



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 6 SEPTEMBER 2022  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chairman), Howard, Bi, A Bond, Hogg, Hussain, Jamil, Jones, Sharp, Simons and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead  
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Alex Woolnough, Principal Engineer  
Connor Liken, Development Management Officer  
James Melville-Claxton, Development Management Officer

**15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Iqbal and Hiller. Councillor Bi was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Iqbal and Councillor Howard was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Hiller.

**16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Several declarations of interests were made as follows:

1. Councillor Jones declared an interest in agenda item 5.1 - 22/00450/HHFUL - 122 Newark Avenue Dogsthorpe Peterborough PE1 4NS and would therefore stand down as he had called the item to Committee for consideration.
2. Councillor Hussain declared that he was Ward Councillor for the agenda item 5.1 - 22/00450/HHFUL - 122 Newark Avenue Dogsthorpe Peterborough PE1 4NS, however, had not been involved in any part of the pre planning process.
3. Councillor Warren, declared an interest in agenda item 5.1 - 22/00820/HHFUL - 35 Ringwood Bretton Peterborough PE3 9SH and would therefore stand down as he had called the item to Committee for consideration.

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

There were no declarations made to speak as ward Councillor.

**18. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 28 JUNE 2022 AND 19 JULY 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June and July 2022 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

At this point Cllr Warren stood down from the Committee due to his declaration of interest in the following item: 22/00820/HHFUL - 35 Ringwood Bretton Peterborough PE3 9SH

## 19. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

### 19.1 22/00820/HHFUL - 35 RINGWOOD BRETTON PETERBOROUGH PE3 9SH

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory to the rear of the garage, the erection of single storey flat roof rear extension, which would provide a kitchen area, conversion of the garage into habitable accommodation with an ensuite room, and a detached pitched roof garden store. The existing conservatory measured approximately 1.9 metres in width by 2.5 metres in length, and 2.3 metres at the eaves. The rear extension measured approximately 3 metres in width and 5.2 metres in length, and 3.3 at the eaves. The storage shed measured approximately 3m in width and 2.35m in length, 2.9m at the ridge and 2.2m at the eaves.

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

Phil Branston, The Agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal was for a rear extension which would extend the kitchen amenity.
- The proposal was only one metre over the permitted planning development requirement.
- The garage proposal would be permitted development for conversion.
- The proposal would provide more living space for a growing family.
- There had been objections received from neighbours over parking, however there had been ample parking available in the area.
- One objection had been received in relation to the proposal being overbearing however, it was quite normal and standard for the type of extension being applied for.
- The shed height was not required to be 2.9 metres high, and a request had been made to the Planning Officer to remove it from the application as only the standard permitted size of shed was required.
- Members were advised that an amendment could be made to remove the shed from the application as the height of 2.9 meters as advised was no longer required.

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

- Members were advised that the applicant would need to submit revised plans in order to comply with the amendment in relation to the change in height for the shed. The Committee would not be able to change what the applicant had submitted on the original plans.
- Members felt that the proposal was within the character of the area. Furthermore, there were similar property extensions in the area.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application as

per the officer recommendation. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to delegated authority to officers to enable the reduction in height of the garden shed to within permitted development limits based on the agent's statement to Committee.

**REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposed extension would not unacceptably impact on the existing character or appearance of the host building or street scene, and was considered that on balance would comply with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); 30 DCCORPT\_2018-04-04 5
- The proposed extension would not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours and thereby accord with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The proposal would not result in any highway safety hazard and sufficient on-site car parking could be provided in compliance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

At this point Cllr Warren joined the Committee and Cllr Jones stood down due to an e declaration of interest in the following item 22/00450/HHFUL - 122 Newark Avenue Dogsthorpe Peterborough PE1 4NS.

19.2 **22/00450/HHFUL - 122 NEWARK AVENUE DOGSTHORPE PETERBOROUGH PE**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the erection of a boundary wall to front and side of the dwelling, measuring approximately 16.80m by 2.25m along the side and 4.20m 2.25m along the front boundary. Materials used in the construction would match those previously approved under 22/00450/HHFUL.

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

Mr Phil Branston, The Agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposed boundary erection was on an old council estate where red brick had predominantly been used for construction The use of yellow brick was intended to brighten the area up.
- To build the entire wall in red brick would be incongruous for the area and the existing wall despite the predominant use of the material in the area of Dogsthorpe. Furthermore, it would attract graffiti.
- The proposal of yellow brick would match the existing wall and make a more attractive street scene.

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

- Members understood the officer's recommendation for refusal; however, the initial wall colour had been acceptable when it was previously approved at Committee under application 22/00450/HHFUL.
- Members felt that a red brick wall would look incongruous and needed to match the existing wall.
- The current boundary hedge had grown out of control due to lack of

maintenance and a brick wall would provide a better appearance.

- Some Members felt that to extend the wall as proposed in a residential area would look out of character.
- Although Members preferred a greener environment, the proposed wall was appropriate due to the issues experienced in Rowan Avenue, such as littering and antisocial behaviour. Furthermore, some Members felt that the proposal was not out of character for the area as there were smaller walls in existence.
- Members felt that the wall colour should be consistent with the previous wall installed.
- Some Members felt that the street scene was improved by the current green boundary hedge. In addition, there would be a further increase of 200 percent of brick façade which would look overbearing and was unacceptable.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application as per the officer recommendation and following a vote (4 for, 6 Against) the proposal was **DEFEATED**.

A motion was proposed and seconded to go against the officer recommendation and **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 For, 4 Against, 0 Abstentions) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

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

Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The wall had been approved at a previous Committee under application 22/00450/HHFUL and therefore, was acceptable and not incongruous with the street scene;
- The colour and materials to be used would match the wall approved previously approved under application 22/00450/HHFUL; and
- There were other properties with side facing walls.

## 20. **APPEALS QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee received a report, which outlined the appeal cases which covered the period from 1 April 2022 to 30 June 2022,

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

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

- Some Members agreed that a consistent approach had been undertaken when considering planning applications.
- The Committee complemented the Planning Team on the planning process and the excellent performance they had achieved.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee noted the past outcomes and performance.

CHAIRMAN  
1:30 - 2:18pm