



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 19 JULY 2022
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Amjad Iqbal (Vice-Chair), A Bond, Hiller, Bi, Hogg, Hussain, Rush, Simons and Sharp

Officers Present: Sylvia Bland, Acting Head of Development Management
Louise Simmonds, Development Management Team Manager
Mike Osbourn, Principal Planning Officer
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Alex Woolnaugh, Principal Engineer

7. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jamil, Dennis Jones, Warren and Harper. Councillors Bi and Simons were in attendance as substitute.

8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Hussain declared an interest in item 4.4 by virtue of knowing the developers but had not had any involvement in the application.

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

There were no declarations of intention to speak made.

10. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

10.1 21/01898/OUT – THE SOLSTICE, NORTHMINSTER, PETERBOROUGH PE1 1YN

The Committee received a report, which sought outline permission for a mixed-use building comprising up to 112 apartments and ground floor Class E(a) retail or E(b) restaurant units. Maximum proposed building heights are set out on a Parameters Plan which shows a “tower” element of up to 29.1m in height and two lower “wings” each not exceeding 9.15m in height. Layout (insofar as the site layout but not internal layout) and scale are for determination at this time, with all other matters (access, appearance and landscaping) reserved by the applicant for future consideration.

In support of the application, plans have been submitted which propose the scale and site layout of development, including a parameter plan giving maximum proposed building heights.

When read together, the parameter plan and proposed site layout plan illustrate a U-shaped building with a maximum footprint of 69m x 32m. The taller element would have a maximum footprint of 32m x 30m and stand at no more than 29.1m in height. The

lower elements would stand at no more than 9.15m in height and would have a footprint of 52m x 28m. The proposed heights are the maximum proposed dimensions with which any future reserved matters application would have to comply, although the applicant seeks to fix the footprint at this stage.

Importantly, external appearance and the internal layout of the development are reserved for later consideration, albeit the disposition of uses on the application drawings confirms that the ground floor would be occupied by Class E (a) & E (b) retail and restaurant uses addressing Northminster and the corner with Brook Street. The proposed residential accommodation would be situated on the upper floors with indicative layouts showing one possible way in which that accommodation could be configured.

Access is not for consideration at this time albeit the applicant does not propose any car parking onsite. 76 cycle parking spaces are proposed, with the location and layout of these again shown on an illustrative basis.

Illustrative elevation drawings and computer-generated images have been submitted which show one possible way in which a building of the maximum dimensions proposed might be designed externally. Those drawings are indicative and, whilst they give a flavour of the architect's thinking, are not for determination at this outline stage.

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

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

- There were objections raised by the Council's Conservation Officer. Although Historic England had not commented they had raised objections to the previous proposals.
- One of the key reasons for the objection was around the height of the building. The plans to the north of the site did give some separation from the bulk of the building. However, in overall terms the proposal was taller than that which was agreed a few years ago.
- It was noted that the proposal was lower in height than the Northminster development which was a positive. It was essential that the proposal stuck to the plans and did not tower over the Northminster development.
- During application process asked to analysis scheme and not lose. Sits down below height of Northminster scheme. Must be lower.
- In overall terms the proposal was now 4m higher and 7m longer than what had previously been agreed.
- It was noted that the Council had improved Stanley Park in recent years and had made it a more attractive place to use.
- It was important that the views of the Cathedral were not affected any more than what were outlined as part of the previous application
- It would be beneficial if a condition could be included in the proposal for roof terraces from the 3rd floor of the development, this would enable residents to get a view of the Cathedral.
- The fact that the proposal was 2m below of the reserved matter application was a positive sign.

Cllr Wayne Fitzgerald addressed the Committee and responded to questions from

Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- This application supported the economic growth of the city. There was a need for more homes and houses across the city.
- It was up to the committee to determine each application. The same objections being mentioned at this meeting were the same objections as raised when the application was originally granted. The height of the development was below that of the Northminster development, the impact on the views of the Cathedral were minimal.
- The applicant had already gone above and beyond to accommodate the concerns of the Civic Society and those who had raised objections.
- It was important to note that what the developers were hoping to do at the time of the original application were not the same as now. This was mainly down to the impact of the pandemic.
- There was a condition to clawback money which could be used to create more affordable housing across the city, this was in lieu of there being no affordable housing as part of this development.
- The Civic society had a right to be concerned as custodians of culture, but this could not be the only factor to be taken into account
- There was a housing crisis across the city, however developments such as this in the centre would bring more people into the city.
- The views of the Cathedral were not overly impacted, the best views of the Cathedral were by visiting the Cathedral. There was lots of support for the development taking place.
- It was better to have housing than no housing at all. There was a mechanism in place to clawback money to create affordable housing in the future.

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

- This was a local company who had worked at locations across the UK and was part of the contractors of the first phase of the university.
- The application was prepared before the covid pandemic and the increase in prices meant the applicants had to re-visit the viability of the scheme. Due to this the original scheme was no longer commercially viable
- The report in front of committee assessed all the material considerations. No objections were raised by operational stakeholders.
- The layout and design of the application was appropriate for a city centre site. The application would respect the overall appearance of the Northminster site and would provide several benefits to the city centre. There were no material grounds on which the application could be rejected.
- In terms of affordability, the Northminster site would provide a large scale of affordable homes for the city centre.
- The scheme was just about viable with the application as it was, if affordable housing was included then the viability would no longer be acceptable and the application would not go ahead.
- This application was not subjected to a £14 million subsidy from Combined Authority, which was the case in terms of Northminster.

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

- Once the development was completed a post-completion viability appraisal would be undertaken. If there was an uplift in the value, then a contribution could be found and this would be put back into affordable housing schemes.
- It was important that more housing was provided for the city. Although the scheme had no affordable housing there was a mechanism in place to clawback money to put towards affordable housing.
- There was no requirement for any parking to be provided in accordance with local policy as this was a city centre core development.
- When looking at the original application against the new proposals there was very little impact. The biggest issue was around affordable housing, however officers had clarified that there was a mechanism in place to get money back into creating affordable housing if the value of the development increased.
- It was important that this development happened to ensure development in the city continued. The viability of the scheme looked good and it would help improve the vibrancy of the city centre.
- The development would complement the Northminster proposal and sat well with the development of the city centre.
- Although there were a number of positives with the proposal it could not be supported as it did not provide for any affordable housing. By having no affordable housing it was setting a precedent and sent a message out to developers that the 30% target in Council policy was not adhered to.
- There were concerns over the affordable housing elements however officers and the developer had alleviated those and there were mechanisms in place to overcome these concerns.

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) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to the conditions set out within the main Committee report and the securing of a S106 legal agreement to secure off-site public open space contributions and a post-completion viability appraisal in respect of affordable housing contribution.

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 application site is situated within the City Core, would provide a mix of residential, retail and restaurant uses. As such the proposed development would introduce a mix of residential development into the City Core, and go towards enhancing the vitality and viability of the City Centre. The principle of residential development would accord with Policies LP2, LP3, LP4, LP6, LP8, LP15 and LP47 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 86 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposed scale and layout of development would not harm the significance of the Grade I listed Cathedral building or the City or Park Conservation Areas above and beyond development which has previously been granted permission on the site, it would not have a harmful impact on buried archaeology and would not harm the character or appearance of the immediate area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 199 and 202 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposed scale and layout of development 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)

and Paragraph 119 of the NPPF (2021);

- There are no Highway safety concerns and cycle parking can be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2021);
- The development would make provision for surface water drainage and uncovering unsuspected contamination, and would accord with Policies LP32 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan, and Paragraphs 167 and 183 of the NPPF (2021); and
- The development would be subject to a viability review requirement which has the potential to secure a financial contribution towards offsite affordable housing, and off-site public open space enhancements towards Stanley Park and Burton Street Allotments, and would therefore accord with Policies LP8 and LP21 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 34 of the NPPF (2021).

10.2 22/00431/FUL – 16 RUSSELL HILL, THORNHAUGH, PE8 6HL

The Committee received a report, which sought the benefit of planning permission for the retrospective extension of the residential garden of the dwellinghouse into the open countryside and the installation of children's play equipment within that garden extension.

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

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

- The officers had gone into detail with the objections around the application being outside of the curtilage of the village and how this application would spoil the countryside. The reality was that local residents had not objected to the application and if there was a concern residents would raise this.
- The family had farmed the land and had maintained the area for the benefit of the village.
- There was acceptance that there were planning issues around the application, however in this instance the needs of the family should outweigh the planning considerations and reasons for refusal.
- The application site sat just outside the conservation area, it was difficult to see how this would impact on the conservation area.
- The family are a farming family and have a large, long-standing relationship in the village. Although the village was picturesque, it was a working village not a museum village. The family needed to have this play area for their son.
- Removing this space could be harmful to the essential needs of the family's son.
- The committee were asked to consider the needs of the child over planning policy.
- It was the understanding when speaking to family that if there was an episode there needed to be sufficient space so that the child could be monitored and that this space was not crowded.

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

- There was important personal circumstance that needed to be considered against the Councils policies. This play area allowed direct supervision for the family's son. There was supporting information from SEN and the school that

agreed that the play area was of direct benefit to the child.

- Although a similar scheme had been discussed in the report and was refused, this was 2km away from the village boundary and would have had a greater impact on the conservation area compared to this application.
- There was no significant harm to the conservation area. The application site was not visible from driving into the village and was not visible when looking at the context of the conservation area.
- The committee needed to see the importance of the circumstances of the family and this could outweigh the planning policy of the council.
- If the property was to be sold then a condition could be imposed where the space would have to revert back to agricultural use.
- The applicant's son had been diagnosed with autism and the committee needed to consider the needs of the son when evaluating this against the planning policies
- It was important that the family's son was given as much freedom as possible and to enjoy the outdoor space, while retaining a for of supervision.
- A planning condition could be imposed that would turn the play space back to farmland if the property were to be sold.

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

- Should members believe that the application be granted then a number of conditions could be imposed that protect the needs of the child and the needs of the land. It would not be possible to impose a condition preventing any planting of trees and hedges as these do not fall within the scope of the Town and Country Planning Act. There was a risk that growing trees and plants would create a biodiversity issue should a temporary consent be granted for years and was one that the committee needed to consider when debating the application. In addition, a condition could be imposed that made this a temporary approval.
- Members needed to be aware that another application could come forward that would set a new settlement boundary.
- There was no significant biodiversity at the moment, however that could change with temporary consent as trees/hedges had been planted.
- There was no legal precedent set by a planning decision, however local planning decisions could be taken as a material planning consideration and could be looked at as departing from the local plan.
- If permitted development rights were not removed, they would allow for swimming pools and outbuildings to be potentially built on the land. Officers could not control things that did not fall under the definition of development, such as general play area toys and trampolines as this did not form part of the Town and Country planning act.
- There was no issue with the application and allowing play equipment to be used. There were some concerns over this application being outside the conservation area if the application was to be granted then adequate conditions needed to be put in place to ensure further development was not forthcoming.
- There was an overwhelming need of the child and this was demonstrable against the value of the land staying as farmland. There was a need to tread carefully over the conditions and what could be left to the detriment of the village, nothing to stop it going back to farmland, a temporary condition could be the best solution.
- Personal circumstances were powerful in this case and the family had sympathy with the concerns of the child. There was support for the permitted development rights to be removed and protect future use of the land.
- There was a need to think outside the box and it was vital applications such as

this were presented to committee.

- It was difficult to go against officer recommendations, however the personal address made and the restrictions that could be imposed outweighed the planning policies on this occasion.
- It was important that conditions were included in the approval, such as making sure the application was personal to the family and that if the property was sold the land reverted to agricultural use. It was also important that a condition was imposed to prevent outbuildings or swimming pools being built. Finally, the application was to be granted a ten-year temporary approval and following this the land would revert to agricultural use.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against the officer's recommendations and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimous) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to conditions delegated to officers securing a personal permission also tied to the residence of 16 Russell Hill (the application site), a temporary time period of 10 years and the removal of permitted development rights.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

APPROVED contrary to Officer recommendation and with the following conditions:

1. The use of the land as residential garden hereby permitted shall endure only for the benefit of Mr and Mrs Sharpley and shall only be used as residential garden associated with and whilst Mr and Mrs Sharpley reside in the dwelling known as 16 Russell Hill.

Reason: The departure from the Local Plan is only acceptable owing to the specific personal circumstances of the Applicant and therefore any other reason for encroachment into the open countryside would be contrary to Policy LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

2. The change of use hereby permitted shall cease and the land restored to agricultural use in accordance with a scheme first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority no later than by 1st March 2031.

Reason: The departure from the Local Plan is only acceptable owing to the specific personal circumstances of the Applicant and therefore any other reason for encroachment into the open countryside would be contrary to Policy LP2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 Classes E and F, and Part 2 Class A of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no building, swimming or other pool, structure, container used for domestic heating purposes for the storage of oil or liquid petroleum gas, hard surface, gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure shall be constructed or erected on the land subject to the change of use hereby permitted unless authorised by this or any future planning permission.

Reason: In order to preserve the character and appearance of the countryside, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP27 of the Peterborough Local Plan.

10.3 22/00506/FUL – CROFT FARM, MEADOW LANE, THORNHAUGH

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the change of use of 585sq.m, of agricultural land into residential garden land for use by the adjacent holiday homes.

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

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

- This was not too dissimilar to the previous application. Although the parcel of land was outside the envelope of the village it was not a used piece of land and could not be farmed.
- The family were part of the rural economy and it was important that the applicant had the opportunity to diversify. The key planning issues were part of the developments and the impact on the heritage of assets.
- There was no development on this parcel of land and if nothing is done it would remain just an open piece of land. Although outside of the conservation boundary it was only just outside
- Planning conditions could be imposed on the buildings and the application site so that it retains a feel of being in an open space.
- There were negligible public benefits, however holiday lets were more important than ever and this was an application to use surplus land for the existing holiday cottages. This would help support the local economy. There was less than substantial harm to local benefits.
- It was impractical to farm the land, it was merely a mowed piece of lawn. There had been objections and those residents had been approached, the applicant had done all possible to curtail any noise made. Objections relate to activities that go on at holiday lets not that specific piece of land.

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

- There were three fundamental areas the committee needed to focus on. The first issue was around the impact in heritage assets. It was difficult to see how the conservation area could be affected as there was no visual change to the setting. It was currently a patch of mowed grass and it would continue to be so going forward.
- The second issue was that this was in open countryside, there was no possibility to farm the land or build any properties. There was no real encroachment onto the conservation area.
- The third area was around the Impact on residential amenity. A request had been made to the Council to ascertain the complaints made about the noise and anti-social behaviour. As no information was provided back it was assumed that no formal complaints had been made to the Council.

- It was important that members noted that the application site was not going to be placed in a large field. The view from Meadow Lane would be retained if the application were given approval.
- There was no possibility to farm the land in question, the space was unusable for any other purpose than to be kept as a piece of grass. The applicants were only asking for this to improve the experience for guests that stayed at the holiday lets.
- The applicant had stated that there were to be no large parties at the holiday lets. At the current time bookings were done as a whole so the people who used the lets would most likely know each other. The 2x units cannot currently be let out separately to one another, they must be booked as a whole.
- There was a curfew on site and no complaints had been made. The terms and conditions also stated that there was automatic removal from the site if the noise levels disturbed local residents.
- The applicant confirmed that although text messages had been sent to them with regards to loud noise nothing had been made formal to the Council.

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

- There was a very different application to the previous one. There was no driving argument to go against the officer's recommendation for refusal. This was a commercial operation, the granting of the application could lead to amenity loss.
- There was already a grass area for residents of the holiday lets to use if they wanted to spend time outside. By protecting the amenity space, it would protect the surrounding neighbour's privacy and peace and quiet.
- Granting the application could increase the noise levels and disruption to residents and neighbours.
- This was a commercial entity; the application did have heritage impacts on the local area. In addition, there had already been complaints made by the neighbours to the applicant over the noise levels.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application for the reasons set out in the Committee report.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The proposal is 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.

R 1 The proposed change of use from agricultural land to garden land would represent encroachment and extension of the domestic curtilage of the applicant site, associated with Croft Farm Holiday Park, into the open countryside for garden land. The proposal would result in the unacceptable erosion of the open countryside for residential purposes that have not been adequately demonstrated as being essential. Accordingly, the development is wholly contrary to the vision, objectives, development strategy and policies of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019), specifically Policy LP2.

R 2 The proposed change of use from agricultural land to garden land would represent encroachment and extension of the domestic curtilage of the applicant site into the

open countryside. The proposal would expand the curtilage of Croft Farm beyond the historical confines of its Listed Building curtilage. In addition, the proposal would blur the separation between residential curtilage of the village and open countryside and be at odds with the character and appearance of the locality. The development would harm the visual amenity and character of the area, and the setting of the village, including the Thornhaugh Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to LP16, LP19 and LP27 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

R 3 The proposed change of use would represent a negative amenity influence on neighbours' health and quality of life. The proposal would introduce garden land to the rear of residential dwellings that currently experience a very quiet level of amenity. Such garden land would likely result in incidents of noise and general disturbance generated by use by occupiers and would be to a degree which is more intensive given that it would serve holiday accommodation. The proposal would therefore unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring occupants and is contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

10.4 22/00631/FUL – SAGES TOWER, FREDERICK DRIVE, WALTON

The Committee received a report, which in 2011 planning permission (11/01739/FUL) was granted for Residential development comprising 115 new dwellings and conversion of former factory to 2 apartments, with new roads, open space, car parking and landscaping.

The scheme has mostly been built out and occupied for a number of years. As part of the approved scheme, however, the proposal included the conversion of the water tower into two dwellings. This part of the scheme has not been subsequently implemented. However, this part of the permission remains extant and could still be implemented.

In 2018 a further planning permission (18/01862/FUL) was granted for the additional of a fourstorey extension to the water tower, alongside a change of use to four residential dwellings. This scheme was intended to replace the earlier approval in so far as it related to the tower.

The tower itself was to be converted into 6x floors to form 2x 1-bed dwellings and 2x 2-bed dwellings.

To facilitate development the proposal introduced a number of new openings within the existing building, alongside the formation of an area of car parking and a detached secure cycle store and bin store area.

The proposed extension was to have a floor area of 4.6m x 5.6m and stand at 9.9m to the eaves and 12.8m to the ridge, utilising bricks to match the existing structure, alongside areas of selfcoloured render.

The proposal also included a commitment to retain the original Signwriting (Sages Tower) on the existing building. All windows were to be metal, whilst self-coloured render was to be applied to the existing water tower to hide historic joints. Metal louvres were to be used to link the proposed extension to the existing water tower. This consent has not been implemented to date and has recently lapsed (01/03/22).

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report.

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

- The application had been a thorn in the side of local people. It was deemed necessary for the application to go ahead, however residents had raised some concerns that needed addressing.
- Some of these concerns revolved around car parking at the development and overlooking onto properties nearby. The condition of the site was also questioned as at the current time the building lay derelict.
- The building had significant historical appeal. Parking was not a major issue as there was a supermarket close by.
- The focus of the major concerns stemmed from the height of the building and the proposed extension. There was concern that the proposal would cause overlooking of the nearby properties and the committee needed to bear this in mind when considering LP17. There was some apprehension that the windows to the side of the building would not be obscured or frosted.
- There had been several consents given to this application in the past however no developer had managed to go ahead and fulfil the needs of the building. In addition, the Council had been slow to act with enforcement notices to try and get this development up and running.
- Ideally this application should be granted for a short period of time so that the application did not come back to committee in three to five years. The site was an embarrassment for the Council and it was now time to consider the feelings of the local people in the area.

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

- It was not possible to require a developer to implement a consent in these circumstances. Officers had conversations with the developers over why the scheme had taken a while and this was due to the covid pandemic which had placed barriers on them to complete the works.
- Officers stated that it would also be unreasonable to impose a shorter period of consent (than the standard 3 years) as this had the potential to place unreasonable burden on the applicant to implement, when factors outside of their control could mean a start cannot be made in such a short time frame, particularly with current labour and material supply challenges.
- A local listing was different to an official designation on the register of nationally listed buildings maintained by Historic England. The building had an identity with the local area without a listing status.
- Members were happy to approve the application as it had been approved before with an identical application.
- There were concerns over the state of the building and it was important that the developers now made good on their promise to renovate the building.
- The proposal looked good and it would provide much needed accommodation for 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** (unanimous) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to

relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The application is identical to a previous permission which recently lapsed. Furthermore, the site benefits from an extant permission to convert and extend the tower for residential use. Circumstances have not changed significantly since the previous permission was granted. This “fallback position” is a key material consideration which carries significant weight.

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 dwellings to be created are situated within the urban area of the city, and the extension and associated external works would not unacceptably harm the significance of the locally listed building, or the character or appearance of the host building or immediate area. As such the proposal would accord with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan 2019;
- The proposed conversion and extension would not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and satisfactory amenity would be provided for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan 2019;
- The proposal would not result in a net loss to the biodiversity value of the site, and the proposal would therefore accord with Policy LP28 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan 2019; and
- The proposed development would not constitute in a highway safety hazard and sufficient car parking could be accommodated, thereby according with Policy LP13 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan 2019.

CHAIRMAN
END - 4.15pm