



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 8 JANUARY 2013**

Members Present: Serluca (Chairman), Casey (Vice Chairman), Sylvester, Todd Harrington, Hiller, Ash, Shabbir and North.

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Group Manager Development Management
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer
Vicky Hurrell, Principle Development Management Officer
Sarah Hann, Acting Senior Engineer
Carrie Denness, Senior Solicitor
Karen S Dunleavy, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Stokes and Lane.

Councillor Ash was in attendance as a substitute.

2. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Members' Declaration of Intention to Make Representation as Ward Councillor

There were no declarations of intention from any Member of the Committee to make representation as Ward Councillor on any item within the agenda.

4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 4 December 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2012 were agreed as true and accurate record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 12/01556/FUL - Rathbones of Peterborough, Midland Road, West Town, Peterborough - Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 90 new dwellings (comprising 62 x 2 bed, 26 x 3 bed, 2 x 4 bed) including new access, car parking and public open space.

The application site was approximately 1.72 ha in size and was comprised of a number of former industrial buildings which were mainly brick built and included a former dairy, bakery and depot. These were vacant and in a poor state of repair. It appeared that part of the bakery building had been demolished. Hoarding had

been erected along the front of the site with Midland Road which covered the original 1.8 metre high brick wall. There was an existing sub station in the north west corner adjacent to Midland Road.

The site was located about half way along Midland Road on the eastern side. This side of the road was generally characterised by industrial and commercial usage although it was not a designated employment area. In contrast, the western side of the road was characterised by residential development and a couple of small local shops.

To the south west was the former Peterborough Hospital site which was subject to redevelopment proposals (policy CC13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005) refers).

A 1.8 metre high wall ran along the southern boundary of the site with the adjacent car park. The car park extended to the south east of the site, which separated it from the East Coast Mainline Railway. This rear area was currently being used for the storage of machinery and equipment being used for works to the railway. The north east boundary directly adjoined railway land. This eastern (rear) boundary with the site was largely overgrown. To the north of the site was a depot containing more industrial buildings.

The application site was located within the Railway Station Opportunity Area (policy CC12 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005) refers).

This application sought permission for the demolition of the existing industrial buildings and the construction of 90 new dwellings, which was comprised of two, three, and, four bed properties in a mix of houses and flats (the flats would be located adjacent to the railway line). 30% of the houses would be affordable.

The development would be served by a new access off Midland Road (the existing accesses to the site would be closed).

Also included with the development was a new area of public open space (1250 square metres) where it is intended to install play equipment.

The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to the imposition of conditions, as detailed in the committee report with specified conditions updated, as per the update report and the completion of a S106 Agreement.

The agent, Mr Woolston addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted included:

- Mitigation measures had been discussed with BP oil depot regarding concerns raised over noise and light pollution. A recent test had revealed there was low risk involved for the future in such an ambient area;
- Given the low test results regarding noise and light pollution risks, the developers would install trickle vents and acoustic fencing as a matter of course;
- A large public consultation had taken place over the development proposals

- for the site, which had received positive feedback; and
- The planning proposals would provide an opportunity to progress the whole railway station development forward.

Mr Woolston's responses to Councillors questions and comments, included:

- Network Rail had been consulted over the health and safety aspects of the development build. It was identified that the railway was a considerable distance away from the boundary, which had posed no safety implications regarding the site build;
- The developers had liaised with the BP Oil over noise and light issues and measures were to be implemented in order to avoid any future impact; and
- A method of work for the site development was being agreed with Network Rail.

Following questions to speakers Members debated further, comments included:

- Concerns regarding disturbance issues arising from the BP oil depot and the rail station had been alleviated following adequate assessment by Officers;
- Plans to regenerate the site were welcomed;
- The parking issues had been properly assessed and addressed;
- There was a minor concern raised over whether development of the site was a short term fix, which may cause sterilisation for potential redevelopment works in the area;
- Safety with regards to scaffolding being placed near the railway line should be paramount;
- Adequate school places should be provided;
- Concerns were raised over whether there would be increased traffic and parking pressure on Midland Road;
- Development of the site should be approached holistically;
- The location was ideal for development for an aesthetically pleasing housing estate; and
- Affordable housing options were welcomed.

Following Members debate the Planning Officer responses included:

- All safety issues were being considered and investigated between Network Rail and the developers;
- The development proposals were a small part of improvements for a larger regeneration plan for the area and provision of school places was being monitored throughout each stage; and
- There was sufficient capacity along Midland Road to allow for frontage parking and traffic volumes.

Following further debate and questions by Members regarding planning permission being sought, a motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application, subject to relevant conditions. The motion was carried by 8 voting for and 1 voting against.

RESOLVED: (8 For, 1 Against) to grant the application as per Officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C26 as detailed in the committee report; and
2. Updated conditions C2, C8 - C10 and C19 - C21 as detailed in the update report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the 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 application site was located within the designated Railway Station Opportunity Area. Policy promoted the complete redevelopment of the Railway Station area, with housing being an appropriate land use. Whilst this scheme would not result in the complete redevelopment of the western part of the opportunity area it would not compromise the delivery of other schemes and would kick start the regeneration process. The scheme would also remove derelict buildings where anti social behaviour was taking place. As such the application was considered acceptable in accordance with policy CC12 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005);
- The scheme included works to Midland Road which would provide additional on street parking and slow vehicle speeds. It was not, therefore, considered that there would be any adverse impact upon highway safety. Although the parking provision was below the new standards in the Planning Policies DPD the application was prepared and submitted under the old maximum standards. Given that this was a transitional period to the new policy standards the parking provision was considered to be acceptable and it would not result in highway safety concerns. The proposal accords with policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy DPD and policy PP12 of the Planning Policies DPD;
- Whilst it was acknowledged that the site did not currently have ideal neighbours in terms of land use it was considered that the level of amenity for future occupiers was, on balance, acceptable particularly given the wider benefits which the redevelopment of this site would deliver at the current time. The proposal therefore accords with policy PP4 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD;
- The proposal would not have any unacceptable adverse impact upon the amenities of existing neighbouring properties and therefore accordance with policy PP3 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD;
- Subject to conditions the site would be adequately drained and mitigation measures secured to deal with ground contamination. The development therefore accords with policy CS22 of the adopted Core Strategy DPD and the NPPF;
- Subject to conditions the proposal would make a contribution towards the Council's aspiration to become the Environment Capital of the UK and accord with Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011); and

- Further to the submission of a viability appraisal the developers had demonstrated that the proposal cannot pay the full POIS contribution. In order to deliver the regeneration of this site as part of the Council's growth agenda a reduced contribution was acceptable in this instance. Subject to the level of POIS being finalised and secured via a planning obligation the scheme would accord with policy CS12 and CS13 of the adopted Core Strategy DPD.

5.2 12/01694/R3FUL - Queens Drive Infant School, Queens Drive West, Peterborough, PE1 2UU - New single storey classroom extension to front of school, new single storey toilet extension to side of school, demolition of house at no.6 Queens Drive West, associated landscaping works; soft and hard landscaping to front, side and rear of school, removal of trees as per Arboricultural Assessment recommendation, reconfiguration of external doors and windows, creation of additional parking and associated access

The application site was approximately 0.4 hectares and was located on the south side of Queens Dive West. The site contained a single storey primary school building of the Victorian era built in buff brick under a slate roof. The building had been extended over the years with more modern elements, which included a school hall to the rear. The site was compact in nature. To the front of the site there was provision for the parking of twelve vehicles; five spaces were within an area which was accessed from the eastern side of the site frontage and seven spaces within an area accessed from the western side of the site frontage (there was currently a mobile unit located within the parking area providing temporary classrooms).

The frontage was bounded by a brick wall approx 0.6m in height and there was a large grassed area with a number of mature trees.

To the rear of the site there was a playground area and a small grassed/wildlife area to the south east which also contains mature trees. The site was enclosed by a brick wall of 2m in height to the side and rear boundaries.

The surrounding character was predominantly residential. Queens Drive West had on street parking restrictions; resident permits to the west, limited time parking for thirty minutes on the opposite side of the road, yellow lines to the east and there were 'School Keep Clear' zig zag lines directly to the front of the site. Queens Drive West was subject to a 30mph speed limit with traffic calming in the form of speed cushions.

The application sought permission for:

- a. a single storey extension to the front of the site to provide two classrooms, a library area and group room. The extension would be irregular in shape and would be to the eastern side of the school building and would project 13.4m from the front elevation at its most eastern point reducing to a projection of 9m at its western point and would have a width of 22.4m where it would abut the school building reducing to a width of 20.4m at the site frontage. The height would be

4.3m. The extension would be located 3m from the eastern shared boundary. Windows would be positioned within the north, east and west elevations;

- b. a single storey extension to the west of the site to provide a toilet block; the dimensions would be 5.4m x 4.4m. The extension would have a flat roof and would be 3.5m in height;
- c. alterations to the windows/doors within the existing building, which included substitution of window for door in the west elevation that served the classroom and the addition of a door to three classrooms to the rear of the building. eleven no. car parking spaces would be provided, which would include one disabled parking bay;
- d. the demolition of the dwelling at 6 Queens Drive West to facilitate the development; and
- e. the works would also provide an increase in outdoor space for play and teaching and a reconfiguration of the internal floor area for additional ancillary support.

The development would result in an additional sixty pupils at the school from September 2013. Staff numbers would increase by one additional teacher and one teaching assistant.

The Committee was advised over the updates and clarification provided in the additional report which had been included for conditions CS07 and CS10 to CS12.

The Committee was also advised of the receipt of additional representation submitted by a neighboring property to the school, which in summary included:

- Concerns raised over the impact increase in traffic for Park Road, Dogsthorpe Road and Queens Drive;
- The poor performance to date of the School Travel Plan and the lack of clarity over proposed targets for the next three years;
- Suitability of drainage and the strain it may present on local sewers, lack of grey water recycling and sustainable water management by the school;
- Concerns raised over the reduction of the existing habitat area, the loss of trees and increase in cooking odour pollution created by Queen's Drive Infant School and Dogsthorpe fish and chip shop; and
- Lack of construction work details provided in the application.

In addition the Planning Officer advised the Committee that:

- A School Travel Plan was being dealt with through a planning condition which would involve liaison with the PCC Travel Choice Team in order to tackle any traffic issues;
- All drainage arrangements and grey water recycling had been reviewed and the requirements had met with relevant planning policy with no

- objection raised by the drainage team;
- Tree loss and ecology was reviewed and conditions had been appended to include choice of native species of tree when replaced and the incorporation of bird and bat boxes;
- An informative would be appended to advise the applicant that a complaint had been received and would be investigated by the Pollution Control Team; and
- Construction management plan would be in place to minimize any disturbance during the construction period.

The recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to relevant conditions.

Councillors Kreling, Peach and Shearman addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary issues highlighted included:

- The planning application was aimed to fit in with the Edwardian building school built in 1909;
- There were currently insufficient school spaces provided to accommodate children in the area, and that the only solution was to build extra schools or extend existing ones;
- The proposals would provide additional open space with the demolition of the property at 6 Queens Drive; however, the plans were not intended to create an adverse affect on the neighbouring area;
- The proposals had met with PP2 and PP3 of the Planning Policy in order to avoid a significant impact on the highways in the vicinity of the site;
- The proposed application was intended to improve the school immeasurably and increase school places by 60;
- The Queen's Drive School had received good Ofsted reports;
- Parents should be discouraged from using transport to take their children to school;
- Care should be taken by parents using the residential parking areas;
- Councillor Shearman confirmed that he lived within the locale and sought confirmation that he could address the committee with regards to any interests he may have. The Solicitor confirmed that if Councillor Shearman did not hold a pecuniary interest in respect of the application then he could speak on the matter. Furthermore as he was not part of the decision making process he couldn't be accused of being biased in respect of the application.
- Parents and staff should not be advised to park on Queen's Drive West and Dogsthorpe Road, as contained in the travel plan, as these were restricted residential parking zones;
- Consideration should be given to install a pedestrian traffic light crossing at the Queens Drive West and Dogsthorpe Road crossing; and
- The Solicitor confirmed that the allegation regarding the disclosure of sensitive information was not a relevant planning consideration and was not pertinent to decision making regarding the planning application submitted at this meeting.

Councillors Kreling, Peach and Shearman responded to questions raised by Councillors:

- There were traffic pressures for most schools in the Peterborough area; however, Queen's Drive Infant School covered a relatively small residential catchment area;
- Installation of a controlled crossing at the Queens Drive West junction would depend on the cost, which would be subject to the Council's affordability; and
- The trees being removed to accommodate the much needed school places within the proposed school extension were in an unhealthy condition.

Dr Reed addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary concerns highlighted included:

- The initial comments made by the landscape officer regarding the bio diversity impact and the opinion to reject plans had not been included within the report;
- Consideration should be given to replace trees that were being removed;
- Concerns were raised over flood risk, foul sewer and surface water flooding and the impact that might be presented through climate change;
- There were unpleasant lingering odours around the residential area near the school;
- Measures should be in place to ensure that adequate soak away systems were being installed in order to avoid the build up in foul sewers;
- Disappointment raised over the lack of a grey water system being introduced for the school toilet block; and
- Measures to manage existing unpleasant odours caused by cooking had not been included in the conditions.

Dr Reed responded to questions raised by Councillors:

- Dr Reed did not share relaxed views over the removal of trees, relayed by some of the residents; and
- There were a large variety of birds that were attracted to the trees scheduled for removal and that it would be shameful not to replace all of them.

Following responses to questions, Members debated further and key points highlighted:

- Consideration should be given by planners to take on board the comments regarding the removal of trees and their replacement;
- There was disappointment over the lack of grey water recycling system for the school toilets, which had not been included as a condition within the planning application;

- Introducing grey water recycling would provide the school with an education opportunity for children and would also save money on water bills;
- Concerns were raised regarding the foul odour arising from the sewer along the Alma Road area and whether the development would exacerbate the issue;
- A beneficial educational opportunity should be taken up by the school to involve pupils along with local residents in replanting trees that were scheduled for removal;
- Had the appropriate measures been considered regarding the increase of cooking odours in the area;
- The proposals to extend Queens Drive Infant School was welcomed by Members;
- Landscaping arrangements had been covered by CS3 and was fairly detailed regarding landscaping and tree replacement, although consideration should be given to ensure that it was adequate for the area; and
- The Flood & Water Management Officer would be able to provide advice to Queen's Drive school regarding the use of grey water for toilets; and
- Concerns were raised over the impact of a traffic increase for the area and that the conditions adopted should be robust enough to keep the disruption to a minimum.

The Senior Engineer responded to questions regarding the transport plan being implemented if planning permission was to be granted which included:

- The object of the condition over the travel plan was to reduce car trips to the site;
- Staff would be encouraged to park further away from the residents car parking bays; and
- A school travel plan would be developed to aim to keep the travelling issues down and to an acceptable level.

The Planning Officer responded to questions raised by Councillors regarding the planning application:

- It would be difficult to retain the existing trees;
- The Planning Team would work closely with the school over the implementation of the condition over tree replacement and provide encouragement to plant a good number of suggested species,
- The tree planting would be reviewed within one month of commencement of the works;
- The grey water usage should be adopted as an informative measure and that the Planning Department would work with the school to encourage adoption of a scheme where possible; and
- The planners would raise the issues regarding the ventilation equipment used by the school which may be causing the cooking odour smells.

Following further debate and questions by Members regarding planning permission

being sought, a motion was put forward to grant the application, subject to relevant conditions and the updated conditions, with the inclusion of the following changes:

1. The timescale on condition CS03 to be met within one month of the application permission; and
2. To place an informative on the consent for the Queen's Drive Infant School to consider the use of grey water within the building development and going forward as part of the school itself.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) to grant the application, as per Officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions CS01 to CS10 as detailed in the committee report;
2. The updated conditions CS07 and CS10 and the addition of CS11 and CS12 as detailed in the update report;
3. The timescale on CS03 to be met within one month of the application permission; and
4. To place an informative on the consent for the Queen's Drive Infant School to consider the use of grey water within the building development and going forward as part of the school itself.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the 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:

- This was a sustainable development which would make efficient use of an existing school site which served a local catchment;
- The loss of the dwelling would be outweighed by the increased educational capacity of the school and would support the agenda for delivering more school places;
- The layout, scale, proportions and design of the extensions would respect the architectural features of the existing building and would not detract from the existing character of the site or that of the street scene;
- The extensions would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties;
- Appropriate provision had been made for safe, convenient and sustainable access to the site and the proposal would not result in a significant increase in vehicular trips to the site that would result in a detrimental impact to users of the highway;
- The Travel Plan set out robust targets to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport; and
- The proposal would provide replacement planting and features to enhance the biodiversity within the site.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with policies CS14, CS16 and CS21 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP12 and

PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

5.3 12/01725/FUL - Thomas Deacon Academy, Queens Gardens, Peterborough, PE1 2UW - Construction of two storey Junior Academy, single storey exam hall and extension to existing construction centre and associated works

The site was approximately 13.6 ha and was currently occupied by the Thomas Deacon Academy which opened in 2007 and was the former site of Deacons Secondary School. The site contained an academy building which opened in 2007 and accommodated up to 2200 pupils aged 11 to 19; a caretakers house and Buttery building to the west of the site and a construction centre to the east. There were a large number of existing sports pitches and playing fields. The site was enclosed by mature trees/shrubs to the boundaries and there were a number of mature trees within the site. The surrounding context was predominantly residential in character and there were two residential nursing homes located adjacent to the Park Crescent exit.

The current access was from Queens Gardens to the west and egress was through a single lane driveway to Park Crescent to the south of the site. Both of these access points could be used by pedestrians with additional pedestrian only access points thorough the schools playing fields on Nottingham Way to the north and on Grimshaw Road to the north east. Servicing vehicles accessed the site from Garton Street to the north.

There were two parking areas, which provided a total of 348 parking spaces; one area provided 238 staff parking spaces which was controlled by a barrier accessed by a key fob and one parking area provided 79 spaces and was used as a drop off area at the school start and finish times and was used for visitors during the school day. Cycle parking was also located within the site in the form of a bicycle shed, which provided storage for up to seventy five bicycles this was located between the two car parks near the entrance to the academy. Emergency vehicle access took place through any existing vehicular access points on Garton Street, Queens Gardens and Park Crescent if necessary.

Coach pick up for pupil travel was accommodated within the site. Coaches would access the site through the vehicular access points and load at a designated bus stop near to the Academy main entrance.

There were a number of schools located nearby including Queens Drive Infant School, All Saints Church of England Junior School on Dogsthorpe Road and Peterborough Regional College to the east of the site on Park Crescent.

It was also important to note that:

- School times would be staggered, which was anticipated to mitigate the impact of the increase in traffic over peak times;
- The widening of the exit lane towards Park Crescent and Park Road would not

- cause an issue with the impact of traffic; and
- The progress of the site development would not be held up if the junction widening was not achievable.

The application sought approval for the following:

- Junior Academy: A two storey junior academy building to be located to the west of the site and on an area currently used as tennis courts. The footprint of the building would be 58.5 metres in length by 23.5 metres in width and would have a flat roof design with edge parapets to a height of 8 metres. Approximately 2,765 square metres of accommodation would be provided, which comprised of classrooms, a double storey height dining hall/sports hall, a double storey height studio, a plant room, kitchen and changing/toilet facilities. A circulation space down the centre of the building would include a double storey height void. The roof would have a central strip rooflight over the central corridor. The external walls would be combination of window system and solid rendered in grey to match the existing academy building.

The junior school would provide a three form entry with four year groups with pupils aged between seven and eleven. It was intended that the school would bridge the gap between the Queens Drive Infant School and the Thomas Deacon Academy. On full occupation the school would have three hundred and sixty pupils and twenty six staff.

- Exam Hall: An exam hall with changing facilities to provide extra exam space for the existing Thomas Deacon Academy. The Exam hall would provide alternative use for ancillary sports facilities as well as for community use. The building would be located approximately 30 metres north of the Academy building. It would be single storey with a flat standing seam roof with parapets and have an overall height of 4.9 metres. The dimensions would be 34.4 metres in length x 18.9 metres in width. The exam hall would provide approximately a 455 square metres of accommodation. The external walls would be combination of window system and solid render in grey to match the existing academy building.
- Construction Centre: An extension to the existing construction training centre located to the north east of the Academy building. The extension was rectangular in shape and the dimensions would be 17.8 metres in length x 9.7 metres in width. The extension would have a flat roof with parapet upstands to a height of 4.2 metres. The proposed materials would be grey render to match the existing academy building.

Entrances to the building would be within the west and south elevations and high level windows were proposed to the east elevation. There were existing trees to the south of this building which demarcates the main school building with the construction centre. The centre was close to the shared boundary to the east with Regional College which was situated some 60m to the east. The building would provide approximately 160 square metres of accommodation.

- An existing Buttery building used for exams and a caretakers house used for construction training would be demolished to make way for new external sports

facilities/Multi Use Games Area (MUGA).

- The proposal included a staff and visitor car parking area comprising 42 spaces and two additional disabled spaces which would be accessed via Garton Street. Access to this car parking would be restricted.
- The proposal included a landscaped area to the west of the academy building which incorporated external teaching areas, an allotment/growing area and a landscape buffer.
- The existing TDA drop off car park area would be used for the Junior Academy building and the existing exit/egress route on to Park Crescent would be widened to 5.5m to provide two lanes. A separate cycle/footpath would be located to the east of the exit lane.

If approved, the junior academy was expected to open in Sept 2014. Its occupation would be phased with each September intake of ninety pupils until fully operational in 2017 with three hundred and sixty pupils. Staffing levels would also increase by phases.

A letter objection was received from a member of public, which raised concerns over the noise pollution being experienced by neighboring properties adjacent to the school and MUGA.

The detail of the amended condition C24 was included in the update report.

The Officer's recommendation was to grant the planning application subject to relevant conditions including the addition of amendments to the condition CS24.

Councillors Kreling, Peach and Shearman addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary issues highlighted included:

- There were currently not enough school places in the PE1 area and it was anticipated that the Junior Academy would accommodate the pressure;
- Children who attended the Queen's Drive Primary School would automatically qualify for a place at the Thomas Deacon Academy (TDA);
- Good for TDA to provide their expertise for the proposed Junior Academy;
- Concerns raised over staff and visitors parking access via Garton Street, Kings Gardens and Park Crescent, which may increase the existing traffic issues for the area;
- Consideration should be given to create two lanes on Park Crescent and Park Road junction to alleviate the impact of traffic increases;
- Consideration should be given to reduce any noise disturbance to residents in the Elizabeth Court area, however, TDA had given assurances that measures would be put in place in order to mitigate any noise issues;
- Consideration should be given to introduce trees at the early stages of the development in order to provide an effective noise buffer;

- Although Garton Street residents were generally in favour of the development, some concerns were parking issues on Garton Street, where in some cases divers were parking on the double yellow lines; and
- Concerns were raised over the increase in traffic for Garton Street and Garton End Road and it was hoped that the proposals contained within conditions C6, CS7, CS10, CS11 and CS15 would be robustly enforced.

The Group Manager Development Management and the Acting Senior Engineer, Highways responded to questions raised by the Committee regarding the traffic and noise pollution issues raised which included:

- There would be maximum capacity for forty two restricted parking spaces which would be accessed via the Garton Street and Garton End Road school entrance;
- If the car park was at maximum capacity the vehicle movements entering and exiting the Garton Street entrance would potentially total eighty four vehicle movements in a day;
- The landscaping and fencing proposals were intended to minimise the noise levels for the MUGA;
- It would be difficult to insist on acoustic fencing around all of the site boundaries given the current arrangements for the existing play area and school site;
- The proposed parking provision for the schools current staffing levels of twenty six, which was anticipated to create forty two traffic movements entering and exiting for the Garton Street area;
- The proposal to provide extra parking spaces for staff was adequate for future increases in staffing levels;
- All options regarding junction improvements had been reviewed and were deemed adequate to accommodate the vehicle movements;
- The start time for TDA was 8.45 and 9am for the Junior Academy. The staggered start time was intended to relieve some of the traffic issues.

Members debated and key points highlighted were:

- Concerns were raised over the aggressive traffic movements that currently existed on Park Road to Queens Drive junction and the challenges that may appear following the school development; and
- Concerns were raised over whether the staggered school opening times would resolve the traffic issues, as many parents commuting to work, would arrive at a time that was convenient to them when taking or collecting their children from school.

Following concerns raised by the Committee over the traffic issues on Park Crescent junction, the Group Manager Development Management responded to questions, which included:

- The Highway Team was aware of the traffic impact on Garton Street and in light of the staggered school drop off and collection times, there were no options to improve the junction any further;

- It was important for Committee to note that the traffic issues had been considered carefully by the Highways and Planning Teams and that all solutions to resolve the junction issues had been exhausted; and
- It was also important for the Committee to note that if the development did not go ahead it would not resolve the traffic issues.

Members debated further and key points highlighted were:

- It was not possible for the Committee to introduce any conditions through the planning process that would provide a solution for the traffic issues raised and that it would be the responsibility of the Highways Team to monitor and provide solutions as necessary;
- The staggered school drop off and collection times should be reviewed further in order to relieve the traffic issues;
- Pollution control measures should be adequate in order to meet appropriate levels to mitigate the noise impact;
- The Highway issues should not hold up the planning application to develop the school;
- Concerns were raised regarding access for emergency vehicles; and
- Further traffic issues should not be created for residents and a survey should be conducted over traffic speeds on Park Crescent.

During Members debate the Group Manager Development Management responded to further concerns raised over the Highways impact and the landscaping arrangements, which included:

- The Highways department would be responsible for extending double yellow lines located on Garton Street through a TRO;
- The Group Manager Development would liaise with Environment Health in over the discharge of revised condition C24.
- Emergency vehicles would gain access to the school via the Queens Gardens and Garton Street access; and
- The planning action sheet was to include a speed survey for Park Crescent.

Following further debate and questions by Members regarding planning permission being sought a motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application with amended conditions. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) to grant the application, as per Officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C35 as detailed in the committee report; and
2. Amendments to condition C24 as detailed in the update report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the 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 site was located within the urban area and the proposal would enhance the educational capacity for the catchment area;
- This was a sustainable development which would make efficient use of an existing school site;
- The start and finish times for the junior school and the Thomas Deacon Academy will be staggered and the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the adjoining highway network;
- The site would provide safe and convenient access and is accessible by a choice of means of transport and the use of non-car modes of travel will be encouraged through the School Travel Plan;
- The layout, scale, proportions and design of the Junior Academy building, the exam hall and extension to the construction centre would respect the Thomas Deacon Academy building and would not detract from the existing character of the site or that of the street scene;
- The siting of the building provided an adequate separation distance to existing neighbouring residential properties and the proposal would not result in any adverse effects on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties;
- The proposal would enhance the sports/playing fields within the site which would be available; and
- The proposal would provide replacement planting and features to enhance the biodiversity within the site.

Hence the proposal accords with Policies CS14, CS16, CS21 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP12, PP13 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

5.4 12/01430/R3FUL - Heltwate School, Heltwate, Bretton, Peterborough - Installation of security fence and gates

The application site formed an area of landscaping (15 metres x 70 metres) in front of Heltwate Primary School, and was identified as such within the Peterborough Open Space Strategy (2010). The site was not suitable for play and was more of a landscaped area. To the north, east and south were high density residential and flats, with the Masonic Hall to the South-West. The site formed the centre of what was effectively a circulation route for the school, with parking and a drop off/pick up area to the west. The site was open with no boundary treatments. There were a number of healthy trees on site, none of which were protected by way of tree preservation orders.

The Applicant sought consent to erect a 2 metre high Paladin Classic fence and two gates, finished in green (RAL6005). This would incorporate the informal amenity space and pick up/drop off area into the school grounds.

The application had been made in order to ensure the safety and security of the school and its pupils with special needs.

The application was deferred at the 18 December 2012 meeting of the PEP Committee so that the Committee could gain a better understanding of why the

fence was needed and why it had to be located in the position shown.

Officer recommendation was to grant planning permission, with conditions, subject to no objection being received which raised a material planning consideration.

Ms Anita Fellows and Mr Alistair Osborn, addressed the Committee in objection to the planning application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The Ellingdon area appeared to be experiencing a reduction in services due to development in the area, with the removal of amenities such as play grounds, paddling pool and various other open spaces that children in the area would play on;
- Further development in the area was planned, which would result in the loss of further open space relied upon for children's play areas;
- The Heltwate School open land had been used by the community for twenty two years;
- Disputes were made towards the school's claim about the Heltwate School open area being covered in dog foul, needles and broken bottles;
- Parents in the area would not allow their children to play on the school's open area that was unsafe;
- Many different ethnic community groups should be supported by being able to access open area near Heltwate School rather than be segregated to their own community groups;
- Concerns raised over losing an open area would create an increase in child obesity;
- The school already had enclosed play areas;
- The football pitch that was close by was not for community use;
- Installation of gates on the open area at Heltwate School would cause a traffic build up issue;
- Installation of the fence and gates on Heltwate School would separate the whole area as well as cause parking issue; and
- The school was closely monitored by CCTV which had often failed to maintain security.

Mr Osborn responded to questions from Members. In summary responses included:

- Many of the houses on the new development had small gardens;
- The new housing developments had taken away parking from the older houses in the Ellingdon area;
- Around sixty children would play on the Heltwate School open area at any one time during the summer;
- The Police had not investigated the issues of broken glass, needles and dog fouling in the Ellingdon area;
- There was recently a camper residing in the area for a total of ten days in November 2011, as there were no other greens spaces available to pitch a tent;
- The camper had been informed that he would not qualify for housing through the housing association;

- The camper had not appeared to be a drug user, and there had been no evidence of broken glass, discarded needles;
- If Heltwate School land became unavailable, the Bretton football field, located five minutes away from the Ellingdon area would be utilised; however, the use was restricted to weekdays;
- There was an alternative field, which could be utilised as a play area; however, there were development proposals underway for that area;
- The Bretton football field had often presented issues such as youths on mopeds and uncontrolled dogs, which had caused safety issues for children wishing to play;
- There would be no objection from residents if the fencing was to be installed around the Heltwate School, which did not take up the entire oval; however, there would be concerns over the build up of traffic, which would block access for local residents;
- The volume of traffic arising from the use of the Masonic Centre would cause congestion if installation of the Heltwate School fencing was to go ahead;
- Residents disagreed with Officer recommendations that the installation of fencing and gates would not create an adverse highways impact due to loss of space; and
- Young Children playing on the oval in front of Heltwate School would easily be seen by parents from houses in the Ellingdon area.

Ms Debbie Heasman, Headteacher of Heltwate School and Applicant for the planning proposal addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted were:

- Attendance figures at Heltwate School was increasing;
- The installation of fencing and gates around the land; which was owned by the school, was essential in order to ensure the safety of the pupils;
- Pupils attending the school had varied complex special needs;
- The play area located at the back of school was not adequate to accommodate the number of children attending, due to the recent school extension reducing the space in the play area;
- The Ellingdon area had recently experienced an arson attack involving a mini bus being burned out and the school wanted to introduce provisions to ensure that staff and visitors cars were safe and secure; and
- The school want to work with residents over the use of the open area; however there had been many incidents such as camp outs, fly tipping and an increase in traffic.

Ms Debbie Heasman responded to Councillors questions. In summary the responses included:

- The school required the fencing in order to accommodate the staff parking and the protection of vehicles. In addition there were also a number of evening events being held at the school, so there was added protection required for visitors vehicles;
- Installing fencing to only the green area of the school would not be adequate as the entire area was required due to it being a learning zone and fire assembly point;

- Some of the children attending Heltwate School with complex special needs would be capable of climbing over a 1m fence, which was why a 2m fence was being proposed;
- The children would not use the play area without supervision;
- The area was not currently being used as a play area for the pupils at Heltwate School;
- Following installation of a fence, the area was intended to be used as an outdoor classroom and not a play area;
- Members commented that the school should work towards a comprise with local residents;
- There were comments made by residents over congestion issues; however, all the pupils attending Heltwate School arrived by mini bus; and
- The extra space was not intended to provide extra parking solely for evening events and that it was the safety of the children that was under consideration by the school.

Members debated further and key points highlighted were:

- Members considered it unacceptable to erect such a high fence of 2m so close to the highway and local residents properties and that the school should work with the Council's Planning Officers to consider alternative options;
- Neighbouring residents had been used to using the open land in front of the school as a facility and it was a shame that these planning proposals would end that use; and
- Members commented that they agreed with the school over maintaining the safety of pupils; however, there were concerns over the height and the need for the fence to be positioned so close to the highway and whether its installation would provide a solution for the problems being experienced by the school.

The Group Manager Development Management advised Members that the school was entitled to erect a 1 metre fence abutting the highway. Members were also advised that it was acceptable for the school to install a 2 metre high fence if it was not more that 3 metres from the highway.

Following further debate and questions by Members regarding planning permission being sought a motion was put forward and seconded to go against Officers recommendation and refuse the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimous) to reject Officer recommendation.

Reasons for the decision:

The application was refused in accordance with planning policies CS16 and PP2 due to the visual impact of the fence on the street scene.

1.30pm - 4.27 pm
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank