that the market would expand further north up Bridge Street in time.
- There were some concerns over the potential noise the market could make in the early morning for local residents. It would be useful to have a time restriction placed on the opening of the market to ensure those living in close proximity were not disturbed by the noise of deliveries. In addition there was nothing in the report that dealt with refuse or waste, a condition should be included in the application to deal with this.
- The Council have to make sure the market is successful. The Heads of Terms for the market traders were proposed to treble in the next three years which seemed excessive if encouragement was to be given to expand the number of traders.
- The Civic Society understood the reasons behind having 12 units to start with. It

was hoped that within a short time frame this could be doubled and so on.

- It was advisable to approve the application, but on the basis of the original drawings and not those that had been submitted to the committee.

Felicity Paddick and Ian Phillips, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The current market was located away from the main city centre. It currently did not benefit from what a city centre market would get and what was usual practice across other major cities.
- The Covid pandemic had a massive impact and the intention was to move the market and give it a stronger vibe for traders and to benefit other small businesses in the centre of the city.
- The Council had taken a balanced view and approach to the market to ensure it met the current needs of the traders. The application also took into account the Council's financial situation.
- A further 12 pop-up stall locations were being proposed to allow for seasonal traders or occasional weekend markets, including local festivals.
- The traders had been consulted on the proposals throughout the consultation and had been supportive of the proposal to move the market onto Bridge Street.
- The designs that had been submitted to committee were minor tweaks and nothing substantial to what had been proposed to the market traders.
- Officers had taken a balanced view of the offer of the market and this proposal would benefit both the traders and the city centre.
- The changes in design revolved around the way the stalls are opened and closed and this was the only change that had been made.
- It was expected that the stalls would last at least ten years with the proper maintenance being carried out. In addition members were informed that the stalls would be of wooden construction.
- In terms of waste and refuse the customer service centre was being converted into a food hall and the traders would be able to use those facilities for their stalls. In addition the trade waste would not be left on the street to pile up and cause issues for local residents.
- Officers were continuously working with the traders to ensure that the design and build of the stalls worked for them.
- At the current time the traders were all on different leases and terms with regards to rental levels. It was proposed that moving to a premium location would require charging a reasonable rent. It was therefore proposed to stagger this increase over a three year period.
- Officers had no concerns over the security of the stalls, there were a number of CCTV cameras and marshals walking around the area.
- There were large facilities nearby that the traders could use to fill up with water during the day and could go back and forward as much as they needed. The traders did not see this as barrier to them being able to trade.
- It was not thought that the overall design of the stalls would change to those that had been presented to committee. There were two options with regards to what the stall would look like when they were open. One option was to have the doors open horizontally and one option was for the doors to open vertically. The original drawing that was presented to traders had the doors opening vertically.



- Members were advised that the overall appearance of the stalls was similar to that which had been proposed to traders in December 2021. As the drawings with doors opening vertically had not been submitted officers could not ask the committee to make a decision on that proposal. Members had the option to either make a decision on the application as was submitted, the applicant would have the opportunity to make a change to the way the stalls looked when opened by way of a non-material amendment application. This would not need to go to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee. Members could defer this application however it may have an impact on the movement of the market and the deadlines that had been put in place.

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

- It was disappointing that this had come to committee in a form that it did not need to. The revised drawings that had been approved by the traders needed to be shown to the committee. It was difficult to understand why the designs had not been presented.
- There was overall support for the move to Bridge Street. There was the matter of timings with relation to the funding and the construction of the flats on the Northminster site.
- There were still some concerns over the security of the stalls, however this did not outweigh the need for the application.

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

#### **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 proposed gondola's would be situated within the City Core, where it would go towards improving the vitality and viability of the City Centre, therefore the principle of development would accord with Policies LP6, LP12 and LP46 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 86 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposed gondolas would not harm the significance or setting of the City Conservation Area, adjacent locally listed buildings, or character or appearance of the immediate area, and would accord with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraphs 130 and 202 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposed gondolas would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, as such the proposal would accord with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- Subject to receiving a detailed arboricultural impact assessment and method statement, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on adjacent trees, and would accord with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and

- There are no Highway safety concerns and parking and servicing could be accommodated within the City Centre, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019)

At this point Councillor Hiller re-joined the Committee.

#### **45.3 19/00836/OUT - Land East Of, Eyebury Road, Eye, Peterborough**

At this point Councillor Brown stood down from the Committee as he had declared an interest in the application.

The Committee received a report, which sought outline planning consent for the construction of up to 265 dwellings. The application seeks approval of the access only at this stage with matters relating to the appearance and design of the buildings, scale, layout and landscaping reserved to a later stage, if outline planning permission is granted.

The application was initially a scheme for up to 300 dwellings, but this was then reduced to 284 dwellings, with a further recent reduction bringing the number of dwellings proposed down to 265. The proposal would provide 30% affordable homes.

The proposal would also provide for up to 2.54ha of public open space which would also include a locally equipped area of play (LEAP) and allotment land.

The proposal also includes an area of land (1ha) to be given over for the purposes of extending the adjacent primary school and the creation two additional access points into the school site. One will be a vehicular access along its southern boundary abutting the application site and the other a pedestrian access only on the eastern boundary of the school site south of Fountains Place.

The primary vehicular access is proposed off Eyebury Road. The access proposals include an on-site cycleway at the site access, along with pedestrian crossing improvements near the school.

Revised proposals also submitted include a footpath/ cycle way to be constructed to the north of the site on a strip of land between properties at Fountains Place and the recent Allison Homes (previously Larkfleet Homes) development linking up to Thorney Road. The cycle way would then continue in a westerly direction alongside the footpath on the south side of Thorney Road up to where it meets with Eyebury Road and the High Street. There will also be upgrades to two bus stops on Thorney Road along this section.

As required by Policy LP40, a masterplan has been submitted with the application and this also includes further details via a parameters plan, strategic movements plan and indicative public open space areas drawing. These plans would provide controls on future Reserved Matters applications.

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has undertaken a screening opinion in respect of the outline application as to whether or not the development would require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The project falls under Schedule 2, item 10 (b) 'Urban development projects,' of the Regulations. The LPA considered that the development would not have significant environmental effects and as such an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required (ref. 21/00013/SCREEN).

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

Cllr Simons, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There were many issues with the application. These included the size of the application which was far too large for the land identified. In addition there had been over 300 objections from local residents, ward councillors, parish councillors and local MP.
- Although the site had been identified in the Councils Local Plan, it was stated that it would be built with adequate infrastructure, however there was no evidence of this from the proposal.
- A fit for purpose link road from the A47 to Fengate was required, which was originally discussed with Larkfleet over two years ago, however it would seem that this was not the developer's intention.
- The report of officers had stated that the application could be rejected on highways grounds if the impact on the road networks was severe. In addition LP40 stated that a transport assessment was required. The report of this nature that had been produced was difficult to understand. The assessment had been carried out during school holidays whilst in the middle of the pandemic.
- Some of the roads around Eye were already at full capacity. It was difficult to leave and enter Eye at certain points of the day.
- Highways officers had accepted that the road was going to be fine when the cycle and footpath was created, along with traffic calming measures that were going to be put in place on Eyebury Road. With a large increase in the number of cars and lorries that would now use Eyebury Road it was difficult to see how these measures would mitigate road safety concerns.
- With regards to LP14 and infrastructure the policy stated that planning permission would only be granted if there were mitigating measures in place to support the development, which was not shown in this case.
- It was disappointing as to how officers could recommend approval of the scheme. The transport survey that was undertaken was done during school holidays whilst in a pandemic. This was unacceptable and needed to be thought through again.

Dale McKean, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There had been a number of objections from local residents, parish councillors, ward councillors and the local MP. One of the key objections was in relation to LP40.
- A number of proposed conditions was suggested to officers, including further work on the internal drainage which was not compliant with policy. In addition the application needed to adhere to the Council's local plan and not exceed the 250 home limit as outlined for the site in the local plan.
- The main internal drainage board drain running through the whole of the site needed to have a 9 metre easement on both sides. This drainage was 20 feet deep and needed fencing for the safety of residents. This would in turn reduce the number of properties on the development and be more in line with what the site could reasonably accommodate.
- The Council's open spaces officer had strongly objected to the plan and had stated that the drainage areas should not be used or classed as open space.
- The site access also needed to have a traffic light system in place.
- There were concerns raised by the Council's highways officers, who had

requested further information such as cycleway policy, safety audit issues and visibility displays. Issues surrounding LP40 was needed to be agreed on upon with this application and not at reserved matters stage.

- The traffic survey was outside of the proposed site and was completed four and half years ago. A further drive by survey was undertaken in July 2021, this was done during lockdown and school holidays.
- Officers in the highways department had stated that the increase in traffic would be mitigated by the inclusion of the cycleway, however it was difficult to see how this could be the case. In addition the inclusion of the cycleway was a key component of adhering to LP40.
- The proposed design of the properties for the site were already three and half years old. It was not possible to determine what types of homes would be included on the site as these drawings were now out of date.
- The proposed cycle path needed to be 5 metres wide and not 3 metres as proposed in the application and should be separated out from where people would also walk on the paths.
- Local schools and doctors surgeries were already at capacity. In addition extra care facilities needed to be put in place with the large increase in the number of residents that this site would bring to the village.

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

- The plans in front of the committee were supported by a meticulous evidence base which had been completed over a five year period.
- The proposals had been informed and altered in line with Allison Homes consultants and feedback from all statutory bodies.
- Officers at the Council had worked collaboratively with Allison Homes throughout the process and working with the developer over a number of key issues that affect both the site and local residents.
- This was an allocated site within Peterborough City Council's Local Plan, which had an indicative number of dwellings proposed at 250. The current plans had a figure of 265 dwellings, however the final number of dwellings would be determined at reserved matters stage.
- The reduction in the number of dwellings had been as a result of direct discussion with ward councillors for the area and the local MP. It was important to note that the reduction in the number of dwellings was a result of the developer listening to residents and not from any feedback from statutory consultees.
- The highways impact survey was originally undertaken when the proposal was drawn up to have over 300 homes. At the time this was deemed acceptable for the number of dwellings that were proposed, so now that the number of dwellings had reduced the highways quantum's were still valid.
- The main emotive issue was around highways impacts. The developers had done everything that they could to combat any issues.
- With regards to a link road between the A47 and Fengate this was outside of the allocation area and was not an option for the developer.
- The original assessment for the highways impacts was undertaken in 2017, since then a number of subsequent assessments had been carried out.
- One of the key benefits of the scheme was the donation of land adjacent to the site to the local primary school. In addition this would create a new access point for the school, which would offer a benefit of pulling traffic away from Eyebury Road.
- The masterplan had been derived from assessment of evidence provided to the developer. Concerns raised by the residents had been taken on board and was reflected by the buffer areas included on the masterplan.

- The developers had done all that they could to ensure the site was policy compliant and to deliver a scheme that would enhance the local area.
- There would be 30% affordable housing on the site, ensuring that this was policy compliant.
- The way the developments had been designed and developed did not allow for a further access road from north to south on the site as they did not have the requisite road to allow lorries and trucks to drive down.
- In terms of the traffic surveys the original one was carried out in June 2017. Further surveys had been carried out at peak traffic times during the day. There was some confusion in terms of surveys looking at conditions in 2017 and then again in July 2021.
- The access point currently on Eyebury road for the school would likely remain but would, as understood, be used primarily for deliveries.
- There would be no benefits to having another access road around the smaller and narrower part of the masterplan.
- Numerous consultations had taken place with the ward councillors, parish councillors, local MP and residents in the area. The pandemic had precluded further events being held, however this was rare once an application had been submitted. The focus was holding meetings with the ward members and the local MP. These meetings had helped inform the reduction in the number of dwellings.
- In terms of the infrastructure the developer had worked closely with officers and statutory consultees to ensure any concerns were addressed. In terms of the internal drainage board concerns had been addressed by a 9 metre barrier from the proposed drainage scheme.

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

- This was an outline application. A further application with reserved matter may come to committee if it is asked to be heard by Ward or Parish Councillors.
- There could be up to 265 houses but the final number would be determined at the reserved matters stage.
- There were a number of positives to the application. There was the inclusion of footpaths and lots of open space provided for. One of the key issues was around the access road. Similar issues arose when the development around Hampton was taking place and caused issues for local residents.
- A vast majority of residents would be using the road which would also be used to access the site. This would affect residents especially during school drop offs and collection times. It was disappointing that this access road had not been thought through at the beginning of the overall development of the area and should have been planned better.
- The size of the development would lose the character and feel of a village location. The plans seemed like an over development of the site. It was clear that the local community were fighting hard against the application and they were supported by their local Ward Councillors.
- It was important to take into account that the Council's planning officers had worked closely with the developers to try and ensure that the application was policy compliant.
- It was up to the developer to ensure that the correct infrastructure was in place to and that they were complying with conditions set out by officers.
- There had been a large number of objections made against the application, in particular the local Ward Councillors had all objected. It was also important to note that the developer had taken the time to consult with local residents and had reduced the number of dwellings down based on these conversations.
- Members needed to give weight to the objections by those who were elected representatives as they knew the local area well and understood the concerns of

local residents.

- Although there were concerns over safety the developers had shown that they were willing to work with highways over this. There was a need in the city to have more affordable housing and this development complied with policy by providing 30% affordable homes.
- It was essential that if the application was to be refused it needed to be on planning grounds.
- Members needed to take into account that this site had been identified in the Council's Local Plan and it was important that these developments went ahead to meet housing targets. The application also needed to be balanced in light of the address made by the Ward Councillor.
- The application made provision for a number of affordable homes. In addition there was a fair amount of open space and the developer was making a CIL contribution.
- With regards to concerns over highway safety and the access road, any plans would need to be submitted to officers and signed off before any construction could take place.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officers recommendations and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (7 for, 3 against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to other necessary conditions delegated to officers.

### **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 site is an allocated residential site therefore the principle of housing is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policies LP02, LP39.7 and LP40 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Subject to conditions and mitigation, the impact on the highway network is considered to be acceptable, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The application would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area including the preservation of Eye Conservation Area. In accordance with Sections 66(1) and 72 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), NPPF (2021) and Policies LP16, LP17 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- It is considered that the site can be developed without any unacceptable adverse impact upon neighbour amenity and that it can afford the new occupiers a satisfactory level of amenity, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Issues of noise, air quality, contamination and drainage can be suitably dealt with by way conditions in accordance with Policies LP17, LP28 and LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- A policy compliant position in respect of affordable housing and other contributions can be achieved. The development will also pay CIL in accordance with Policy LP14 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The development will not have any unacceptable ecological and trees/ landscaping

impacts. The layout can also be designed to accommodate existing on-site trees and hedgerows with new landscaping and biodiversity enhancement measures proposed. The proposal therefore accords with Policies LP27, LP28, and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

At this point Councillor Brown re-joined the Committee.

#### **45.4 21/00736/R4FUL - Land R/o 30 Hallfields Lane, Gunthorpe, Peterborough, PE4 7YH**

The Committee received a report that sought planning permission for 'Proposed development of three residential dwellings'.

The scheme would form a pair of semi-detached dwellings (Block 1) in a dog-leg layout and a detached dwelling (Block 2) in an L-shaped layout, and Block 2 would utilise a flat roof single storey side element with what appears to be a fence above. These dwellings would utilise a shared design theme, they would be of modular construction utilising a modern design (render and boarding), framed windows and a monopitch roof.

Block 1 would have an overall floor area of 13m x 9.8m and proposes to stand at 6m in height. Block 2 would have an overall floor area of 8.5m x 9.8m and proposes to stand at 6m in height. The single storey side element would be flat roof stand 2.6m in height.

Access to the site would be from Hallfields Lane, sharing the existing vehicle access with Kingdom Hall, and would provide 5x parking spaces and associated turning.

The proposed dwellings would be run and operated by Hope into Action, a Peterborough based charity, who currently have 18x houses in Peterborough catering for 34 tenants, however, have housed 154 persons, including children, since 2010. Across the country, Hope into Action run 91x homes for over 250 tenants.

This proposal would allow Hope into Action to provide accommodation for 6-8 vulnerable persons.

This application has been subject to amended plans, which has introduced cladding to Blocks 1 and 2, additional planting around the site and illustrates 2x parking spaces to serve No. 30 Hallfields Lane.

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

Cllr Sandra Bond, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Council's local plan, in particular LP8 stated that thought needed to be given to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in the city. This was the primary reason for referring the application to the committee.
- The applicants had been working for 12 years on similar projects to help assist homeless and vulnerable people. They had done this at their own expense. This was therefore a worthwhile cause and would help people turn their lives around.
- There would only be a small loss of green space, which was a hotspot for fly-tipping and had been reported by local residents as a problematic area.
- Initial concerns were around the proposed accommodation units and vehicle access, however this had now been altered and was no longer a major issue.
- The needs of those who were vulnerable outweighed policy concerns and therefore the application could proceed.

On behalf of the applicants, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicants had been providing support and homes to vulnerable people for over 14 years. At the current time there were 17 homes run by the organisation in the city. Figures had shown that the support of a home for those who were vulnerable had stopped them from offending.
- The organisation had won numerous awards over the years for their work in the local community. Their aim was to help people and keep the streets safer.
- Work had been undertaken with a number of local authorities. Draft contracts had been drawn up however could not be handed over until the application had been approved.
- The current space was underutilised and was often a spot for vandalism and fly-tipping.
- The design of the accommodation had been worked on with officers and it was the applicant's view that this was an acceptable compromise.

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

- The main issues were around the loss of open space. The Council had placed an emphasis on retaining the open space areas as far as it could.
- Most open space across the city was rundown or neglected, this application would improve the local scene.
- Taking away this small section of open space would not have an impact overall on the open space provision across the city.
- Most of the objections related to the size of the development and the impact on the neighbourhood amenity.
- The Council needed to do all it could to work charities such as this to help and support homeless people. With regards to the footpath the developers would put a footpath than what was currently in place.
- It was important to note that there had been an objection from the police. It was important that if planning permission was granted that the developer ensured the site was maintained.
- Developers had shown that they were willing to work with Ward Councillors in getting support for the application.
- There had been a lot of focus on losing green space. There had been occasions in the past where applications had been granted which were contrary to local plan policies. The project was welcomed however it needed to be balanced against the loss of open space.
- Although it is understandable the concerns over loss of amenity the design of the property was not overly big in nature. In addition the open space was not used by anyone and it had become an area for fly-tipping.
- The site had been neglected and left to overgrow. There were no recreational facilities with regards to the open space and this application was a better use of the space.
- The loss of open space was minimal and the application outweighed policy. If this was to be granted officers would need to be able to attach conditions to the application.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officers



recommendations and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (10 for, 1 against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to other necessary conditions delegated to officers.

**REASONS FOR DECISION:**

Reasons given were that the minimal loss of a low-quality area of POS was not outweighed by the benefit of providing accommodation for the homeless or ex-offenders and that objections from the Police and Fire Service could be overcome. Officers to add standard conditions for new residential development together with additional conditions for a landscape buffer to mitigate the impact on 44-48 Swale Avenue, external lighting (or crime prevention measures) to the proposed footpath and restriction on occupation to that stated in the application. Officers to check the proposal will comply with the fire safety requirements of the Building Regulations as indicated by the Agent

**45.5 21/01734/HHFUL - 40 Westwood Park Road, Peterborough, PE3 6JL**

With the agreement of the Committee the item was deferred to a future meeting.

**45.6 21/01803/HHFUL - 39 The Green, Werrington, Peterborough, PE4 6RT**

With the agreement of the Committee the item was deferred to a future meeting.

CHAIRMAN  
1.30 – 6.35PM