



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 12 APRIL 2022,  
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, BITTERN WAY, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Cllr Harper (Chair), Cllr Hiller (Vice Chair), Cllr A Bond, Cllr Brown, Cllr Dowson, Cllr Hogg, Cllr Jones, Cllr I Hussain and Cllr Rush.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Charlotte Cameron, Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Joanna Turnham, Legal Officer  
Alex Woolnaugh, Highways Engineer  
Amanda McSherry, Development Management Team Manager  
Phil Moore, Development Management Team Leader

**59. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sharp and Councillor Iqbal. Councillor Rush attended as substitute for Councillor Sharp.

**60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hiller declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5 by virtue of being predetermined as to the application.

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

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

**62. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2022 were agreed as a true and accurate record subject to the following alteration:

From:

“Councillor Hiller declared a non-pecuniary interest on agenda item 3 21/01965/HHFUL - 28 West End Road, Maxey as he knew the applicant and would be speaking on the item.”

To:

“Cllr Hiller declared a pecuniary interest in Item 5.3 21/01965/HHFUL – 28 West End Road, Maxey, due to the owner of the property being his wife and would be speaking on the item”.

## **63. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

### **63.1 The Golden Pheasant, 1 Main Road Etton Peterborough**

Councillor Hiller stood down from the Committee at this point due to being pre-determined to the application for this item.

The application sought the retention of two marquees linked by a short covered walkway. The application sought the retention of the marquees to be used for events and in addition, in use Fridays and Saturdays 6-11pm and Sundays and bank holidays 12-4pm.

The two marquees were to be split into the 'bar marquee' and the 'main marquee'. The bar marquee measures 6m in width, 6m in depth and 3.9m in height. The main marquee measures 12m in width, 12m in depth and 5.1m in height. The bar marquee was to be served by a small BBQ area along its western flanks and an outside standing area to its south.

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report and update report. It was noted that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting and sent a letter to be noted by the committee. The letter was subsequently included in the committee update report

Mark Bond and Ian Todd addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. The key points raised included:

- The previous temporary permissions granted to the landlords had breached conditions set on numerous occasions. Mr Bond and Mr Todd echoed that any new conditions proposed would not be sufficient in deterring breaches in the future.
- The previous permanent application was refused on the ground that this caused harm to the local area and was objected to by the Council's Conservation officer.
- Members were advised that the parking plan was not detailed enough as it was unclear how the number of spaces had been concluded.
- The applicant had no engagement with local residents to address their concerns and the lack of information provided was likely to see a breach of any conditions imposed.
- Several temporary conditions had previously been granted but they did not address the levels of noise disruption the marquees caused.
- After the refusal of the permanent application, there had been a significant amount of irrelevant information submitted. This meant that the proposal did not reflect the views of residents in the area. Members were made aware that statements were made on social media directed at the objections to the plan.
- Etton Parish Council had been contacted with residents' concerns about the proposal, but this was after they had submitted a letter of support for the plan.
- Breaches of the previous temporary permissions were so severe that planning enforcement had been contacted. The most common breach concerned the levels of noise disturbance.
- There was no confidence that the new conditions would be followed given that most of the previous landlords had not run the pub in accordance with the conditions of use.
- The pub itself is a Grade 2 Listed Building and there were concerns that the marquees would be used as a money-making scheme instead of conserving the

site.

- The information provided in the application gave no evidence that the marquees were viable and only included a list of maintenance costs.
- Members were advised that the fundamental maintenance of the site falls to Milton Estates and not the landlord.

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

- Members acknowledged the concern around noise disruption and highlighted that it could be controlled by other means outside of the planning system. Tighter conditions on noise disruption had been included in the proposed conditions and past breaches cannot be considered against this application.
- The harm to the conservation area had not always been a reason for refusal and in this case, officers had come to a balanced view. The Conservation Officer was concerned with the visual character of the conservation area rather than the noise disturbance.
- Members were advised that conditions on the applications have been tightened and enforcement of these conditions are down to the planning enforcement team.
- Concerns were raised regarding the ground conditions of the proposed car park. Members were advised that if the weather conditions prevented the use of the paddock, there were alternatives that could be used.
- Members discussed how marquees are a common feature in local villages up and down the country and if approved, they would like to see greater enforcement of the application conditions.
- The Conservation Officer had objected to the application as marquees result in harm to the local area.
- Members noted that the key issue was the viability of the pub to which it would not survive without the marquee. After 20 years on site, the marquees were seen as essential to business.
- The number of landlords suggested that the pub was not easy to run, and the marquees helped make it easier. The loss of the marquees would be a loss of a community asset and a place for people in the village to go and socialise.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and its representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officer recommendations and **APPROVE** the application. Following a vote (6 for and 3 against) the motion was agreed.

#### **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:

- taking into account section 66(1) and 72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the identified less than substantial harm to heritage assets is outweighed by the public benefits in accordance with Section 16 NPPF (2019)

and in accordance with Policy LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan.

- there would be no adverse impact to neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- the proposal would not result in any undue impact to highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan.

At this stage, Councillor Hiller re-joined the meeting.

### **63.2 21/01943/FUL - Castor Business Centre- Vogel Training Centre Helpston Road Ailsworth Peterborough**

Planning permission was sought to demolish the existing building on site and replace it with 4no. detached 4 bedroom dwellinghouses. Each proposed dwelling would have a double garage, together with private and public garden areas.

The proposed dwellings would all be two storey in height and the garages for plots 2 and 3 would be 1 ½ storey in height with office accommodation at first floor level. Each dwelling would utilise coursed limestone for its elevations and slate for their roof material. The proposed linear layout of the dwellings would be orientated with their frontages facing north, which would be perpendicular to the adjacent public highway to the west of the site. The existing vehicle access from Helpston Road is to be used to serve the dwellings. Plot 1 was the nearest to the public highway, with Plot 4 furthest east. The proportions were as follows:

- Plots 1, 2 and 3: The proposed dwellings would have an overall width of approximately 14 metres and they would measure approximately 12.2 metres in overall depth. The highest ridge line would measure approximately 8 metres from ground level, with the proposed eaves to measure approximately 5 metres high from ground level.

- Plot 4: This dwelling would be positioned furthest to the east on site and is the most varied in appearance. The proposed dwelling would have an overall width of approximately 14.5 metres and it would measure approximately 21 metres in overall depth, given the attached single storey garage to its north elevation. The highest ridge line on this property would measure approximately 8 metres from ground level, with the proposed eaves to measure approximately 5 metres high from ground level.

The Development Management Team Manager introduced the report and update report.

David Shaw, on behalf of the Castor and Ailsworth neighbourhood committee and Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Member of Castor and Ailsworth neighbourhood committee emphasised their hope that the site would be developed for housing. The neighbourhood plan, of which 97% of residents supported, required 20 new homes to be built and these proposed houses would help meet that target.
- Respect was given to the Conservation Officer, however, in matters of design there were occasions when opinions differed. The Member noted that stone tile materials proposed by the applicant would be preferable and that this be a local

stone. It was stated that this could be added as a condition to the application.

- The Officer's recommendations sought a farmstead design for the application in keeping with the feel of the area. However, the Member noted that there had been no farmstead appearance on that site and the applications proposed design is supported by the neighbourhood committee.
- It would be sensible to look at the trees surrounding the site and where some were identified as eligible for a TPO, that those past their prime would be removed. For example, the trees on the north side and beside Helpston Road would be retained.
- The Member requested that the Committee approve the application and delegate to officers to insert appropriate conditions for the application.
- This site was never a farmstead and was used as a training centre with no farming background. It was more viable for the area to have four new buildings built with local materials and the Member welcomed Hereward Homes as the developer for the site.

Simon Machen, agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points included:

- Mr Machen thanked the Parish Members for their comments. He noted that he was happy to support the change of roof tiles and would work with Officers with regards to any TPO's.
- He noted that the existing building was in poor condition, and it was important to upgrade what was already on site.
- There would be more traffic issues in the Parish if the site was extended from the current premises to suit the training facility's needs.
- There were no objections from local residents and the developer has a strong reputation for building high quality bespoke products, with traditional designs and products.
- An agricultural design to this site would not be viable as it was built as a telephone exchange. The proposal was designed with the individual site and surrounding area in mind.
- It was noted that it would not be financially viable or meet land use efficacy to have less than 4 units.
- The developer committed to continued work with the Parish as they have done throughout the application process.
- Tree consultants had different views on the viability of trees on site and would be happy to review the requirements for TPO's and retention of existing trees.

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

- The lack of a farmstead appearance in the proposal would not take away from the agricultural feel of the area.
- If the low-quality trees were replaced and the applicant would be willing to do so, the site would be a generous development for the area. Members noted that they would be minded to go against officer recommendations and approve the proposal if the discussed conditions on trees were agreed.
- Members acknowledged that the Parish Council had an active role in the planning process and were happy for the application to be approved. The conditions for an amendment to roof tiles and the TPO's were to be delegated to officers for finalisation.

- It would be an attractive redevelopment of the site as Herward Homes had a good track record of working with the Parish Council.
- Some members noted that a farmstead appearance on site would not be in keeping with the sites origins and would look contrived in comparison to the style proposed in the application.
- There was no other way to develop the site except with something that was being proposed.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and its representations. A motion was proposed, with conditions, and seconded to go against officer recommendation and **APPROVE** the application. The conditions outlined would be delegated to officers. The Committee voted (unanimously) in favour of the planning permission subject to the raised conditions.

#### **REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

The proposal was acceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan. In addition conditions to the application were delegated to officers.

#### **63.3 22/00106/ADV - 2 Alma Road Millfield Peterborough PE1 3AW**

The application sought the benefit of advertisement consent for the installation of a digital display screen at first floor level which would be of 3.2m width x 1.6m height and 200mm thickness.

The proposed display unit would provide remotely regulated static illuminated advertising with a new image at every 10 seconds with instantaneous interchange between images. The advertisement would not contain any moving images, animation or special effects, with the illumination limited to 300 candela/sqm at night.

The application is a re-submission with an amendment to the previous application reference 21/01563/ADV, which was refused by Officer delegated powers in November 2021 for the following reason:

*The proposed digital display, by virtue of its large size, siting and changing image display would have an unacceptably adverse impact upon the visual amenity and appearance of the site and surrounding streetscene. When combined with the signs on the nearby commercial units, it would lead to a proliferation of signage and visual clutter on the road frontage to the detriment of the amenity of the area and resulting in degradation of the streetscene. This proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), and paragraph 136 of the NPPF.*

The previously refused proposal consisted of a similar digital display screen 3.6m wide x 1.6m high.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the report and update report. The Officer noted that the application was a re-submission with an amendment.

Councillor Bashir addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members.

In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Cllr Bashir expressed her support for the application based on her local knowledge and role in supporting public health. It was noted that the proposed site for the display screen had been a high-risk area for covid-19 rule breaking and the installation of screen would allow for the right messages to reach more people.
- The proposed site was a building next to 'King Carz' which had a large sequin covered sign. Cllr Bashir stated that if that sign had been approved, the current application should also be approved. The new sign had not caused a distraction and it was not seen that it would do so in the future.
- The local community had been welcoming of this sign and its innovative nature. The City was growing and innovative sign such as that being proposed should be given a go.

Simon Machen, agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Machen noted that the proposed screen would use the 60% more efficient LED'S that are on the market.
- The applicant had been liaising with the Council over what communications could be used for the board.
- It was noted that a similar board and design had been approved in Boston, with no issues raised by their highways team.
- The portrait screen would bring innovation to the area and would work to support local brands and businesses.
- The display screen would have the ability to display messages in different languages. This would allow the messages to meet the wider demographic of the area.
- As the screen would be monitored remotely, it would allow brands and businesses to display messages at times suited to their target audience.
- The proposal designated 10% of slots to council business and would use 60% less power compared to other billboards.
- It was noted that the sign met the parameter of light pollution standards.

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

- Members acknowledged that luminosity standards were difficult to understand. If the proposal were to be granted for 5 years, it could be required to be removed if the Council would prefer to overturn a previous decision.
- The sign complied with advertising standards so would not be a reason for refusal as it would not cause a material risk to road users.
- It was noted that drivers had a duty of care to concentrate on the road and the sign could be a distraction. On balance, the highways team determined that this would not be an issue.
- Members were reminded by officers that they could only take into account public safety concerns when considering this application
- The area was densely populated with signage already and too much would cause harm to public safety. There would be potential for incidents to occur with the proposed size of the board.
- Members noted that approval of this planning application could lead to more

illuminated signs across the city with potential public safety concerns.

- On a site visit, it was noted that you would see the sign as you drove down the road. There were many signs that caused visual impact whilst driving, however the traffic in the area was of a slow speed.
- There were several languages spoken in the area and the sign would help inform and educate residents.
- The significant amount of advertising signs along the street were already competing for attention and the addition of this sign would increase this.
- Members noted that a change in the sign would likely result in it catching someone's eye and could cause an accident.
- A concern for members was the implications around what would happen next if the application was approved.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officer recommendation and **REFUSE** the application. Following a vote (6 for and 4 against), the motion was agreed to refuse the application.

#### **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 digital display, by virtue of its large size, scale and siting would have an unacceptably adverse impact upon the visual amenity and appearance of the site and surrounding streetscene. When combined with the signs on the nearby commercial units and the application property, it would lead to a proliferation of signage and visual clutter on the road frontage to the detriment of the amenity of the area and resulting in degradation of the streetscene. This proposal is therefore contrary to Policies LP16 and LP18 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), and paragraph 136 of the NPPF (2021).

CHAIRMAN  
1.30 – 4.00PM