

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1.30PM, ON TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

To be read in conjunction with the agenda and supplementary agenda for the meeting.

[\(Public Pack\)Agenda Document for Planning and Environmental Protection Committee, Tuesday, 9 April 2024, 1.30pm \(peterborough.gov.uk\)](#)

[\(Public Pack\)Supplementary Agenda Supplement for Planning and Environmental Protection Committee, 9 April 2024, 1.30pm \(peterborough.gov.uk\)](#)

Should you wish to listen to the debate had, please visit Peterborough City Council YouTube Channel at
[Planning and Environmental Protection Committee - Tuesday, 9 April 2024, 1.30 pm \(youtube.com\)](#)

Committee Members Present: Iqbal (Chairman), Jamil (Vice Chairman), A Bond, Casey Fitzgerald, Harper, Hogg, Hussain, Jones, Rush, and Warren.

Officers Present: Phil Moore, Phil Moore, Development Management Team Leader
Molly Hood, Senior Development Management Officer
Connor Liken, Development Management Officer
Stephen Chesney-Beales, Tree Officer
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor
Sarah Hann, Principal Engineer (Highway Control)
Ross Percy-Jones, Principal Transport Planner

Speakers Attendance: in **24/00107/OUT - 25 NANSICLES ROAD ORTON LONGUEVILLE PETERBOROUGH PE2 7AS**
Parish Councillor Skibsted
Wayne Farar - Agent

23/00852/FUL - LAND ADJACENT TO MAGNOLIA HOUSE OLD OUNDLE ROAD THORNHAUGH PETERBOROUGH
Councillor Elsey – Ward Councillor
Mr Dickie - Agent

50. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Sharp, Councillor Casey was in attendance as substitute.

51. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

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

There were no declarations to speak as Ward Councillor.

53. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

53.1 24/00107/OUT - 25 NANSICLES ROAD ORTON LONGUEVILLE PETERBOROUGH PE2 7AS

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with officer recommendation to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to Refuse the planning permission.

REASONS FOR 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:

R 1 The proposed development by virtue of its siting and design would fail to respect the established pattern of development and character of the surrounding area, resulting in a form of development which would appear hemmed in and incongruous. The proposal, therefore, would result in overdevelopment of the site and have unacceptable harm to the character, appearance, and visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and the National Design Guide (2021).

R 2 The proposal, by virtue of its siting and design would unacceptably impact upon the future occupier amenity due to the adverse levels of overshadowing to the amenity areas and eastern elevation of the proposed development. Additionally, the first-floor habitable rooms would be subject to darkness and poor levels of outlook. As such, the proposal was unacceptable and contrary to Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

R 3 The applicant had failed to demonstrate that safe and convenient access could be achieved from the public highway, as the submitted plans do not show a fully dimensioned drawing showing the existing and proposed site access with the associated vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays (1.5m x 1.50m on both sides of the access), a 3.50m wide access width and a proposed parking arrangement which demonstrated vehicle turning. As such, the application was considered to be contrary to Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

R 4 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause harm to nearby existing mature trees. Insufficient information has been submitted to assess the impact of the development on the existing mature trees to the southeast of the site, by way of adequate consideration in the form of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (BS5837:2012) and British Standard 5837 Tree Survey. As a result, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development could be undertaken without causing harm to existing trees. As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

53.2 23/00852/FUL - LAND ADJACENT TO MAGNOLIA HOUSE OLD OUNDLE ROAD THORNHAUGH PETERBOROUGH

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go with the officer recommendation to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR DECISION

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable for the following reasons.

Whilst the development was located within the open countryside and contravened the merits of Policy LP2, the proposal was considered to be a rural use and appropriate for its proposed location. The applicant has supplied sufficient evidence to justify this particular development site, with detail on the businesses proposed and the local need. Furthermore, there were no identified residential amenity impacts, highway safety risks or visual impacts from the development. On balance, these material considerations outweigh the conflict with the development plan and the development is considered acceptable.

At this point, the Committee took a short comfort break 2:46pm for five minutes

53.3 23/00009/TPO - 7A MAFFIT ROAD AILSWORTH PETERBOROUGH

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **CONFIRM** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **CONFIRM** the TPO without modifications.

REASONS FOR DECISION

The Box Elder T.1 subject of the TPO, shown in was considered to contribute to the public visual amenity value of the immediate and wider area and to the character and appearance of the Ailsworth Conservation Area. The tree has been assessed and was considered to be worthy of a TPO, therefore, it was recommended that the TPO was confirmed.

CHAIRMAN
Start: 1.30pm - End 3.09 pm